means of attaining collective justice and self-transformation. It ends with a refreshing discussion on theology and culture.

The book as a whole understands practice as an activity judged in a community setting, thereby overruling individualistic approaches to theology. For example, part 1 on “reason” emphasizes the social aspect of reason referred to as “conversation,” “shared conversation,” “public reason,” “people seeking a settlement,” “social activity,” and “team sport.” This kind of understanding tends to stimulate collegiality between the practitioner and the interlocutor of theology by ameliorating the tone of discussion so that it is held in a less confrontational and more contextually engaging way.

On the other hand, this same communitarian emphasis—necessary for the book’s claim to interpret practice in terms of standards of excellence held by the community—implicitly gives, in varied ways, too much weight to tradition and ecclesiology as compared to Scripture. Thus, the initial claim—that the quadrilateral sources are simply “aspects” of the same activity, without the further claim of ordering them—does not harmonize with the actual practice of the authors. That is not to say, however, that the Companion’s communitarian emphasis requires ecclesiology become first-theology; instead, it is to say that the attempt to structure the book by following the quadrilateral without prioritization between its parts is formally impossible.

The book is valuable for its many notable examples and pieces of advice intended to increase the quality of the practice of theology, so the preferred audience is young theologians in the making. Yet its price certainly limits its availability to the point that it will most likely be accessed in institutional libraries.

Berrien Springs, Michigan


When I first saw the title of this book, it raised a question in my mind that could be answered in one word: none. The correct answer, of course, is much more nuanced. It may depend on who you are, where you are, who lives near you, and what is happening around you. This book deals with these nuances in wonderful detail. It is a book for serious students of Islam and will be of particular interest to missiologists, sociologists, jurists, journalists, and others planning to write about Islam.

As with all edited volumes, it is a mixed bag and will probably be read selectively. It is worth noting that four of the chapters have been written by Muslims and one by an ex-Muslim. There is a very helpful, brief biography on each contributor.

As the editor notes, “The idea of freedom . . . is articulated in various empirically tangible forms. . . . Some of the chapters . . . do not seek to present fact-based, empirical, ethnographic minutiae, but transcending that, engage with generalisations.” As the editor further notes, “Freedom of speech and expression is an equally elusive ‘entity.’ . . . It is an almost mystical quality” (15).
Part of the challenge is that freedom of speech is an Enlightenment concept and not part of the Muslim worldview. While the West protects the individual, Islam and other groups not impacted by the Enlightenment protect the collective, the umma. This book is, in itself, a modernist, Enlightenment project (cf. 36).

Chapter 3 is written from an Australian perspective and is a reasoned, well-documented plea for hearing the silent or quieter majority of peaceful Muslims. As long as the two groups were kept separate, there was little difficulty. Proximity has changed the calculus. The challenge is not really freedom of speech, Krayem writes, but decent respect for the feelings of others and a positive understanding of The Other.

The editor, writing in chapter 4, warns of the danger of an intolerant, Islam-swamping, post-modern Europe, which is devoid of a strong cultural/ethical/religious (spiritual) base. It is a reminder that a few radicals can cause a massive revolution, as Communism taught us. The chapter evokes Samuel Huntington’s “clash of civilizations.” The Jewish model of seeking protection from insult, is raised as a useful model, but it is hampered by the violent, extremist rhetoric of the very (intolerant) conservative.

Chapter 6 is Iran-specific, dealing with the issue of apostasy and its punishment. The close identification of state and Islam in Iran can make any criticism of the state a matter of apostasy, punishable by death. Western, particularly North American, readers will come away from this chapter with a reverent thankfulness for their founding fathers’ and mothers’ stern separation of church and state. Think how some in the current Tea Party might relish this close identity.

According to Khomeni, during the “occulation (hidden state) of the twelfth Imam, Islamic affairs should be regulated by the clergy who preside over the state and are led by a jurisprudential leader, himself or his designated successor.” He insisted that it is impossible to be a true Muslim without an Islamic State. Particularly frightening is a sentence on pp. 160–61: “It is only in an Islamic state that the execution and torture of citizens is acceptable because its system is innately pure and supervised by a pure leader who is divinely appointed in his function to guide citizens in the path of God.”

Chapter 8 is written from a more Western perspective, but not noticeably biased. The two writers attempt to separate Islam (faith) and Islamism (ideology). I found it interesting to learn that the term “Islamophobia” was originally coined in Iran to quell any criticism of the Shiite, Islamic State (195–96).

In Chapter 9, K. Völker assesses the researching and teaching of Islam in the German academic setting and the complications involved due to federal laws. The teaching must be consistent with the German constitution, and Islamic theology does not always fit that parameter. Federal law requires agreement between the state and the particular religious authorities. This is difficult when there are no comprehensive religious authorities and when the existing, diverse authorities cannot agree. What happens when German academic culture and Muslim sensitivities or concepts of truth disagree? Can
Islam withstand academic critique? The diversity (lack of homogeneity) within the German-Muslim community makes all of this very difficult and dangerous. I found myself reflecting on the possibility that we Westerners have become so diluted by relativism that we may no longer believe in truth. Have we become so blindsided by Western, secularized education, so secularized by this Enlightenment model, that we have lost our cutting edge of spirituality? Are we threatened by the Muslim “true believer” who reveals our spiritual, theological weakness?

In all, this is a well written and rewarding book for the serious student of the current theo-political scene.

Berrien Springs, Michigan

BRUCE CAMPBELL MOYER


The book consists of four chapters, preceded by a preface typical of dissertations and succeeded by a summary and conclusion. Chapter 1 describes the background to the study by looking at general Protestant, Millerite, and early Sabbatarian Adventist attitudes towards charismatic and visionary experiences in mid-nineteenth century America up to about 1850. Levterov points out that while Protestants were generally quite hospitable to such manifestations, the Millerite attitude was somewhat more complex. The leaders of the Millerite movement usually responded negatively to these