

fulness for pulpit ministry. Certainly, advocates of the redemptive-historical method of preaching will find a feast here, but those regarding expository preaching as the true heir of the redemptive-historical model of biblical theology will feel shortchanged.

Garner's monograph will be remembered as an early rather than as a definitive study of the redemptive-historical kind. While his courageous and weighty endeavor raises the profile of adoption and offers a foundation that should withstand the test of time, its legacy is marred by Garner's decision to make Rom 1:3–4 rather than Gal 4:4–7 the lynchpin of his exposition. Add to that the very real possibility that Garner has read too much into Rom 1:3–4, and we are left gleaning from the volume what we can.

In seeking to, there are questions Garner does not address. For example, how does Paul's reading of the OT sonship tradition in terms of adoption comport with OT references to Israel's birth (e.g. Exod 4:22–23)? What are the hermeneutical guidelines for mixing into Paul's redemptive-historical reading of adoption elements of the practice of Roman adoption? How does the adoption model function metaphorically if it bespeaks both a union and a forensic declaration? Because adoption reveals the union to be filial, how do we do justice to other Pauline pictures of union with Christ (e.g. Eph 5:22–33)? How may we maintain the integrity of justification and sanctification if they are but subsets of adoption? Is Garner's denial of the logical sequence of justification-adoption consistent with the Westminster Standards? If not, his methodological divergence from the Westminster Standards confirms that the new wine of the redemptive-historical approach to adoption calls for new wine skins (the methodological and attitudinal renewal of Puritan/Presbyterian systematics). Garner disavows this constructive form of Calvinism, yet his volume, to a degree, presents the case for it, and supplies a springboard from which adoption may be recovered and Westminster Calvinism renewed.

Tim J. R. Trumper

From His Fullness Ministries, Grand Rapids, MI

*Doctrine and Race: African American Evangelicals and Fundamentalism between the Wars*. By Mary Beth Swetnam Mathews. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 2018, 204 pp., \$29.95, paper.

In *Doctrine and Race*, Mary Beth Swetnam Mathews (professor of religion at the University of Mary Washington) explores the interaction between fundamentalists and African American evangelicals during the period between World War I and World War II. Mathews selects four black denominations for her study: the National Baptist Convention, Incorporated; the National Baptist Convention, Unincorporated; the African Methodist Episcopal Church; and the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church. While these groups do not speak for all black Protestants during this period, they offer a representative picture of responses to fundamentalism among black evangelicals. Mathews' primary source material for these black evangelicals is quarterlies and weekly papers. These publications provide a window

into the debates, discussions, and concerns that occupied black evangelicals during this period. In the case of white fundamentalism, she draws on a wider variety of sources including sermons, journals, and books.

In chapter one, Mathews explores racial attitudes of fundamentalists in the early part of the twentieth century. In painstaking detail, she demonstrates that fundamentalists leaders mirrored the racialized perspectives of the white majority; for example, they supported segregation (e.g. Dwight L. Moody holding segregated evangelistic rallies). A. C. Dixon strongly opposed interracial marriage. (Fear of interracial marriage proved to a galvanizing issue among fundamentalists in the 1928 presidential election.) Dixon argued for the legitimacy of segregation by distinguishing between “political privileges” and “social privileges.” Whereas voting was a “political privilege” extended (in theory) to all African Americans, integrated accommodations represented a “social privilege” that was not extended to persons of color (p. 16). Fundamentalists adopted paternalistic attitudes toward African Americans flowing from a posture of superiority. Black Christians were frequently presented as emotional, impressionable, easy led astray, and standing in need of white guidance. The involvement of black musicians at white evangelistic events “allowed [fundamentalists] to marginalize and subjugate blacks” (p. 25). (As a side, Mathews’ discussion of black musicians serving in white spaces sheds light on the recent experiences of Lecrae with white evangelicals as he began to speak out on issues of justice at his concerts.) A few fundamentalists did speak out on racial issues. For example, Baptist minister John Roach Straton criticized the film *Birth of a Nation* as well as the founding of a KKK chapter in New York City. At the same time, his sermons reflected a posture of racial superiority by presenting blacks as “easily manipulated, intellectually simple and relatively harmless when properly handled” (p. 34). Even schools founded by whites to train black preachers during this period (e.g. Dallas Colored Bible Institute) did not view blacks as equal partners in ministry but rather as those needing protection from corrosive influences of modernism.

