

with supposed late sources of influences. He concludes that the grammatical structure of the book is "fully in the realm of the pre-exilic language once one respects the complex nature of the book's style and language" (p. 267). He warns that the book's language is "so unusual that simple comparisons can, and do mislead the student to faulty deductions about it" (p. 255). The nature of the work obviously makes it technical, but most helpful for those who can follow the linguistic arguments.

Loader, J. A. *Polar Structures in the Book of Qoheleth*. New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1979. 136 pp.

Analyzes the book according to what he terms polar structures, "patterns of tension created by the counterposition of two elements to one another" (p. 1). He claims this is the outstanding characteristic of the book and provides "an adequate literary explanation" (p. 1). Argues against typical views that either the book is just a series of loose sayings or it has a logical development: "we have no logical development of thought reflected in the composition of the book, but there are various separate pericopes ... which are structured carefully" and then the pericopes are "compositionally related" (p. 9). Identifies the basic idea running through everything as the "conviction of emptiness which purposely begins and ends the book" (p. 9). Gives a detailed review of the formal literary aspects of the book. Chapter 3 is the key. It shows the actual polar patterns throughout with diagrams of passages. On the basis of his study he makes the following conclusions: 1) must reject any Greek influence, 2) must reject the notion of redactors, 3) must reject the notion of contradictions. What have been identified as contradictions are part of the intended polar structure (pp. 132-133). Says that Ecclesiastes is "one of the most delicate and complex literary products of the ancient Near East" (p. 133).

Zuck, Roy B. (ed.). *Reflecting with Solomon: Selected Studies on the Book of Ecclesiastes*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1994. 426 pp.

Superb collection of 33 journal articles and other short studies on the book as a whole and on selected passages. Though the editor espouses Solomonic authorship, many of the contributors adhere to critical positions. Begins with J. Stafford Wright's excellent study originally published in 1946 (pp. 17-30). Includes William Henry Green's classic unsigned article, "The Scope and Plan of the Book of Ecclesiastes," originally published by *Princeton Review* in 1857 (pp. 115-131) and very difficult to find now. Many books like this do not have an index, but Zuck has indexed both subjects (including authors) and Scripture.

© 1997 Bob Jones University
Reproduced with permission.
Further reproduction prohibited.

Was J. Gresham Machen a Fundamentalist?

by Mark Sidwell

The idea that Presbyterian scholar J. Gresham Machen (1881-1937) could be regarded as anything other than a Fundamentalist might seem preposterous at first consideration. Machen was the preeminent literary foe of Modernism in the 1920s with his popular work *Christianity and Liberalism* (1923). An heir to the Princeton theology of Charles Hodge and B. B. Warfield, his theological orthodoxy was as impeccable as his scholarship. When, through the Auburn Affirmation, elements within the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. (PCUSA) opposed the strict doctrinal test for ministers, Machen stood up firmly for the orthodox side. When reorganization threatened to shift control of Princeton Theological Seminary from conservatives to inclusivists, the professor resisted and, on losing that fight, founded Westminster Theological Seminary as an orthodox alternative. When Modernism began to make inroads in the mission boards of the PCUSA, Machen led a counterattack and founded an independent mission board as an instrument to put conservative missionaries on the field. Tried and defrocked by the PCUSA for his association with this board, Machen founded the doctrinally strict Orthodox Presbyterian Church. All of these elements seem to etch a portrait of the staunchest of Fundamentalists.

But there has been some dissent from this viewpoint. One of the earliest dissenters was Machen's first biographer, Ned Stonehouse, who argued against identifying Machen with Fundamentalism, saying that

one must take account of the fact that, judged by various criteria adopted by friend and foe, he was not a fundamentalist at all. His standards of scholarship, his distaste for brief creeds, his rejection of chiliasm, the absence of pietism from his makeup, and in brief his sense of commitment to the historic Calvinism of the Westminster Confession of Faith disquali-

fied him from being classed precisely as a fundamentalist. And he never spoke of himself as a fundamentalist; indeed he dislike the term.¹

Stonehouse also offers quotations from Machen himself, who certainly displayed at least an ambivalence to the term. Machen said on one occasion,

The term fundamentalism is distasteful to the present writer and to many persons who hold views similar to his. It seems to suggest that we are adherents of some strange new sect, whereas in point of fact we are conscious simply of maintaining the historic Christian faith and of moving in the great central current of Christian life.²

