

Who Is the Seventh-day Adventist in 2006?

By David Thiele

From January 20 to February 2, 2006, the South-Pacific Division (SPD) of the Seventh-day Adventist Church held a conference titled "Who Is the Seventh-day Adventist?" The theme was Adventist identity, more specifically theological identity. Topics included the sanctuary, the judgment, the remnant, the second coming, the sacraments, prophetic interpretation, the Trinity, and the nature of man. The centerpiece of the program was a series of presentations by guest speakers Niels-Erik Andreasen, Gunnar Pedersen, and Roy Gane, all of whom went to Australia for the conference

The purpose of this article is neither to report on that conference nor to evaluate it. Rather, its intention is to explore a question raised there but left unanswered. The approach taken here will be to offer a tentative model and to test it against a case study.

The issue at stake concerns the borders of Adventist identity. The SPD conference focused largely on its core. Various presenters acknowledged diversity in Adventist thinking, but where do the acceptable limits of this diversity lie and how are they to be determined?

To put this question in concrete terms: Is

there room for Alden Thompson and Richard Davidson in the same church when they differ on the nature of inspiration?¹ Or for Jack Provonsha and Hans LaRondelle when they disagree on the atonement?² Or for Richard Rice and Fernando Canale when they differ on the nature of God?³ What about Desmond Ford and William Shea when they disagree in regard to the judgment?⁴

The answer appears to be Yes in the first three cases and No in the last. Why? In each case, a fundamental belief of the Church is involved (nos. 1, 9, 3, and 24, respectively). Why do the differences between Ford and Shea warrant a

response that differs from that of the others?

The reason is not because Ford made his views known, since all the scholars named above have published their views. Is Ford's deviation greater than that of the others? How can that be quantified? Is deviation from a distinctive doctrine more serious than deviation from common Christian heritage? If so, why? Would that mean that being Adventist is more important than being Christian?

To me, these seem to be the fundamental questions

also in the experience of believers (nos. 10, 11). The availability of the relation-restoring atonement is made a contemporary reality through Christ's ministry in the heavenly sanctuary (no. 24), and humanity experiences it through the work of the Holy Spirit (no. 5).

God desires a comprehensive relationship: no part of the human entity is excluded—body, mind, or soul (no. 7). Indeed, that relationship is essential to life; without it, no part of a person ultimately survives (nos. 26–27). The

Just as families are multifaceted, so the church is diverse.

that ought to lie at the heart of any discussion about Adventist identity. A number of different solutions may be offered for this puzzle, and I tentatively offer one here.

How should the nature of Adventist doctrine be correctly conceptualized? Adventist theology has been compared to a chain of pearls on the string and to a patchwork quilt.⁵ The essential point of such views is that Adventist doctrines have no integral relationship to one another.

This seems fundamentally wrong. Adventist doctrines interlock, forming a theological system in much the same way that the five points of Calvinism form a theological system that is integrally related. Each doctrine has an essential—not incidental—relationship to others in the system.

Unlike Calvinism, which finds its center in the sovereignty of God, Adventism focuses on God's personhood and the need for relationship. Relationships are essential for the human individual, created in God's image, and they are essential for God's personhood. John declares, "God is love" (1 John 4:8, 16), and love is an essentially relational term. The God of Adventist theology is a God of relationships.⁶

The Bible is the revelation of God's personhood and the relationship with humanity that it entails (Fundamental Belief 1). Nature reveals much about God but not his personhood. The Trinity doctrine shows that personhood and relationship are constitutive for God and not merely a cloak adopted for his dealings with others (nos. 2–5). Creation (no. 6) outlines the beginnings of God's relationship with humanity and illustrates what it was intended to be.

The fall ruptured that relationship (no. 8). The atonement provided a restoration of the relationship (no. 9), which results in a basic change not only in the status, but

Church consists of those who have entered into a renewed relationship with God (nos. 12, 14). Baptism (no. 15) is the sign of entering that relationship, and the Lord's Supper is the celebration of the relationship's continuation (no. 17).

Marriage and the family ideally provide a living parable of the relationship that God desires to have with humanity (no. 23). Marital fidelity echoes the faithfulness God demands of those who enter into relationship with him. Just as families are multifaceted, so the Church is diverse. Believers are called to assist in building up the Church (Eph. 4:12)—by extending the invitation to enter the heavenly relationship to others, and ultimately to all. God does not merely demand such work as sovereign. Rather, he equips us with spiritual gifts (no. 17) and works together with us.

