Father Johannes (to use the Orthodox method of referring to clergy) traces the theme of God as love through more than two dozen thinkers, although he does not indicate how they influenced each other. In spite of this slight shortcoming, this monumental work does indicate the central role this theme played in the writings of each of these figures. Prominent, especially in the first period, is V. Solov’ev; he is followed by a long list of Russian religious thinkers. Fr. Johannes provides a brief biography of each of them and then discusses their thinking on the theme of divine love. The centrality of love in the writings of all of them shows how important this theme is in Russian religious thought. Yet, at the same time, the diversity of these thinkers is evident, and the myth of a single school of Russian thought is dispelled.

Although the entire book is focused on love, the last chapter is an especially beautiful essay on the nature of love in all its many aspects, incorporating the insights discussed earlier in the book. I heartily recommend this book as a good entry point into the centrality of love in the thought of some of the greatest Russian Orthodox thinkers.

—Adrian Helleman


In six chapters, Southern Baptist writer Owen Strachan has provided an accessible account of how there has been a resurgence of broadly evangelical scholarship and writing within American Christianity since 1940. He is certainly not the first to take up this subject; he has advanced over a trail blazed by such earlier writers as George M. Marsden in *Reforming Fundamentalism: Fuller Seminary and the New Evangelicalism* (1987), Joel Carpenter in *Revive Us Again: The Re-Awakening of American Fundamentalism* (1999), and most recently Garth Rosell in *The Surprising Work of God* (2008).

Yet, while he is frank in admitting his indebtedness to such writers, Strachan’s compact work of 238 pages is more than a distillation of earlier efforts. It is instead a retelling of a story that gives center stage to Harold John Ockenga (1905–1985) as the entrepreneurial pastor-theologian who, having been invited to Boston’s Park Street Church in 1937, exerted an ever-widening influence. From that base, Ockenga gathered a coterie of postgraduate theological students in Ivy League universities around himself, helped to orient them to pressing issues through summer conferences, and began to chart an evangelical theological resurgence.

A particular strength of the book is its description of the formation of Ockenga as a pastor-theologian (chapters 1 and 2). From Wesleyan roots
in Indiana and as a graduate of Taylor University, Ockenga—like so many other young evangelicals in the post-WWI era—went to Princeton Seminary. It was not a precommitment on Ockenga’s part to Reformed theology but Princeton’s reputation as a bastion of evangelical orthodoxy that explained the attraction. From Princeton, Ockenga followed his hero, J. Gresham Machen, to the humbler Westminster Seminary, Philadelphia—meeting in rented facilities on Pine Street (not, as Strachan has it, the post-1937 Chestnut Hill campus). Strachan portrays Machen as the mentor who directed Ockenga both to initial ministries in Pittsburgh and who in 1936–1937 commended him to Park Street Church, Boston. This enables us to see the embattled Machen, at the very period when he was active in establishing the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, acting also with a view to influencing wider evangelical Protestantism.

As indicated, the Ockenga circle in greater Boston spent the World War II years discussing evangelical priorities for the coming years. A second particular strength of Strachan’s treatment is his depiction of the young Carl F. H. Henry, himself drawn into the Ockenga circle while completing a Boston University doctorate. As eventual colleague to both Ockenga and Billy Graham, Henry became the promoter of the design of a new Ivy League Christian research university (chapter 6). The Reformed community was not the only constituency in Protestant America in those Eisenhower-Kennedy years left wondering what Henry meant to imply about the role of the nation’s existing Christian colleges and universities. This analysis is the single most extensive treatment of this university scheme known to this reviewer. It seems quaint—almost odd—to learn that the name proposed for the prospective institution for which Henry invested so much time was “Crusade University.” Surely, this would have proved to be a public relations disaster in post 9/11 America.

Yet, Strachan’s *Awakening the Evangelical Mind* is comprised of six chapters. We acknowledged that three of these turned up genuinely new material. What of the remaining three? This reviewer wishes to take issue with the story line that Strachan follows. It is one thing to grant that Harold J. Ockenga soon became more than a regional leader in North American evangelical Protestantism. We can grant without difficulty that he attracted the attention of budding younger scholars in greater Boston, and eventually secured their services for the nascent Fuller Theological Seminary (begun 1947) in Pasadena, California. This is a story already narrated by others. The issue that begs attention however is, “Is this story line, extending from greater Boston to Pasadena itself the story of post-War America’s evangelical Protestant theological resurgence?”