In 1926 Machen asked,

Do you suppose, gentlemen, that I do not detect faults in many popular defenders of supernatural Christianity? Do you suppose that I do not regret my being called, by a term that I greatly dislike, a "Fundamentalist"? Most certainly I do. But in the presence of a great common foe, I have little time to be attacking my brethren who stand with me in defense of the Word of God. I must continue to support an unpopular cause.³

On June 25, 1927, Machen turned down the offer of the presidency of the newly founded Bryan Memorial University contending that

thoroughly consistent Christianity, to my mind, is found only in the Reformed or Calvinistic Faith; and consistent Christianity, I think, is the Christianity easiest to defend. Hence I never call myself a "Fundamentalist." There is, indeed, no inherent objection to the term; and if the disjunction is between "Fundamentalism" and "Modernism," then I am willing to call myself a Fundamentalist of the most pronounced type. But after all, what I prefer to call myself is not a "Fundamentalist" but a "Calvinist"—that is, an adherent of the Reformed Faith.⁴

Such statements indicate that there is at least a basis for discussing Machen's adherence to Fundamentalism. The arguments of two writers who question that identification help delineate the points involved in this debate. From within the Fundamentalist camp itself comes the critique of George Dollar; from the heritage of Machen himself at Westminster Seminary and the Orthodox Presbyterian Church come the arguments of Darryl G. Hart.

Dollar's Argument

George Dollar was the first from within Fundamentalist ranks to attempt a comprehensive history of Fundamentalism. In his flawed but pioneering work *A History of Fundamentalism in America*, he argues that Machen was not a Fundamentalist but rather an "Orthodox Ally" of Fundamentalists, albeit one to whom the movement owed a great debt for his scholarship and defense of the truth.⁵

Dollar's rationale for excluding Machen and others such as Mark Matthews and Clarence Macartney revolves around his definition of Fundamentalism. In the main, Dollar contends that Fundamentalists were dispensationalist and premillennialist; these "Orthodox" men were neither. In addition, he contrasts the Orthodox with Fundamentalists by stressing Orthodox ancestry in the Reformation instead of what he alleges is the more purely New Testament heritage of Fundamentalists. Dollar also cites their disagreement with some means of evangelism popular among the Fundamentalists.⁶ At the conclusion of his discussion of Machen and other Orthodox Allies, Dollar reiterates his distinction in a list of several points. In addition to reprising the difference in eschatology, he adds a reluctance by the Orthodox to join Fundamentalist organizations (e.g., the World's Christian Fundamentals Association), the failure of the Orthodox to lead large churches and rally crowds to their cause, the valuing of education in the original languages of Scripture and Reformed theology instead of engaging in soulwinning and building Sunday schools, and a gentlemanly approach to controversy instead of the pugnacity of Fundamentalists such as J. Frank Norris.⁷ He also alludes to a difference "on matters of personal separation and ecclesiastical polity" but does not develop the point.⁸

One immediately picks out one or two flaws in Dollar's argument. Why is a Reformed amillennialist Baptist such T. T. Shields considered a Fundamentalist while Reformed Presbyterians are not?⁹ And it seems a little ridiculous to classify Mark Matthews and Clarence Macartney as men unable to build large churches or rally conservatives to their cause. The center of his argument, though, is his definition of Fundamentalism.

It is not clear how Dollar formed his definition. The presentation in his book gives the impression that he first formed a definition of Fundamentalists as dispensationalist premillennialists and then read it back into history rather than attempting to form a definition based on the study of the evidence. One must hasten to note, however, that his views are similar to those of other scholars, such as Ernest Sandeen.¹⁰ Clearly, by the definition that Dollar gives, Machen was not a Fundamentalist. The question is whether that definition is accurate. Ironically, there would seem to be no reason why Machen would not qualify under Dollar's initial definition of a Fundamentalist: "Historic Fundamentalism is the literal exposition of all the affirmations and attitudes of the Bible and the militant exposure of all non-Biblical affirmations and attitudes."¹¹ Indeed, Machen would seem an ideal Fundamentalist under these terms.

Hart's Argument

A similar line of thought, although developed differently, appears in the writings of D. G. Hart of Westminster Seminary. The outlines of his position may be found in his biography of Machen, *Defending the Faith*; in his history of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, written with John Muether; and in various articles.¹² Hart is by no means rigid about not calling Machen a Fundamentalist. He is willing, for example, to allude in a general way to Machen as "one of the more important religious leaders within both Reformed and fundamentalist folds."¹³ But he contends that too easy an identification of Machen with the movement does not do justice to Machen's thought.