To survive as minorities, African Americans had to understand the world of whites. This was especially important for black clergy who functioned both as pastors and community leaders. In chapter two, Mathews examines how black Baptists and Methodists responded to fundamentalism. While there is little evidence that black pastors received copies of *The Fundamentals* (mailed to every preacher in the U.S. and bankrolled by Lyman Stewart), black Christian leaders were intimately aware of the debate over “modernism” in white churches. These leaders viewed “modernism” through a racialized lens as a problem that was created by white people. Although black leaders frequently opined that modernist ideas (e.g. Darwinism, higher criticism) would not affect their churches, Mathews demonstrates that the story is more complicated. Debates over modernist ideas did emerge in black spaces. For example, in 1915, the National Baptist Convention Incorporated (NBCI) and National Baptist Convention Unincorporated (NBCU) split. While leadership differences played an important role, theological differences were also at stake. In denominational publications, NBCU regularly attacked modernism while NBCI expressed a more sympathetic stance toward modernist ideas. At the same time,

both groups emphasized the importance of social justice and criticized white churches for failing to address injustice. While theological differences existed among black Baptists and Methodists in their responses to modernism, their conversations were far less polarized than conversations among white Protestants. Some black leaders condemned modernism while others sought a middle ground between fundamentalism and modernism. For many years, debates between fundamentalists and modernists received detailed coverage in black denominational publications. Interestingly, Mathew notes that “while both black Protestants and white fundamentalists could agree that modernism was their enemy, each believed the other was more susceptible to it” (p. 54). Like their white fundamentalist counterparts, black evangelicals viewed the debate over modernism as a battle for the future of Protestant Christianity (p. 66).

In early decades of the twentieth century, fundamentalists drew a theological line in the sand in their response to modernism. In chapter three, Mathews considers how African American evangelicals interacted with fundamentalist teachings. While they refused to identify as “fundamentalists,” black Baptists and Methodists embraced the core beliefs of fundamentalism including the divine inspiration and inerrancy of Scripture, the virgin birth, the deity of Christ, and the need for conversion. Denominational publications frequently “underscore[d] their adherence to what they understood as traditional evangelical Christianity” (p. 69). There was one element of fundamentalism, however, that most black evangelicals rejected: premillennial dispensationalism. They viewed dispensationalism as “innovative and untested” teaching and distanced themselves from it (p. 77). Black evangelicals also debated the merits of evolutionary theory, frequently expressing skepticism about Darwinism. At the same time, many refused to adopt the either/or posture of fundamentalists. Denominational writers urged pastors to avoid this debate and focus on preaching Christ. A tension existed among black leaders between embracing modern science as an avenue for social uplift and resisting evolution. Reflecting on this reality, Mathews observes, “their position on the margins of American society complicated their participation in the discussion over religious doctrine and modernity” (p. 97). They wanted to protect their communities from the dangers of modernism without (further) marginalizing themselves.

Modernism not only presented intellectual challenges to the church but also social challenges in the form of divorce, drinking, gambling, movies, and dance halls. In chapter four, Mathews explores how African American evangelicals responded to these challenges. Like their fundamentalist counterparts, black evangelicals expressed concern about changing social mores. Denominational publications regularly attacked dance clubs, condemned gambling, and criticized new ways women were behaving. In their responses to these issues, black Protestants may have sound similar to fundamentalists; however, they sided with fundamentalists on these issues not because they were copying the latter but because they believed these practices were contrary to Scripture. Unlike fundamentalists, their response to these issues was also driven by concern for the social uplift in the context of segregation. It was important for the black community to appear respectable to white majority. Baptist and Methodist denominational papers expressed grave concern

about the corrupting influence of dancing on young people (especially young black women). They claimed that dancing draws people away from the church, hinders the formation of Christian character, and encourages sexual immorality. Pastors were encouraged to speak out against the evils of dancing from the pulpit. Along with dancing, denominational papers also discussed marriage. They defended the institution, condemned divorce, criticized the use of birth control, and encouraged women to embrace traditional gender roles. Concern for social uplift also played a key role in discussions of marriage as the family was seen central to improving the standing of the black community.