This reviewer would contend that the pursuit of this thesis has employed a kind of historical fallacy, protested against earlier in American religious
history. It is the fallacy of exaggerating the influence of “northern evangelicals” (located in greater Chicago, Boston and Philadelphia) in determining the future intellectual course of the whole of American evangelical Protestantism. In a nutshell, this approach to the history of American evangelical Protestantism maintains that the intellectual and theological course of the movement in the second half of the twentieth century was set by Ockenga and his Boston circle (chapter 3). This circle led by Ockenga formed the nucleus of the faculty of the fledgling Fuller Seminary; this circle enriched the biblical and theological faculty of Wheaton College; this circle helped to launch the Evangelical Theological Society in 1949. It is worth asking what this approach ignores.

For one, it ignores other geographical centers in the postfundamentalist resurgence of scholarship in the 1940s. Never mentioned in Strachan’s treatment are such occurrences as Bernard Ramm’s joining the faculty of Biola in 1943 while pursuing a PhD at the University of Southern California (granted 1950). Everett Harrison (mentioned only in passing by Strachan) gained a PhD at the University of Pennsylvania (1950), teaching both at Dallas and (subsequently) Fuller. Notable conservative scholars such as William Hendriksen, Anthony Hoekema, and Vernon Grounds gained doctorates at Princeton and Drew in this period. Meanwhile, in the postwar period, Americans of promise were also pursuing doctorates in the United Kingdom and on the Continent (notably of Amsterdam’s Free University).

For another, the approach followed also slights existing denominational and confessional theological education in the mid-twentieth century. Strachan is a Southern Baptist. One would conclude (mistakenly) by taking *Awakening the Evangelical Mind* as authoritative that the sizeable Southern Baptist seminaries at Wake Forest, Louisville, New Orleans, and Fort Worth were on the sidelines in this period. At mid-century, mainline seminaries such as Princeton, Pittsburgh-Xenia, and Columbia still retained theologically conservative faculty members. Meanwhile, not only was Ockenga himself an alumnus of Westminster, Philadelphia, so also were future Fuller faculty members Paul King Jewett and E. J. Carnell. Their former Philadelphia teacher, theologian John Murray, was soon in the young seminary at Pasadena delivering the 1955 Payton Lectures (eventually published as *Principles of Conduct*). Fuller, in addition to drawing on these Philadelphia connections, soon included alumni of Calvin Seminary in Grand Rapids, Michigan: Lewis B. Smedes and James Daane.

Finally, Strachan’s approach—because it treats Ockenga’s circle as determinative for America’s postwar evangelicalism—dares assign no blame for the disheartening controversy that plagued Fuller two decades after its founding, leading to Ockenga’s and various conservative faculty members’ disassociation from it. Thus, it can fairly be said that the approach taken in *Awakening the Evangelical Mind* is one of monocausality: Ockenga and his
Boston circle were preeminent. In truth, an evangelical theological resurgence in postwar America was unfolding in multiple regions, in multiple institutions, and under the leadership of multiple nascent leaders. The resurgence was multicausal, but the sad fact is that we do not, at this stage, have any single work, taken as a whole, that describes that picture. Until we do, Strachan’s work offers us the best broad-brush account available.

—Kenneth J. Stewart


Transcribed with annotations by Isabella Watt, Wallace McDonald, and Jeffrey Watt, this volume continues the careful work on the Consistoire de Genève in the time of John Calvin. Like those of the previous volumes, the detailed annotations benefit from the extensive general biographical articles gathered by the team for this and previous work.

The period under consideration in this volume was particularly important and challenging for the Consistoire. As the editors explain in the introduction to the volume, the period of February 15, 1554, to January 31, 1555, sees a spike in the number and length of documents from the Consistoire due in large part to the challenge to its authority—particularly that of Calvin. Stress on that authority stemmed from not only the increase in refugees to the city but also from the continued will of the Consistoire to exercise discipline. This turbulence would culminate in the riot of May 1555 after which Calvin’s position would be more secure.

Throughout 1554, a steady stream of refugees would enter Geneva, looking for a place of peace. Calvin and the pastors of the Consistoire—almost all from France themselves—would face off against the “Enfants de Genève,” a group of Genevan citizens who were distressed at the increasing influence of these foreigners. In particular, the question of foreign authority was wedded to that of church discipline. Calvin and the foreign pastors seemed to have too much influence over regulating the Lord’s Supper and excommunication. A letter helpfully cited in the introduction of this volume from Calvin of February 13, 1554, shows his firm opinion on the subject (xi).

Overall, the texts in question reveal the often-tense workings between the Consistoire and the various other Genevan political institutions. Equally important, these texts again reveal the continued presence of Berne in the movement of reform in Geneva. As previous volumes in this series have shown, the Genevan Consistoire had minor, but potentially significant differences with Berne on liturgy and ecclesiastical discipline. This tension would continue throughout 1554 and continuing into 1555.