Hart does not deny that Machen was a separatist, but he questions whether separatism is by itself a sufficient basis for definition. He cites the Christian Reformed Church as a group that practiced an ecclesiastical and cultural separation, yet is not considered Fundamentalist.¹⁴ Instead, arguing along lines similar to Dollar and Sandeen, Hart defines Fundamentalism in terms of inerrancy and dispensationalism. Hart and Muether characterize the heart of Fundamentalist ideology as dispensationalist premillennialism, revivalism, personal separation from "worldly entertainments," and "a low view of the institutional church."¹⁵ Hart states, "Recent scholarship has shown that fundamentalism was an alliance of conservatives who held that human history was on the verge of collapsing, that Christ's return was imminent, and that the Bible was inerrant in scientific and historical details as well as spiritual matters." Dispensationalist premillennialism, he maintains, lay at the heart of this position.¹⁶

With this definition in place, Hart is able to put Machen in proper perspective. He cites Machen's own protests (mentioned above) as one obvious piece of evidence against his identification with Fundamentalism. He notes how Machen turned down an invitation by W. B. Riley to join the World's Christian Fundamentals Association not only because it was overtly premillennial but also because he feared his joining would be seen as an endorsement of dispensationalism.¹⁷ Machen became more openly anti-dispensationalist as time went on, criticizing it as "profoundly harmful."¹⁸

The alleged shortcomings of dispensationalism aside, Hart contends that Machen saw Fundamentalism as theologically inadequate. This perspective is seen in Machen's reaction when his Independent Board of Presbyterian Foreign Missions was reorganized by a faction led by Carl McIntire. Machen bemoaned the fall of the mission board into "mere fundamentalism."¹⁹ As mentioned before, Machen viewed Calvinism as "consistent Christianity," and he held staunchly to the Westminster Confession of Faith as the fullest and finest expression of Christian doctrine. Hart believes that many historians miss this confessional aspect of Machen's ideology. Even inerrancy, as impor-

tant as it was to the Princeton men, was only one part of a complete system of biblical theology. Hart expands on this point in discussing Machen and his Princeton colleague William Park Armstrong:

Contrary to prevailing notions which associate the Seminary's conservatism with the institution's commitment to inerrancy and the influence of Common Sense Realism, Machen and Armstrong reveal that the Seminary's principal concern in the fundamentalist controversy was to defend the system of doctrine taught in the Westminster Confession of Faith. Undoubtedly, their Calvinistic understanding of sin and grace implied a conservative view of Scripture. But by focusing on the doctrine of inerrancy historians have missed the priority of Princeton's confessional perspective.²⁰

Hart is thus able to argue that although Machen's actions may sometimes look like those of other Fundamentalists, they actually arise from different motives. Machen's separation from the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., for example, arose from his concern for a denomination free of liberalism because of the nature and purpose of the church. "The issue was not separatism but discipline and integrity."²¹ Machen professed less interest in the anti-evolution crusade than other Fundamentalists because of his focus on Christ-centered salvation as expressed in Reformed theology. "For him, the crucial difference between historic Christianity and liberalism had more to do with antagonistic ideas about Christ and the nature of salvation than with divergent accounts of creation."²²

One aspect that Hart especially brings out, but Dollar does not, is that Machen was not concerned with preserving "American Christian civilization." As George Marsden points out in *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, many Fundamentalists in their fight for the Faith devoted their energies to saving what they saw as the distinctly Christian culture represented by America in the nineteenth century.²³ Machen did not. A political libertarian, Machen was uneasy with using politics to promote moral causes, as most Fundamentalists did.²⁴ Machen thought, Hart says, that "the churches had no business meddling in society," and he did not hold that "Christian values constituted the bedrock of American society."²⁵ Hart contrasts Machen's attitude with that of William Jennings Bryan. That statesman Fundamentalist was more typical of the movement, says Hart, in desiring to preserve Christian civilization in broad spheres of life. By contrast, Machen wanted to preserve orthodox Presbyterian teaching in the church.²⁶

