known of Jesus from the synoptic gospels. Parratt offers criticisms of most christologies presented, but unfortunately seldom includes constructive suggestions for how the issues he raises might be addressed along with the concerns of the theologians he discusses. This book identifies some issues involved in inculturating the gospel in non-Western contexts and the questions this raises for Western christologies. It could be useful for undergraduate and seminary courses on christology. Seminary libraries should have it.

Don Schweitzer
St. Andrew’s College, Saskatoon


What is the meaning of “Christian Mission” in a postmodern world in which all religions seem subjective, even superfluous? How can Christian missionaries evangelize in situations that are explicitly non-Christian and sometimes anti-Christian? These questions have become increasingly acute in the past half century as Christian missionaries have been confronted by fundamental challenges to the legitimacy of both their theology and practice of evangelization. This small book provides some perceptive theological reflections and some thought-provoking pastoral examples in response to these questions. The theological reflections, centered on Missio Dei (God’s mission), grapple with postmodern difficulties with such doctrines as the Trinity and human mortality. The practice of Missio Dei is illustrated by four short accounts of “nontraditional” missionary endeavors in South Sudan, Guatemala, Bangladesh, and Cambodia, which have replaced direct evangelization with the witness of evangelical lifestyles. As is true with many case studies, one wonders whether these endeavors are ephemeral efforts undertaken by charismatic individuals or whether these initiatives provide new paradigms for missionary work: only time will tell. In any case, on the plus side, this book is informative and interesting and could well serve as a discussion resource for mission-related classes in colleges and seminaries. On the minus side, this book, which is somewhat repetitious, might well have gone into greater depth both in treating missiological issues and in suggesting ways of coping with “the gift of uncertainty.”

John T. Ford
The Catholic University of America


Studebaker argues that Pentecostal theology contributes to the doctrine of the Trinity a distinct pneumatological approach. Pentecostal trinitarian theology contributes to traditional pneumatology by accounting for the personal identity of the Spirit from the narratives of Scripture that correct the hitherto underprivileged perspective of the agency of the Spirit. Studebaker suggests not only that pneumatology contributes significantly to trinitarian theology, but that trinitarian theology, from a Pentecostal orientation, should begin with the Holy Spirit, in general, and with the outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost, in particular. The consequence is a view of the more active identity of the Spirit who completes the immanent fellowship of the Trinity and the economic work of redemption. A constructive first chapter argues for the theological significance of the Pentecostal experience of the Spirit, while the second chapter examines the biblical foundations of a pneumatological starting point for trinitarian theology. Chapters 3–5 critically engage a somewhat subjective selection of key figures from Eastern and Western thought, Reformed Evangelical theology, and charismatic trinitarian thinkers. The book concludes with an account of a pneumatological and trinitarian theology of religions and a trinitarian theology of creation. Studebaker shows that the theological implications of the Pentecostal experience of the Spirit read, offering succinct and straightforward definitions of the technical vocabulary of the discipline, clearly explaining difficult concepts like “thought” and “language” and “gospel” with felicitous ease. Each chapter ends with thought-provoking questions for reflection and discussion. The authors manage to present a depiction of the theological endeavor in a manner that is both accessible and engaging for classroom use. Insofar as the book aims to be an introductory roadmap to theologizing, it admirably succeeds. The problem with the text, however, is its individualistic account of the theological enterprise. Stone and Duke’s roadmap seems uncritical to assume the autonomy of the subject’s theologizing. The traditional sources of theological reflection—scripture, tradition, reason, and experience—are for the authors neither “sources” nor “authorities” to which one’s theology is accountable. They are instead “resources” that the theologian uses for her personal endeavor. Stone and Duke’s language often fosters a vision of a theology that is do-it-yourself. They emphasize the creativity of theology, but not its humility and receptivity; its constructiveness but not its listening. They teach students how to be good theologians, but fail to teach theologians how to be good students of theology.

Matthew A. Moser
Loyola University Maryland


Stone and Duke’s book is a how-to guide to theology in the best and the worst senses. Its strengths revolve around its central task of introducing Christian theological reflection to students unfamiliar with the language, the sources, and the methods of theologizing. The text is slim and easy to understand, offering succinct and straightforward definitions of the technical vocabulary of the discipline, clearly explaining difficult concepts like “thought” and “language” and “gospel” with felicitous ease. Each chapter ends with thought-provoking questions for reflection and discussion. The authors manage to present a depiction of the theological endeavor in a manner that is both accessible and engaging for classroom use. Insofar as the book aims to be an introductory roadmap to theologizing, it admirably succeeds. The problem with the text, however, is its individualistic account of the theological enterprise. Stone and Duke’s roadmap seems uncritical to assume the autonomy of the subject’s theologizing. The traditional sources of theological reflection—scripture, tradition, reason, and experience—are for the authors neither “sources” nor “authorities” to which one’s theology is accountable. They are instead “resources” that the theologian uses for her personal endeavor. Stone and Duke’s language often fosters a vision of a theology that is do-it-yourself. They emphasize the creativity of theology, but not its humility and receptivity; its constructiveness but not its listening. They teach students how to be good theologians, but fail to teach theologians how to be good students of theology.

Matthew A. Moser
Loyola University Maryland