Perhaps the most important part of this chapter was Mathew's discussion of the 1928 presidential election between Republican candidate Herbert Hoover and Democratic candidate Al Smith. Prohibition was a dividing line between these candidates (Hoover supporting it and Smith opposing it). Prior to 1928, African Americans uniformly voted for the party of Lincoln, but this election marked the beginning of an exodus from the Republican party. Black voters faced a difficult choice. On the one hand, many black ministers and denominational leaders were concerned about the negative influence of alcohol and supported Prohibition. For this group the choice was clear: "all Christians ought to vote for Hoover" (p. 122). However, there was also a growing sense that the Republican party had grown indifferent toward the core concerns of African Americans, who might be better served by the Democratic party. These leaders urged black Christians to cast their vote on issues of race and economics. Whereas black voters may have been divided in 1928, they abandoned the Republican party en masse in the 1932 election (which occurred in the wake of the Great Depression). In future elections, issues of justice and economics would play a far greater role in shaping the black evangelical vote than drinking and dancing.

Whereas the previous chapter highlighted shared social concerns between black evangelicals and fundamentalists, Mathews examines the great divide on race in chapter five. In the early decades of the twentieth century, black Christians experienced racism and injustice on a daily basis. This was true not only in the South (with lynchings and Jim Crow laws) but also in the North. Every denominational paper Mathews examined contained numerous articles addressing racism and injustice. Black evangelicals shared a deeply-held conviction that the dignity and equality of all human beings was central to true Christianity: "Any understanding of the Christian message had to include a steadfast belief in the equality of all people before God" (p. 127). As a result, social justice was just as important in defining true Christianity as "doctrines like the Virgin Birth, the inerrancy of the Bible, and the substitutionary atonement of Jesus" (p. 128). Here the contrast with fundamentalism was stark. The AME *Star of Zion* recounted the lynching of two black men in Sherman, Texas. How is it, the author asks, that Sherman has twenty-six churches yet not one white religious leader spoke out? Indeed, the consistent failure of white Christian leaders to speak out against acts like these raised difficult ecclesiological questions in the minds of black evangelicals. Can someone be a *true* Christian and remain silent? How can "Christian" churches include members of the KKK who lynch blacks? There was a conviction among black leaders that "white Christians

had either forsaken Christianity or embraced a very warped interpretation of it” (p. 131). One glaring inconsistency frequently caught the attention of black leaders: “why did white Americans seem to have so much charity and evangelistic zeal for people of color in other countries and continents when they could not treat their own neighbors of color with the simple decency taught by their religion?” (p. 138). This was not merely a problem in the church. Denominational publications also pointed out the hypocrisy of the U.S. government when it championed human rights abroad but ignored them at home. Despite experiences of racism and hypocrisy from white Christians, black Baptists and Methodists did not walk away from the Christian faith. From their perspective, the problem was not with Christianity itself but with white interpretation and practice. “For these black evangelicals, being a Christian meant right belief and right living, being theologically traditional and socially progressive in terms of racial equality” (p. 155). Fundamentalists championed the former but neglected the latter while black evangelicals avoided the false dichotomy that white fundamentalists made between personal conversion and social justice.

*Doctrine and Race* is carefully written, well-argued, and engaging reading. Lack of historical awareness represents a major hindrance to contemporary discussions of race and justice in white majority-culture spaces. Many white evangelicals are clueless about the experiences of ethnic minorities in their midst (whether Black, Latino/a or Asian). By exploring interactions between black evangelicals and fundamentalists in the early part of the twentieth century, Mathews offers a great gift to the church—namely, the opportunity to learn from the past. History matters! By selecting four black denominations, Mathews is able to highlight the commonalities and differences that existed among black evangelicals in their responses to fundamentalism.