Answering the Question

Dollar and Hart raise important points. They rightly argue that one cannot define Fundamentalism simply as "anti-Modernism." Otherwise Pope Pius X becomes one of history's preeminent Fundamentalists. It is this realization that

has led historians and Fundamentalists themselves to attempt to frame more precise definitions, such as the association of Fundamentalism strictly with inerrancy and premillennialism and even more narrowly with inerrancy and dispensationalism. One cannot, however, simply ignore the central place that opposition to Modernism holds in defining Fundamentalism. Consider the positions ascribed to Charles Erdman of Princeton on the one hand and Machen and Clarence Macartney on the other in the Presbyterian Fundamentalist-Modernist controversy. Bradley Longfield notes the ways in which Erdman was closer to the Fundamentalist heritage than Machen or Macartney. Erdman was a staunch premillennialist, a friend of revivalism and worker with D. L. Moody, an editor of the *Scofield Reference Bible*, and even a contributor to *The Fundamentals*. But in the Presbyterian battle, Erdman stood on the inclusive side while Machen and Macartney stood with the rigorists. Hence writers understandably class Machen and Macartney as Fundamentalists and leave Erdman's position ambiguous at best.²⁷

This is not to say that the identification of premillennialism with Fundamentalism is without merit. Machen's co-belligerent Macartney also thought that premillennialism was the defining quality of Fundamentalism.²⁸ But even among staunch premillennialists, it was not always a litmus test. As noted before, Machen was put off by W. B. Riley's insistence that his World's Christian Fundamentals Association maintain an overtly premillennial stance. Yet when issuing the creed for the Bible Baptist Union in 1923, Riley was willing to ask only an affirmation of the Second Coming in deference to Canadian Baptists such as T. T. Shields and Southern Baptists such as R. H. Pitt who were amillennialists.²⁹

Hart's argument from Machen's rejection of "American Christian civilization" is likewise important but not conclusive. It is interesting that Hart uses William Jennings Bryan as a contrast to Machen on this point. Yet Bryan—a postmillennialist and political Progressive—was fully as atypical of Fundamentalism on some points as Machen was on others. One should also note the sketch that Marsden gives of the views of staunch dispensationalists such as Arno C. Gaebelein and I. M. Haldeman. Their dispensationalist views actually caused them to question the whole ideal of "Christian civilization," whether in America or elsewhere. Ironically, the very strength of their adherence to one tenet of Fundamentalism caused them to question another.³⁰ If Bryan, Gaebelein, and Haldeman may dissent from one plank of the Fundamentalist platform while remaining within the movement, why not Machen too?

The alleged theological shallowness of Fundamentalism can cut two ways. On the one hand, Fundamentalists might contend that only the common essentials of Christianity are of real importance, and other distinctives (Calvinistic, denominational, etc.) should be downplayed. In a different context, this was something of the position of D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones in arguing

for Evangelical unity in the face of Liberalism.³¹ Machen would likely have been as uncomfortable with that view as were some dissenters from Lloyd-Jones.³² The other position, which seems closer to Machen's view, is that Fundamentalism is inadequate because it does not deal with the whole of Christian theology. The argument is not that Fundamentalism necessarily adhered to doctrines that Machen abhorred (unless one includes dispensationalism); it is rather that Machen thought there was more to Christianity than Fundamentalism was demanding. Machen was willing to fellowship with non-Calvinist brethren on one level, but he was not eager to pursue a church connection with them. His Orthodox Presbyterian Church, founded in 1936, was to be a confessional Presbyterian church, not an interdenominational Fundamentalist one.

Yet one should note in this connection that at least twice after Machen's death, the OPC went through controversies with minority factions that did view the denomination as part of the Fundamentalist movement. In 1937 a faction led by Carl McIntire and J. Oliver Buswell eventually broke off to form the Bible Presbyterian Church as avowedly Fundamentalist Presbyterians.³³ Likewise some of those supporting the ordination of Gordon Clark in the late 1940s hoped to see the church move in a Fundamentalist direction.³⁴ Even in Machen's own house, identification with Fundamentalism found its adherents.

Perhaps the strongest argument for associating Machen with Fundamentalism is the one alluded to in the introduction of this article: Machen fit the *pattern* of a Fundamentalist. In his opposition to Liberalism; in his participation in denominational controversies; and in the founding of a separatist school, mission board, and denomination, Machen appears to be the very model of a modern Fundamentalist. The founding of the Independent Board of Presbyterian Foreign Missions is especially significant in this regard. Hart and Muether admit the act is "an anomaly at best" in the light of Machen's churchmanship.³⁵ Elsewhere Hart says that Machen's support of the IBPFM resembled the approach of many Fundamentalists in downplaying the institutional church and upholding parachurch organizations.³⁶ The action at least highlights the difficulty of trying to separate Machen too far from Fundamentalism.

