

these Wesleyan/Holiness movements find themselves in a "tension with two dance partners." Some choose to dance with their primitive heritage, others leave the church and dance with modernity. Yet a third dance partner has joined the party according to Stanley. This option involves questioning the assumptions of modernity from a postmodern communitarian perspective.

Despite the difficulty and confusion that still surrounds the conceptual viability of "Primitivism," this collection of essays will be very important for historians of religion in America. The pervasive presence of the spirit of Restoration, whether it be simply rhetorical or not, flows through American Protestant history. Whether we call it Fundamentalism, Primitivism, or Biblicism, we must recognize its force. The authors and their essays collected here do bring a clarity to these concepts. But in the face of such Restorationist tendencies, McClendon reminds us we must not be in the present as "sleepwalkers." Rather as Stanley asserts we must like dancers hold closely the truths of God's past, our past, as we flow into the future fulfillment of His plan.

2590 Village Dr.
Waynesboro, VA 22980

MARK F. CARR

Jones, Scott J. *John Wesley's Conception and Use of Scripture*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, Kingswood Books, 1995. 268 pp. Paper, \$16.95.

Scott Jones has provided the first detailed study of Wesley's views of and actual use of Scripture. He has immersed himself in the major primary documents, allowed his immersion to mature over time, and produced a first-rate contribution to Wesleyan studies. Furthermore, the scholarly matrix of the book is impressive: it is a revision of Jones' Ph.D. dissertation done at Southern Methodist University under the direction of John Deschner (a major contemporary Wesleyan scholar). In addition to Deschner's direction, the original idea for the research came from the late Albert Outler, the acknowledged *doktorvater* of modern Wesleyan Studies.

The title of the book truly reflects the two major issues that Jones addresses. Initially he sifts through the Wesleyan corpus to identify his "conception" of Scripture's inspiration, authority, and use (especially his principles of interpretation). Then he seeks to test Wesley's "conception(s)" of Scripture against the way in which he actually uses and interprets Scripture.

In addition to the book's value to Wesleyan Studies in general, the research of Jones does shed some further light on the current debate over the conception and use of the "Quadrilateral" of authorities alleged to inhere in Wesley's theological method. While it is true that the term "Quadrilateral" is somewhat anachronistic when applied to Wesley (the term was coined by Albert Outler and Wesley never used it), it should be noted that all participants in the current discussion admit that Outler did quite correctly identify four major components of Wesley's theological authorities: Scripture, Reason, Tradition, and Christian Experience. What has seemed to cause some unease among a number of Wesleyan scholars (and evangelicals) is the seeming implication that Scripture is only one of four authorities and that its primacy has been compromised.

The debate over Outler's "Quadrilateral" was sparked by Ted Campbell, who has drawn prominent support from William J. Abraham and strongly recommends

Jones' work. Two things seem immediately apparent about Jones' contribution to this debate: First, he has persuasively demonstrated that Wesley gave full primacy to the authority of Scripture. For the advocates of the so-called "Quadrilateral" who want to employ this foursome to make Scripture merely one leg of his "stool" of theological authorities, Jones' research lends precious little comfort. Wesley's conception and use of Scripture would not make it possible for two or three of the other authorities to outvote Scripture. For Wesley, theological authorities are not so much to be modeled after a democratic assembly where the majority rules, but much more to be likened to the Supreme Court, in which Scripture can veto any law or doctrine voted by any majority assemblage of reason, Christian tradition, and experience.

Second, Jones has fine-tuned "tradition" as understood by Wesley, to be "Christian antiquity" (the early church, especially the Ante-Nicene Fathers) and the doctrinal standards of the Church of England (especially its "Thirty-Nine Articles," the Edwardsean "Homilies," and the "Book of Common Prayer"). Jones shrewdly points out the irony of Wesley's conception of legitimate "tradition" as mainly consisting of the early church and the Church of England: Wesley's restricted understanding of tradition is severely undermined when one considers the comprehensive nature of what has gone into the making of the doctrinal standards of the Church of England: it has drawn not only from Scripture and the early church, but also from many strands of Medieval Catholicism, Eastern Orthodoxy, the Continental Reformers, and Puritanism. So "tradition" comprehends a quite broad spectrum of Christian influences.

This book is destined to become a classic in Wesleyan Studies and will probably take its place alongside other such seminal works as Deschner's *Wesley's Christology* (1960), Harold Lindstrom's *Wesley and Sanctification* (1946), and Ole Borgen's *John Wesley on the Sacraments* (1972). Jones does have a very readable and clear writing style, but due to his exhaustive analysis, the book is not easy reading and will be of most interest to the Wesleyan specialists. Jones, however, has provided a rewarding piece for anyone interested in Wesley as a theologian or the broader issues involving the contemporary discussions of theological methodology and scriptural hermeneutics.

Andrews University

WOODROW W. WHIDDEN

Latourelle, René, and Rino Fisichella, eds. *Dictionary of Fundamental Theology*. New York: Crossroad Publishing Company, 1995. xxxviii + 1222 pp. \$75.00.

Present-day fundamental theology has emerged out of classical apologetics which for centuries has been concerned with the "proofs" for Christianity. Due to the massive changes in society and theology over the past 50 years, classical, traditional apologetics has undergone a profound paradigm shift which has obliged theologians to rethink, from the ground up, the task of classical apologetics. In this process apologetics became known as *fundamental theology*. But yesterday's apologetics has changed more than its name, it has changed its state and condition. This *Dictionary of Fundamental Theology* (hereafter referred to as *DFTth*) is, to our knowledge, the first ever of its kind in the English language and tries to set forth