

---

*Disciplining Hermeneutics: Interpretation in Christian Perspective.* Ed. Roger Lundin. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm B. Eerdmans, 1997. ISBN 0-8028-0858-1. Pp. 177.

---

This well-edited publication puts into print essays first presented at a 1994 Wheaton College conference on "Hermeneutics and a Christian Worldview." A helpful introduction raises broad issues and summarizes the focus and thrust of the various contributors. The book is divided into four sections, each consisting of a main paper accompanied by a response. The major essayists and respondents provide diverse disciplinary specialization. The emphasis is on offering orientations and guidelines rather than imposing rigorous formal constraints in the interpretive enterprise. These approaches are commended as fruitful within a shared conviction that a loving God may be truly (though far from fully) known via interaction with His disclosure in the biblical writings, in the natural world, in human experience, and in the person of Jesus.

The first area addressed falls under the title "The Speech of God: The Hermeneutics of the Word." Despite growing despair over the defensibility of reading the Christian Scriptures as divine speech, philosopher Nicholas Wolterstorff contends that the corpus may be approached once again with a view to ascertaining what God said by authorizing it. His discussion appropriates speech-act theory, indicts the evidentialist historical-critical approach (implicating evangelicals along the way), and rejects the notion of textual sense as advocated either by Frei or Ricoeur in reaction to Schleiermacher's romanticism.

Commended instead is an "authorial discourse interpretation" (43-44) which seeks to identify the illocutions God performed by way of deputizing or, especially, appropriating fallible human discourse. Both levels of communication must be respected, with the reader's prior knowledge of God guiding the recognition of God's intentional expression through the human language God utilized. Wolterstorff's recent book, *Divine Discourse*, elaborates on the position he sketches in this essay.

In reply, New Testament scholar I. Howard Marshall briefly relates problems and questions evangelicals would have as to the adequacy of Wolterstorff's view. Of particular concern to him is the question: how can its apparent regard of God as inactive in the initial production of Scripture satisfy traditional doctrinal convictions about inspiration?

At greater length, philosopher Merold Westphal takes issue with Wolterstorff for remaining unsatisfactorily pre-Kantian in his framework, failing to consistently acknowledge the room texts allow for interpretive plurality without opening the door to indiscriminatory free-for-all. Westphal especially makes use of the analogy of musical interpretation to illustrate his point that Wolterstorff continues to be overly objectivist, and does not appreciate either the overall interpretive implications of our human finitude, or how well texts resist abuse.

The second segment is entitled "The Truth of the Matter: Interpretation as Art and Science." In it, English professor Donald Marshall applies himself to the question of how truth with any universal validity can come to us through interpretation. Taking his cue from Aristotle, he reflects on three ways of attaining verity: *episteme*, *techne*, and *phronesis*. Both conceptual rationality and scientific study provide worthwhile tools, but fail to deliver vital transforming personal engagement with the biblical text. The more practical art of moral reasoning evokes the hermeneutic of communal performance in accord with the Scriptural accent on promise, invites significant experiential support in responsible action, and expects only final, full-fledged confirmation.

However, systematic theologian Ellen T. Charry replies that Christian interpretation can claim more correspondence with scientific endeavor than Marshall has allowed. The science-art distinction is not as strong as Marshall's presentation would suggest, and the practice of clinical medicine indicates substantial methodological affinities between its operation and theological undertaking. Both involve thoughtful reliance on existing knowledge, cumulative case reasoning toward judgements, and the role of trust and compliance. Imperfect results and ongoing uncertainty invalidate neither exercise: both call for the fruitful conditions of earnest trained pursuit, subject to faith and critical refinement. Lack of conclusive verification does not diminish the value of encouraging transformative results consistent with core doctrine, an empirical adequacy which supports a non-naive realism.

In section three, "From Suspicion to Retrieval: Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences," sociologist David Lyon profiles the development of his discipline and of the emerging postmodern climate. While aware of the dislocation that many sense in the face of evident relativism, he applauds the exposure of the modernist ethos as an imperialist cover for instability. In the new ambiguous pluralistic milieu, people easily feel isolated on a risky playing field stripped of familiar markers. However, several writers are attempting to honour ethical concerns by promoting an active communal care in responsibility to the "other." The opportunity is there for a chastened Christian witness to the crucial contribution of divine self-sacrifice, and to the worth in individual and collective faithfulness to that path of caring service.

Cultural analyst and theologian Willie James Jennings seeks to further Lyon's recommendation by settling forth features of an agenda to "reassert truth without seeking its re-establishment" (118). In the context of hermeneutical suspicion, Christian reading is to gain its credibility through prayerful response to the Spirit's witness rather than playful neglect of Jesus. Knowledge is to be seen as discernment which gets framed into discourse out of and towards love. True community flows from the death of the false self and its will.

The fourth heading is "Revelation and Human Understanding: General and Special Hermeneutics." Here, theologian Kevin Vanhoozer finds that, for the most part, Derridian postmodernism is inimical to Christian conviction. On review, both the Chicago and Yale schools are deficient in subjecting the literal sense of Scripture to contemporary intelligibility and community consensus respectively—these latter each quite vulnerable to deconstructionist critique. A

trinitarian hermeneutic is required to aptly appreciate and appropriate the divine communicative action: the Spirit provides perlocutionary power to enable applied response to the illocutions tied to Christ and conveyed in the Father's authorized verbal locutions.

Vanhoozer advocates a theological approach for all reading—not only the Bible. Such a strategy, remaining aware of the limits of its own grasp, should show more regard than does deconstruction for the “other.” Submission to the Spirit's witness in the letter brings personal receptivity to the text's authority and force, as well as recognition of the Spirit's enabling of others likewise to heed it. Largely sympathetic to this stance, philosopher Dallas Willard asks for a further spelling out of how the Spirit's action in bringing understanding ties in with one's own involvement in a manner that is not merely occasionalist, but rather upholds our responsibility as discerning agents.

All the presenters here disclaim pretentious certainty. They all agree that genuine understanding is shown in personally pursued, practical conformity to what the text is taken as calling forth. They differ over the degree to which they feel postmodern, and particularly deconstructionist, outlooks can or must be incorporated into a consistently Christian approach.

Unfortunately, contentious characterizations are made at several points of contrasting views—without being either adequately supported, or subsequently challenged. Overall, one might wish for more extended interaction on several specific issues, especially as could arise in a direct three-way conversation between Westphal, Wolterstorff and Vanhoozer on appropriation of Derrida, use of speech-act theory, and the sense of the text. Still, there is already enough explicit, and implied, contrast to give the reflective reader a worthwhile sense of how differing emphases represented here arise, and how their proponents relate to both enduring and emerging questions.

Tim Dyck

McGill University

---

*The Challenge of Tradition: Discerning the Future of Anglicanism.* Ed. John Simons. Toronto: Anglican Book Centre, 1997. ISBN 1-55126-163-4. Pp. 188.

---

Most, if not all, major denominations in North America experience internal dissonance over the doctrines and practices of their church. In recent years, this dissonance has taken its own particular form within the Anglican Church of Canada (hereafter ACC). This article will both review a particular volume published within the ACC context, and directly engage in the Anglican debates by means of this review. Nonetheless, outsiders are invited in—both to hear the conceptual content and to observe the process. Perhaps the Canadian Anglican experience may be helpful for others as they engage in their own discourses.

The “particular form” of which I speak arises out of a conference, called “Essentials ‘94,” held near Montréal in 1994. This gathering of about 700 peo-