The law (no. 19) reveals God's character and outlines appropriate behavior for people in relationship with him.⁷ A new relationship with God does not destroy our moral obligations, but heightens them because others judge God through our behavior. The assertion that the judgment extends to believers emphasizes our moral responsibilities. The prospect of divine judgment is bearable only because it occurs while Christ continues his priestly ministry in heaven (no. 24), and not after he has finished there (that is, at the second coming or during the millennium).

The Sabbath (no. 20) makes a provision of time for the relationship, and both stewardship and church standards reflect our appreciation and gratitude for the relationship (nos. 21–22).

The remnant (no. 13) are those who ultimately



stand firm in their commitment to the relationship in face of overwhelming opposition, whereas the rest of the world rejects the offer of salvation. This remnant is also given the task of extending the invitation to enter the relationship with God to all who dwell in the world, aided by special guidance through the gift of prophecy (no. 18).

The relationship we now have with God is undeniably real and will be fully realized at the second coming of Christ (no. 25). The relationship with humanity that God intended in the beginning will ultimately be realized in a

Given the diversity of views in the Church—even on distinctive doctrines—the interlocking nature of the Church's doctrines is not absolutely rigid. Where, then, are the limits to this diversity? Surely, those are found at the point where the system unravels. Thompson and Davidson can differ on inspiration, and the system remains intact.

But if one were to deny the inspiration of Scripture, the system would obviously unravel. Similarly, LaRondelle and Provonsha may differ on the nature of the atonement, but both see it as the means of restoring the

Does denying the prophetic significance of 1844 cause the Adventist theological system to unravel?

world made new (no. 28), when sin is finally and completely brought to an end (no. 27).

Adventist theology, then, looks like a wheel—each doctrine a spoke connected to the central hub of the God of relationships. However, the doctrines do not relate only to the central hub. They have an integral relationship with each other. If any of these interlocking doctrines is discarded, the entire system unravels.

For example, if the law of God (no. 19) is discarded, the Sabbath (no. 20) goes with it, as does the judgment (no. 24)—there now being no standard of judgment. This, in turn, dramatically alters the understanding of the second coming and the millennium (nos. 25, 27). The self-understanding of the Church as the commandment-keeping remnant (no. 13) must also be discarded. Our traditional understanding of the Great Controversy (no. 8) would also be destroyed. Without a judgment of believers, the entire understanding of salvation is likely to move in a much more Calvinistic direction.⁸

This process can be demonstrated from many starting points. If creation is denied, the Sabbath is lost and, with it, the law. If the judgment is discarded, the entire system unravels.⁹ If the Trinity is denied, the atonement doctrine is rendered incomprehensible, and the entire doctrine of salvation is altered. Relationship is then understood as not being integral to God's being.

Instead, God is a being who drives one created being to his death on the cross, so that he might spare another—not a God of love, but a god of rage. The great controversy theme with its emphasis on the justice of God would inevitably collapse, as would the doctrines of judgment and the millennium.

broken relationship with God. Rice and Canale differ on the question of God's foreknowledge, but this issue is tangential to the crucial questions of God's relationship with humanity (as we experience it).

This brings us back to Ford and Shea.¹⁰ Why were Ford's views deemed outside the permissible range of diversity? Clearly, it was felt that Ford had denied the doctrine of the judgment of believers and that the whole system would unravel if his views were accepted.

According to Ford, one crucial question he refused to answer was how his views differed from those of Robert Brinsmead.¹¹ When one looks at Brinsmead's subsequent history—with his rejection of virtually every tenet of orthodox Christianity—it is clear that he had, in fact, rejected the judgment doctrine and the entire theological system consequently unravelled.¹²

However, the Adventist theological system did not unravel in the case of Ford. He remains today, twenty-five years after Glacier View, a Sabbath keeper, a nondispensational premillennialist, a health reformer, a conditional immortalist. Could it be that both his friends and his enemies misunderstood the significance of what he said about the sanctuary and the judgment at Glacier View?