What is the answer to the question of the title? Yes, J. Gresham Machen was a Fundamentalist—with qualifications. One who would provide an accurate portrait of Machen must acknowledge Machen's distaste for the term and point out the objections of both Machen and historians such as Dollar and Hart. But one must be careful not to exclude Christians of diverse backgrounds who are willing to identify themselves with Fundamentalism because they do not fit every preconception of the movement. Otherwise, some Fundamentalists such as T. T. Shields or modern-day Ulster Presbyterian Ian Paisley cease to be Fundamentalist at all. Such a conclusion is a danger with Dollar's

view, although not so much with Hart's. Defining Fundamentalism historically with any accuracy is a delicate task, and as the case of J. Gresham Machen shows, one that can tax even the most careful historian.

Notes

¹Ned B. Stonehouse, *J. Gresham Machen: A Biographical Memoir* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1954), p. 337. Also on p. 343 he reiterates that high standards of scholarship distinguish *Christianity and Liberalism* as being "considerably beyond the range of ordinary fundamentalist thinking and writing."

²Ibid., p. 336.

³Ibid., pp. 336-37.

⁴Ibid., p. 428.

⁵George W. Dollar, *A History of Fundamentalism in America* (Greenville, S.C.: Bob Jones University Press, 1973), pp. 173-83.

⁶Ibid., p. 175. Dollar acknowledges the popular identification of Machen and other "Orthodox Allies" as Fundamentalists when he offers "a word of warning" that the "more popular use of the word 'Fundamentalist'" in the 1910s and 1920s "included all those who defended the Bible against the attacks of Liberalism."

⁷Ibid., pp. 181-83.

⁸Ibid., p. 182. Dollars mention this distinction as the topic sentence of his sixth point, but his discussion that follows revolves around differences in personal style.

⁹Dollar includes Shields as one of his four "Prima Donnas of Fundamentalism," pp. 106-12.

¹⁰Ernest Sandeen, *The Roots of Fundamentalism: British and American Millenarianism, 1800-1930* (1970; reprint ed., Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1978), argues that Fundamentalism was the result of an alliance between premillennialism and the Princeton theology's teaching of the strict inerrancy of the Scripture.

¹¹Dollar, p. xv.

¹²D. G. Hart, *Defending the Faith: J. Gresham Machen and the Crisis of Conservative Protestantism in Modern America* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1994). D. G. Hart and John Muether, *Fighting the Good Fight: A Brief History of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church* (Philadelphia: Orthodox Presbyterian Church, 1995). For representative articles by Hart, see "J. Gresham Machen, the Reformed Tradition, and the Transformation of Culture," *Evangelical Quarterly* 68 (1996): 305-27; "The Legacy of J. Gresham Machen and the Identity of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church," *Westminster Theological Journal* 53 (1991): 209-25; "Presbyterians and Fundamentalism," *Westminster Theological Journal* 55 (1993): 331-4; and "A Reconsideration of Biblical

Inerrancy and the Princeton Theology's Alliance with Fundamentalism," *Christian Scholar's Review* 20 (1991): 362-75. The author also heard Hart present a paper on this topic, "Conservatism of a Different Sort: The Presbyterian Confessionalism of J. Gresham Machen," at the Re-Forming the Center Conference at Messiah College (June 3, 1994).

¹³Hart, "J. Gresham Machen and the Reformed Tradition," p. 305.

¹⁴Hart, "The Legacy of J. Gresham Machen," p. 220 note 27.

¹⁵Hart and Muether, pp. 42-43.

¹⁶Hart, "The Legacy of J. Gresham Machen," p. 215.

¹⁷Hart, *Defending the Faith*, pp. 63-64.

¹⁸Hart, "The Legacy of J. Gresham Machen," p. 215.

¹⁹Ibid., p. 216.

²⁰Hart, "A Reconsideration of Biblical Inerrancy," p. 374.

²¹Hart, "J. Gresham Machen and the Reformed Tradition," p. 318.

²²Hart, *Defending the Faith*, p. 105.

²³George Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of Twentieth-Century Evangelicalism 1870-1925* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980). See, e.g., pp. 207-9 and the discussions of William Jennings Bryan (pp. 132-35) and John Roach Straton (pp. 162-64). Marsden also notes the ambivalence of Machen on this point (pp. 137-38).

