

Analysis in the Light of the Order of Creation and Redemption (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1988), especially, 121-276, to name but a few, even though one does not need to follow them in every point. Sometimes the grammatical arguments brought forward by Spencer in support of her argument are less than convincing and at times simply incorrect, as for instance when it is claimed that "'Wife' in German is masculine (*das Weib*)" (122). "*Das Weib*," however, is neuter in German, as the German neuter article "*das*" readily indicates.

Not even A. T. Robertson, who is quoted in support of this mistaken statement, makes such a claim in his *Grammar of the Greek New Testament*. Such sloppy research makes one wonder about some of the other research presented in *The Goddess Revival*, and cautions the reader to carefully think through some of its claims and their far-reaching implications for the doctrine of God and theology in general.

Schloss Bogenhofen 3
A-4963 St. Peter/Hart, Austria

FRANK M. HASEL

Toulouse, Mark G., and James O. Duke, eds. *Makers of Christian Theology in America*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1997. 568 pp. Paper, \$34.95.

Toulouse and Duke (both of Texas Christian University) have made a major contribution to the reference works related to the intellectual history of American religion. The book surveys the contributions of ninety-one "makers of Christian theology." The volume's aim, the editors note in their general introduction, is "to orient readers to the subject matter at issue rather than to plead a case" (13).

That aim definitely seems to have informed the choice of the individuals they selected for treatment. Thus one finds among the ninety-one not only those who have contributed to mainline religious thought, but also the makers of theology in traditions generally viewed as being far from the center of the mainline. As a result, the volume sports chapters on those who defined the edges of reason and revelation, the developers of Black theology, and the main theological voices of the Orthodox tradition. On the individual level, such people as Joseph Smith, John Dewey, Ellen G. White, W. E. B. DuBois, and Charles Taze Russell find their place along with America's Hodges, Niebuhrs, and Edwardses.

That lineup is quite at variance from the collections of an earlier generation, such as Sydney E. Ahlstrom's *Theology and America* (1967). Toulouse and Duke are definitely in the tradition so nicely represented by R. Laurence Moore's *Religious Outsiders and the Making of Americans* (1986). The historiography represented by *Makers of Christian Theology in America* is concerned with both the center and the edges of historical theology.

The theologians treated in the book are arranged topically in a generally chronological format. Each of the ninety-one essays includes basic biographical data, an analysis of the key theological issues and concerns to which the figure responded, a critical discussion of the major theological theses developed by each person, an assessment of the short-term and long-range influence of each theologian's thought, and a bibliography of useful primary and secondary literature on each person.

The core of the editors' task was one of selection. In that realm the key words in their title proved to be both problematic and informative. How, for example,

should one define theology? Should it include only those who have been professionally thought of as being “theologians”? Or should it also include those in the American tradition who had “a running polemic against established theologians and their theologies” (16)? Toulouse and Duke opted for the latter definition.

The word “makers” was equally problematic. After all, the concept is closely tied to influence. Whereas some thinkers influenced more people than others, their thought doesn’t make up the whole of American theology. What about the notable dissenters, outliers, and renegades from the established churches and the conventional modes of doing theology? As might be expected, the editors selected the more inclusive route.

Even the term “Christian” became a problem in the selection of candidates for inclusion in *Makers of Christian Theology in America*. Again, the editors followed the broad path. Thus the pragmatic Dewey is included along with many who have in previous time been seen as sectarian rather than Christian.

The authors are to be congratulated not only for their final roster (although one can always quibble over the value of one person’s inclusion over that of another) in terms of both breadth and balance, but also for the high-quality list of contributors to the volume. The essays themselves were generally well-written and informative.

This book will be a standard reference work for some time to come among those who have an interest in American historical theology.

Andrews University

GEORGE R. KNIGHT

Webb, Stephen H. *On God and Dogs: A Christian Theology of Compassion for Animals*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997. 234 pp. Hardcover, \$29.95.

What is the relationship between humans and animals? Does God’s salvation in Jesus Christ extend beyond humans to include the animal kingdom? Will our pets be in heaven? Webb tackles these types of questions and, as a result, makes an excellent contribution to the growing theological and philosophical debate concerning the relationship between humans and animals.

In Part 1, Webb outlines his own theological method, and then contrasts it to the main theological approaches that deal with the human-animal relationship. He examines the biblical approach of Stanley Hauerwas and John Berkman, the animal-rights philosophy of Andrew Linzey, and the ecological holism espoused by process theologians, environmentalists, and ecofeminists. Although Webb notes the strengths of each approach, he concludes that each strategy fails to adequately describe the place of animals in Christian theology.

In Part 2, Webb criticizes utilitarian and functional theories of pet-keeping, which perpetuate incorrect ideas about the order of nature and the relationship between humans and animals, and more significantly, prevent humans from seeing the “otherness” of animals. According to Webb, humans tend to treat animals, especially those animals we keep as pets, as extensions of ourselves or as beings of lesser value. Our refusal to see animals as beings with their own distinct identities allows humans to control, manipulate, and use animals for our own ends rather than the ends for which they were created.