Ford explicitly affirmed belief in the judgment in his Glacier View document, albeit a judgment conceptualized as beginning at the ascension and finding eschatological realization in a declaration of verdict immediately prior to the second advent, rather than a process of investigation. He should be allowed to speak for himself:

True it is that the judgment spoken of in Scripture vindicates God's righteousness to the universe in the sense of making public His righteous deci-

sions...Certainly the Scripture teaches a judgment for all men, but it is one that holds no terror for the true believer...It is just as certain that while the great judgment has its public revelation at the coming of Christ, destinies are judged and sealed while Christ is still high priest above. This is the truth of the pre-advent judgment. At every point of His intercession Christ knows whether professed believers are truly abiding in Him. While they trust Him as Saviour, a trust manifested by loyalty and obedience, He represents them before the Father and their destiny is never in doubt. We must ever keep in mind 1 Cor. 4:4 which speaks of a pre-advent judging of us all by our Lord...See also 2 Thess. 1:5-10 and compare Rom. 2:5-8,16. These latter passages make it clear that both those who have been patiently continuing in well doing and those who do not obey the truth; those that need rest from persecution, and those that persecute—both groups are revealed for what they are at the actual appearance of Christ in glory. Because the saints are to join Christ in judging even angels they must themselves be judged first—that is found in Christ at the close of their probation.¹³

What Ford does deny is that the pre-advent judgment began in 1844. This is the point of his extensive treatment of Daniel 8 and his detailed examination of Hebrews.

Does denying the prophetic significance of 1844, in and of itself, cause the Adventist theological system to unravel? Evidently not. This might appear startling, but when analyzed dispassionately it is not surprising. No date has theological significance. Dates mark segments of human history; theology deals with God's acts. Certainly, God acts in history and his acts are fraught with theological significance, but not the date of their occurrence.

How many crucial events in salvation history are undated in Scripture? When was the creation? The fall? The flood? The Exodus can only be dated from a passing reference in the account of the building of Solomon's temple—and if it is assumed that the Deuteronomic author is not using a round number.¹⁴

No date is given for the birth of Jesus, or for his death. Luke notes the beginning of John the Baptist's ministry by mentioning the ruling authorities at the time. However, not even Luke tells us how long John's ministry had gone on before Jesus came to him, or how long Jesus ministered before his crucifixion.

The year of Jesus' execution is uncertain.¹⁵ Scripture

specifically excludes knowledge of the date of the end of the judgment, that is the second coming (Matt. 24:36). Is the date of the beginning of the judgment that much more significant than the date of its end? The creation, fall, flood, exodus, birth and passion of Jesus, and the judgment are of extraordinary theological significance. But their dates are not.

The one theological value of dates may be their evidence for the fulfillment of prophecy. However, in the case of 1844, we cannot see any fulfillment. What proof do we have—outside the prophecy itself—that the judgment began in 1844?

It is certainly possible to muster evidence that 1844 was a significant year in human history.¹⁶ However, surely, there is no conceivable earthly activity that could serve as evidence for the sort of heavenly activity we associate with 1844. It is logically invalid to point to our own proclamation of the judgment's start as evidence that it had actually started.

In the SPD Bible conference, Roy Gane declared that Daniel 8:14 (and therefore 1844) was important because it told us when the words of John, "The hour of his judgment has come," became true. The question remains: Why is this theologically valuable? Does sin become more serious in the judgment hour? Does salvation become more urgent? Surely this has been a matter of life and death from the beginning.

The one possible theological significance of knowing that the judgment has begun is that it provides a sign of the imminent return of Christ. However, as time goes by, it becomes harder and harder to maintain 1844 as an eschatological sign. Logically, nothing that happened more than a lifetime ago can serve as any sort of sign that Jesus is coming soon, that is, in my likely lifetime.¹⁷

If time should go on (God forbid) until 3844, would the two thousand years since the beginning of the judgment be any less of a difficulty for eschatological imminence than the two thousand years since the cross are for us today? If Adventist identity is to be understood in terms of theology, denial of the prophetic significance of the date does not threaten this identity.

There is no denying that the date has vast historical significance for Adventists. Can the Church pre-



serve its identity if that historical significance is shorn of theological significance? When such effort has been put into defending the prophetic significance of 1844 has the basis for this effort really been historical and theological? Theologically, the date 1844, has no significance.