²⁴Hart, *Defending the Faith*, p. 146.

²⁵Ibid., pp. 8-9.

²⁶Ibid., pp. 68-69.

²⁷Bradley J. Longfield, *The Presbyterian Controversy: Fundamentalists, Modernists, and Moderates* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), pp. 134-40, 220. Longfield notes, however, that by the 1920s Erdman was not a staunch inerrantist, p. 140.

²⁸Macartney wrote in his autobiography, "The only difference between the 'Fundamentalists' and the great body of conservative and evangelical believers lay in the fact that, while all true Christians believe that Christ will come again in glory and judgment, the 'Fundamentalists' held to a premillennial and imminent coming of Christ. Clarence Macartney, *The Making of a Minister* (Great Neck, N.Y.: Channel Press, 1961), p. 184.

²⁹See Robert George Delnay, *A History of the Baptist Bible Union* ([Winston-Salem]: Piedmont Bible College Press, 1974), p. 40.

³⁰Marsden, pp. 125-27; on general dispensationalist disenchantment with the ideas of "Christendom" and "Christian civilization," see pp. 66-68, 149-51.

³¹See D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones, "Evangelical Unity: An Appeal," in *Knowing the Times: Addresses Delivered on Various Occasions 1942-1977* (Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1989), pp. 246-57. On the background of this address, see Iain Murray, *David Martyn Lloyd-Jones: The Fight of Faith* (Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1990), pp. 513-32.

³²R. J. Sheehan, although approving of Lloyd-Jones's stand, fears that his position "has created special problems and tensions for Strict Baptists and Presbyterians who both have a greater consciousness of confessional standards than most other churches." R. J. Sheehan, *C. H. Spurgeon and the Modern Church* (London: Grace Publications, 1985), pp. 118-19.

³³Hart and Muether, pp. 49-51. See also George Marsden, "Perspectives on the Division of 1937," pp. 295-328, in Charles G. Dennison and Richard C. Gamble, *Pressing Toward the Mark: Essays Commemorating Fifty Years of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church* (Philadelphia: Orthodox Presbyterian Church, 1986).

³⁴Hart and Muether, pp. 108-14. See also Michael A. Hakkenberg, "The Battle over the Ordination of Gordon H. Clark," pp. 329-50, in *Pressing Toward the Mark*.

³⁵Hart and Muether, p. 31.

³⁶Hart, "The Legacy of J. Gresham Machen," p. 213.

The Pastor's Bookshelf

Basic Theology: Applied edited by Wesley and Elaine Willis & John and Janet Master. Wheaton: Victor Books, 1995. 335 pp.

"Theology is practical," observe the editors, "and good theology is very practical. The same is true of theologians" (p. 10).

Compiled in honor of Ryrie's seventieth birthday, this festschrift features thirty-one essays by colleagues and former students of Charles Ryrie. The articles are organized on the paradigm of Ryrie's own *Basic Theology*, with two to four essays arranged under headings on God, the Bible, angels, demons, man, sin, Christ, salvation, the Holy Spirit, the church, and eschatology. In a final section, two articles on aspects of Ryrie's life and ministry, as well as a brief reflection from Ryrie himself, round out the volume. Contributors include a few pastors and laymen, as well as established writers such as Thomas Edgar, Zane Hodges, Gromacki Lightner and Pentecost.

The title capsulizes the book's aim to explore and unfold the practical ramifications of theological truth for everyday Christian living. The essays are readably brief (four to twelve pages). Abstract, academic treatises are absent. Instead, the reader will discover essays on "The Real but Unseen Ministry of Angels" (Renald Showers), "Child-Rearing and Angelology" (Wesley Willis), "Animal Rights and Hunting" (Joseph Wong), and "Knowing Tomorrow Helps Living Today (The Practicality of Prophecy)" (Charles Dyer). Theological considerations are translated into practical treatments of life.

As with most anthologies, the quality is varied. Jeffrey Townsend's article on "Who Is Qualified to Lead the Church?" makes some disconcerting concessions regarding qualifications for church leaders (pp. 230-33). Physician and former city councilman Charles Tandy's brief essay on "A Christian Witness in the Midst of Controversy" is weak and disappointing in terms of substantive biblical content and application in the direction the title suggests. In "Biblical Inspiration and Bible Translation," Richard Elkins argues for a meaning-equivalency translation philosophy: "Meaning must be king for the