One striking feature of Mathews’s study is way in which some of the weaknesses encumbering fundamentalism in the early decades of the twentieth century continue to plague contemporary evangelical churches today. This problem comes most sharply into focus in chapter five where Mathews compares the differing postures of fundamentalists and black evangelicals toward social justice. Whereas the black evangelicals in her study viewed social justice as a core element of Christian teaching (along with other doctrines that whites affirmed), white fundamentalists defined Christianity simply in terms of adherence to doctrines like inerrancy, the virgin birth, and the work of Christ. Carl F. H. Henry put his finger on this problem in 1947 when he wrote *The Uneasy Conscience of Modern Fundamentalism*. Despite “orthodox insistence upon revelation and redemption,” writes Henry, “evangelical Christianity has become increasingly inarticulate about the social reference of the Gospel.” This reflects a “divorce between evangelical doctrinal and evangelical ethical insistence.” Henry urged evangelicals to develop a robust social ethic based on the kingdom teachings of Jesus. Unfortunately, Henry’s call was largely ignored. More recently, African American theologian Carl Ellis has argued that theology includes two elements: what we believe (which he calls “side A”) and how we live, our ethics (“side B”). Ellis argues that white evangelicalism tends to focus on “side A” while largely ignoring “side B” (apart from a few areas of personal morality).

Mathews' study demonstrates that the roots of this problem run deep. By way of contrast, it is striking how the black evangelicals in her study held together robust affirmation of side A (e.g., inerrancy, virgin birth) along with an equally strong commitment to side B (e.g., social justice).

Three minor limitations of *Doctrine and Race* should be noted. First, because this is a historical study, readers will need to look elsewhere for input on the way forward in responding to the lingering effects of the problems she identifies. Second, while Mathews carefully distinguishes fundamentalists from evangelicals, readers would benefit from greater clarity on who counts as a fundamentalist. Whereas black evangelicalism has a clear ecclesial referent(s) in her study, white fundamentalism does not. In chapter three, she talks about how black evangelicals rejected a key element of fundamentalism—premillennial dispensationalism; however, not all fundamentalists were dispensationalists (e.g. Presbyterians). Finally, *Doctrine and Race* omits Pentecostals. Mathews's rationale for excluding Pentecostals makes perfect sense (see p. 9), especially as the black denominational papers she studied did not directly engage them. Nevertheless, it would be interesting to see how the inclusion of white Pentecostals (who shared many of the same theological commitments as fundamentalists) might (or might not) reshape the picture she paints of the decades between the wars—particularly because Pentecostal churches tended to be ethnically diverse. These limitations notwithstanding, *Doctrine and Race* is a must-read. It would make a great addition (either the whole book or individual chapters) to courses covering the history of American Christianity, courses exploring issues of race and justice, ethics courses, and systematic theology courses covering theological anthropology or ecclesiology.

Keith E. Johnson  
Reformed Theological Seminary

Eduardo J. Echeverria, *Revelation, History, and Truth: A Hermeneutics of Dogma*. Ecumenical Studies, volume 2. New York: Peer Lang, 2018. 190 pages plus general index.

A full disclosure as I begin this review. Eduardo Echeverria is a friend of a number of years. Eduardo knows very well that I am passionately and robustly Protestant, and I of course know he is a true Catholic. For those who do not know Echeverria, he is a former Protestant, and knows the Reformed tradition very well. He studied with folks in Toronto, then went on to do his Ph.D. at the Free University in Amsterdam. His significant recent volume on Berkouwer (*Berkouwer and Catholicism: Disputed Questions* [Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2013]) has been well received. He currently teaches philosophy and theology at Sacred Heart Major Seminary in Detroit, Michigan.

In the Introduction, Echeverria gives us several theses statements of sorts: “a hermeneutic of creative retrieval, in short, of *ressourcement*, is at the heart of the Second Vatican Council’s Lérinian hermeneutics” (p. xiv). Echeverria believes Berkouwer is posing the key question correctly: “What is the relationship between