And yet... In one respect, 1844 is perhaps more important to us than it has been to any generation since the one that experienced the Great Disappointment. We, like the Millerites, are confronted with disappointment over the nonreturn of Jesus. Like them, we have had our hopes dashed—again and again. History itself seems to mock us and our beliefs, and our proclamation of “soon” is becoming increasingly problematic. How long can we credibly say “soon”?¹⁸

Little wonder we are confronted with questions of identity—even as the Millerites eventually were. The crucial difference between us and the Millerites is that their pain, disappointment, and self-doubt were concentrated in a point—October 22, 1844—whereas ours is the culmination of generations.

In the face of their disappointment, disillusionment, and despair, the pioneers turned their gaze from the mocking of their neighbors and the stubborn continuation of a sinful world to heaven and the ministry of Christ in the sanctuary. We must do the same. Our hope is in the sanctuary. Eighteen forty-four remains for us a reminder that God rules in heaven, despite the happenings on earth. “Though it linger, wait for it; it will certainly come and not delay” (Hab. 2:3 NIV).¹⁹

Closing the Bible conference, South Division president Laurie Evans spoke of the dangers of reengineering the Church. He highlighted the dangers of severing the tree from its roots, of becoming alienated from our own history. His warnings were apt and appropriate. However, might not a different sort of reengineering be needed—one that allows the experience of our forebears to be ours, one that reformulates their message in terms that make it as exciting and relevant for us as it was for them?

Whatever the answers, it seems evident that church identity is more complicated than the simple affirmation of certain doctrinal positions might indicate. The topic of the Church’s self-identity is timely and important. Preserving self-identity is vital for the Church. The South Pacific Division is to be commended for convening a conference with scholars, administrators, field pastors,

and even the odd layperson to discuss openly such potentially sensitive matters.

Division Field Secretary Paul Petersen deserves the thanks of all who attended, for organizing the entire program and its speakers so that the final result was stimulating, informative, and challenging. The SPD Bible conference on this theme was an important first step, but more work is needed. The issues are perhaps deeper than acknowledged at the conference and need to be addressed more broadly than was done there.

Notes and References

1. See, A. Thompson, *Inspiration: Hard Questions, Honest Answers* (Hagerstown, Md.: Review and Herald, 1991); R. A. Davidson, “Revelation/Inspiration in the Old Testament: A Critique of Alden Thompson’s ‘Incarnational’ Model,” in *Issues in Revelation and Inspiration*, ed. F. Holbrook and L. van Dolson, 105–36 (Berrien Springs, Mich.: Adventist Theological Society, 1992).
2. See J. W. Provonsha, *God Is With Us* (Washington, D.C.: *Review and Herald*, 1974), 126–35; H. K. LaRondelle, *Christ Our Salvation* (Mountain View, Calif.: Pacific Press, 1980), 21–39.
3. See, R. Rice, *The Openness of God: The Relationship of Divine Foreknowledge and Human Free Will* (Washington, D.C.: *Review and Herald*, 1980); F. L. Canale, “Doctrine of God,” in *The Handbook of Seventh-day Adventist Theology*, ed. R. Dederen, 105–59 (Hagerstown, Md.: *Review and Herald*, 2000).
4. See, D. Ford, *Daniel 8:14, the Day of Atonement and the Investigative Judgement* (Casselberry, Fla.: Euangelion, 1980); W. H. Shea, *Selected Studies on Prophetic Interpretation* (Washington D.C.: General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1982).
5. G. Knight, “Twenty-seven Fundamentals in Search of a Theology,” *Ministry*, Feb. 5–7, 2001; James Londis, “Can We Trust Our Theologians?” *Slingscope*, Apr. 1981. The article was savagely criticized at the time by David Lin in the sixth of his *China Letters*, in August of that year.
6. Sakae Kubo has explored Adventist theology in relational terms. See his *The God of Relationships* (Hagerstown, Md.: *Review and Herald*, 1993), and *God Meets Man* (Nashville, Tenn.: Southern Publishing Association, 1978).
7. The first four Commandments deal with the human relationship with God; the last six with human relationship with other people.
8. Walter Martin pointed out many years ago that many of the objections to Adventist theology (especially in regard to the law and judgment) are in reality objections of Calvinism to Arminianism. See, W. Martin, *The Truth about Seventh-day Adventism* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 1960), 205.

