proper reciprocal and cyclical engagement of contemplation and action (p. 184).

To dismiss Boersma as an antiquarian with a fondness for things patristic is to misunderstand his proposal (p. 9). For Boersma, what distinguishes the Great Tradition from modern Christianity is its overwhelming sense that reality is pregnant with the mystery of Christ, and the theology of the Great Tradition (and particularly its exegesis) is to be embraced only inasmuch as it represents a 'cashing in' of this conviction (p. 129). Boersma agrees with his detractors that theologians of the Tradition sometimes failed to give adequate weight to earthly realities due to their overwhelming emphasis on heavenly ones. He insists, however, that the dominant trajectory of the Tradition steers a middle course between this caricatured vision of 'pie in the sky' and the reification of nature – the position Boersma identifies as his primary target. It is here that Boersma specifically addresses a young *evangelical* readership, readers Boersma identifies as increasingly passionate to engage in social action and creation care. Boersma's fear is that such initiatives are often motivated by an underlying desire to affirm creation 'in and of itself', which amounts to reification: creation becomes an idol when it is affirmed apart from its relationship to and dependence upon God (pp. 29–30).

But *Heavenly Participation* is to be considered a programmatic example of *evangelical ressourcement*, not merely because of its intended audience – indeed much of the work appears equally to address Roman Catholics. Nor is it to be considered evangelical because of a narrow confessional perspective. Boersma writes as an evangelical, but his vision is ecumenical. He proposes that evangelicals are able – as are all Christians – to bind themselves to the larger Tradition, and strengthen it, through their appropriation of its participatory ontology (p. 10). The book, then, is – in the first sense – evangelical *because* it is *ressourcement*. The heartbeat of *ressourcement* – as the *nouvelle theologians* conceived it – is the notion of going back in order to go forward, scholarship for the sake of the Church, for the sake of the world: for the sake of the gospel.

David Ney
Wycliffe College, 5 Hoskin Avenue, Ontario M5S 1H7, Canada
david.ney@mail.toronto.ca

doi:10.1017/S0036930612000695

William Vandoodewaard, *The Marrow Controversy and Seceder Tradition: Atonement, Saving Faith and the Gospel Offer in Scotland (1718–1799)*, Reformed Historical-Theological Studies Series (Grand Rapids, MI: Reformation Heritage Books), pp. xiv + 313. $25.00.

In this well written, scholarly and attractively published book, William Vandoodewaard relates what he considers to be the central tenets of 'Marrow' theology to the doctrines which he implies were characteristic of the churches of Associate Presbytery and Associate Synod in Scotland in the eighteenth century.

The Marrow of Modern Divinity was first published in 1645. Its anonymous author was advertised as 'E.F.'. Dr Vandoodewaard identifies its core as particular understandings of: atonement; saving faith; and the free offer of the gospel. Although it remains a strong one, his case for asserting that the author of the book was Edward Fisher is weakened by his uncritical assertion that the author actually had the initials 'E.F.' How could we be justifiably sure that someone who wished to remain anonymous was happy to divulge his initials?

Dr Vandoodewaard's thesis, that the theology of the secessionist churches in question is a continuation of Marrow theology, is well supported by his quotations from and expositions of the published works of numerous secessionist ministers. However, one wonders what were the views of those secessionist ministers who did not write books or whose publications did not survive. Furthermore, a comparative study of the theological views of contemporary Church of Scotland ministers would be required to give an indication of the fuller significance of such continuity.

What were the views of the members of the secessionist churches? Did they differ from the views of the Church of Scotland laity? We cannot comfortably assume that the members of a congregation will tend to share the particular pet theological theories of their minister. Do we belong to particular churches because of or despite some particular theological views?

This is a history of particular ideas rather than an analysis or evaluation of them. However, the Marrow account of atonement consistently comes across as by far the weakest of the three tenets. That each person deserves punishment and requires to be redeemed because Adam was in breach of a covenant he made with God while acting as the representative of the human race is an analogy which provides only very limited illumination.

Suppose that someone acts as a representative for, say, Elderslie Golf Club. In that capacity, he might enter into a contractual arrangement which binds Elderslie Golf Club to follow a particular course of action. If Elderslie Golf Club fails to fulfil the terms of the agreed arrangement, it might be held to account. However, current and future members of the club cannot be held to account as individual people for the debts and other obligations of Elderslie Golf Club. They are not bound as individual people by the deal that was struck by the representative of Elderslie Golf Club in his capacity as a representative of Elderslie Golf Club.

In general, there is a crucial difference between criminal and civil law the force of which should, surely, pertain to the analogy at issue. Breach of contract provokes the sanction of compensation rather than of punishment. There is a profound difference between the rightful punishment of thieves and the appropriate treatment of those who have failed to fulfil a contractual agreement they have, without fraudulent intent, entered into. *A fortiori*, it would be inappropriate to mete out punishment to individual people who happened to be members of Elderslie Golf Club for the failure of Elderslie Golf club to fulfil its contractual arrangements.

This is an interesting and a very stimulating book. The clear, well-structured prose as well as its generous type – the size I would choose if reading on my Kindle – makes it a pleasure to read.

Hugh V. McLachlan
Glasgow Caledonian University, Glasgow G4 0BA, UK
h.mclachlan@gcu.ac.uk

doi:10.1017/S0036930612000683

Irina Papkova, *The Orthodox Church and Russian Politics* (Washington, DC: OUP, 2011), pp. 265. £40.00/$65.00 (hbk).

Western observers frequently accuse the Orthodox Church of legitimating the Putin regime in exchange for wealth and privilege. Not long before presidential elections in March 2011, Patriarch Kirill described Putin's rule as a miracle of God. Several months later, the state imposed stiff prison sentences on members of the feminist punk group Pussy Riot, after they entered Christ the Saviour Cathedral to protest the church's unholy alliance with the state. The state has introduced religious education in the public schools, provided property for new church buildings and invited hierarchs to bless army troops and national security agents. Everywhere, the constitutional wall between church and state seems to be falling.

Irina Papkova's new book cautions us not to jump to premature conclusions. Carefully analysing events from 1995–2008, Papkova demonstrates that the church achieved almost none of its legislative goals at the federal level. Even the 1997 Law on Freedom of Conscience and Religious Associations, which restricted the work of Western evangelical missionaries, was less a result of church lobbying than of a popular turn against the West after the economic and political confusion of the Yeltsin years. In other areas, such as religious education in the public schools, the state took firm stances against church interests.

Particularly valuable is Papkova's refusal to treat the Orthodox Church as monolithic. While the Patriarchate has represented traditionalists who