9. In an unpublished paper titled "Yes, There is No Judgment," I have outlined the significance of denying the pre-advent judgment. Logically, anyone who does so has to adopt at least one (and probably many) of the following positions as a result: atheism/agnosticism; universalism; immortality of the soul; some form of postmortem "second chance"; unconditional election and perseverance of the saints (Calvinism); antinomianism; or amillennialism, with a postadvent judgment.

10. As with the brief discussions of the views of Thompson, Davidson, Provonsha, LaRondelle, Rice, and Canale, the purpose of the discussion of Ford's views is not intended to present a defense or rebuttal of either his proposals or Shea's. At issue is whether or not the table of Adventism is large enough to include him, and if not, why. Fritz Guy's evaluation that "subsequent [that is, since Glacier View] Adventist thinking in North America seems to have moved closer to his [that is, Ford's] position and further away from that of those who dismissed him" suggests that the issue deserves attention. See, F. Guy, *Thinking Theologically: Adventist Christianity and the Interpretation of Faith* (Berrien Springs, Mich.: Andrews University, 1999), 90.

11. A. Zytkoske, "Interview with Desmond Ford," *Spectrum* 11.2 (1980): 57–58. Brinsmead's critique of the Adventist understanding of the judgment, *1844 Re-Examined*, was published in 1979, before Ford made his notorious Pacific Union College Forum presentation.

12. L. Pahl, "Where is Robert Brinsmead?" *Adventist Today*, May/June 1999, available online: <<http://www.atoday.com/magazine/archive/1999/mayjun1999/articles/WhereIsBrinsmead.shtml>>.

13. Ford, *Daniel 8:14*, 296–97.

14. See, G. R. Driver, "Sacred Numbers and Round Figures," in *Promise and Fulfillment* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1963), 62–90.

15. It is illegitimate to determine the year of Jesus' passion from the prophecy of Daniel 9 and then, in turn, demonstrate the accuracy of the prophecy from the fact that Jesus came "right on time."

16. See, J. Clark, *1844*, 3 vols. (Nashville, Tenn.: Southern Publishing Association, 1968).

17. The point here is this: If Jesus does not come in my lifetime, then his return is not soon for me. The affirmation that Jesus is coming soon is an existential one. Once my existence ends, it is irrelevant to me if the second coming is a day away or a millennium away. The clock, in a very real way, has stopped.

18. For a recent provocative discussion of this issue see, E. W. H. Vick, *The Adventist Dilemma* (Nottingham, Eng.: Evening Publications, 2001).

19. This is one of the texts that spoke directly to the experience of the pioneers after the Great Disappointment.

David Thiele is senior lecturer in New Testament and ethics in the School of Theology at Pacific Adventist University. He is currently on study leave completing his doctorate in New Testament at the University of Queensland.

Continued from page 59...

care, "he suddenly becomes the mainstay of the social order...His sexual passions are channeled. He discovers a sense of pride—yes, masculine pride—because he is needed by his wife and children. Everyone benefits from the relationship."²⁰

In ideas of gender, as in theories of self-esteem and views of discipline, it would seem that James Dobson shapes his family ethic as much or more by the honor-shame codes of early Anglo-American patriarchy as by Christian faith or Scripture. This kind of honor-shame response showed up vividly in his polemical work of cultural politics, *Children at Risk*, coauthored with Gary L. Bauer, head of the Family Research Council, "the Washington office of Focus on the Family."²¹

In a vituperative discussion of Planned Parenthood and SIECUS (Sexuality Information and Education Council of the United States), Dobson portrays the access of young minor women to contraception and abortion without parental notification as an assault on the liberty of the local community and its individual households:

Imagine how your father or grandfather would have reacted if a school official had secretly given contraceptives to you or arranged a quiet abortion when you were a teenager. The entire community would have been incensed. Someone may well have been shot! Yet today's parents have tolerated this intrusion without so much as a peep of protest. Why? What has happened to that spirit of protection for our families—that fierce independence that bonded us together against the outside world? I wish I knew.²¹

To what conclusions does this brief analysis of the Dobson family ethic push me? Not that Dobson is guilty of sponsoring authoritarian abuse of women and children. Such crude generalizations and wild charges are unfair to his explicit prescriptions and fail to square with current sociological evidence.²³

Rather, I believe it fair to suggest that the boundary posturing entailed by Dobson's deeply ingrained stance as pugnacious patriarch encourages a politics of enmity, absolutism, and the scapegoating of minority groups perceived as sources of impurity and disorder. Homosexuals,



unmarried pregnant women, and never-married single mothers come to mind as categories likely to be socially and politically disadvantaged by Dobson's family values politics. Within Adventism, for instance, it is difficult to see how the seeds of healing and reconciliation planted at the Ontario Conference reported in the last issue of *Spectrum* could ever grow if the Dobson family ethic were to further pervade our subculture.

More deeply, I would recall the push for radical spiritual equality in the community of early American Methodism. Even though it was a thrust soon blunted and compromised, it bore witness to the longstanding Christian message: "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus" (Gal. 3:28 KJV).

The original Methodist message undermined the inherent inequalities of the culture of honor. Historically and culturally sensitive research into the world of the New Testament also shows that the radical life and message of the Christian community was not compatible with the first-century Mediterranean culture of honor.²⁴

To the degree that James Dobson and Focus on the Family sacralize codes of honor and shame, misrepresenting them as the ageless "Judeo-Christian tradition," they create an idol and betray the gospel of Jesus Christ.

Notes and References

1. See, for example, James Dobson, *Dare to Discipline* (Wheaton, Ill.: Tyndale House, 1970), 13–14, 98–107, 224.

2. James Dobson, *The Strong-Willed Child: Birth through Adolescence* (Wheaton, Ill.: Tyndale House, 1978), 176.

3. For a story of how God, mother, and flag joined forces, see A. Gregory Schneider, *The Way of the Cross Leads Home: The Domestication of American Methodism* (Bloomington, Ind.: University of Indiana Press, 1993); and idem, "Social Religion, the Christian Home, and Republican Spirituality in Antebellum Methodism," *Journal of the Early Republic* 10 (summer 1990):163–89.

4. Dobson elaborates on his ties to his father in James Dobson, *Straight Talk to Men: Recovering the Meaning of Biblical Manhood* (Nashville: Word Publishing, 1995), 39–51. See also, Rolf Zetterson, *Dr. Dobson: Turning Hearts toward Home: The Life and Principles of America's Family Advocate* (Dallas: Word, 1989), 11–30.

5. The term *effective history* derives from the hermeneutic philosophy of Hans Georg Gadamer as practiced and explicated in Don

S. Browning et al., *From Culture Wars to Common Ground: Religion and the American Family Debate*, 2d ed. (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2000).

6. James Dobson, *Hide or Seek*, rev. ed. (Old Tappan, N.J.: Fleming H. Revell, 1979), 17–21.

7. *Ibid.*, 38–39.

8. *Ibid.*, 14.

9. *Ibid.*, 60–61.

10. *Ibid.*, 79–84, 162–65.

11. *Ibid.*, 94–95.

12. James Dobson, *Love Must Be Tough: New Hope for Families in Crisis* (Waco: Word Books, 1983), 61–63.

13. Schneider, *Way of the Cross*, 1–10.

14. This account of the clash of evangelical community with the culture of honor draws on Schneider, *Way of the Cross*; Russell E. Richey, *Early American Methodism* (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1991); and Christine Leigh Heyrman, *Southern Cross: The Beginnings of the Bible Belt* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1997).

15. This is the central argument of Heyrman, *Southern Cross*.

16. Schneider, "Republican Spirituality."

17. For a self-depiction as the beleaguered Christian warrior, see Dobson's online newsletter for April 2006, <<http://www.focus-action.org/Articles/A000000189.cfm>> (accessed April 25, 2006). For complaints of disrespect and ridicule directed at motherhood and traditional masculinity, see Dobson, *Hide or Seek*, 157; and idem, *Straight Talk*, 22–33.

18. Dobson, *Straight Talk*, 49.

19. *Ibid.*, 47–48; Zetterson, *Dr. Dobson*, 101–2.

20. Dobson, *Straight Talk*, 26–32.

21. James Dobson and Gary L. Bauer, *Children at Risk: The Battle for the Hearts and Minds of Our Kids* (Dallas: Word, 1990), 82.

22. *Ibid.*, 13.

23. W. Bradford Wilcox, *Soft Patriarchs, New Men: How Christianity Shapes Fathers and Husbands* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004).

24. See Chapter 5, "Honor, Shame, and Equality in Early Christian Families," in Browning et al., *Culture Wars to Common Ground*, 129–54.

A. Gregory Schneider is professor of religion and social science at Pacific Union College, Angwin, California.