privileging of reality over fiction, since everything was now equally uncertain. With the primacy of process came a questioning of the old ontological categories of time and space that had helped to separate art from life. Now time and space became functions of each other, leading to the increasing conviction that the work of art -- far from being a distinct and eternal embodiment of the ideal -- is never finished by the artist. The era of environmental art, of ephemeral art, of 'happenings' and performance art, could not be far off.

To make such broad claims for James's notion of vagueness reflects a blurring of focus in Gavin's book, pointing to its one real weakness. Gavin's exposition of the vague is, in sum, itself vague--and not always in the positive way James meant this term. I am troubled by the lack of historical specificity, of context here. Are we to believe that James is really the source for such a protean notion or was he simply one of its more brilliant and self-conscious expositors? It would seem that Gavin's broader philosophical interests have subsumed his specific historical perspective on James: where did the notion of vagueness come from (one thinks most immediately of Emerson, who gets almost no mention) and, even more problematically, how were James's ideas about it passed on? With respect to James's influence on the direction of modern art, one would expect at least some mention of Gertrude Stein, a pupil of James at Harvard who, as a "literary cubist" in Paris in the years before World War I, exercised a telling influence on literary and aesthetic thought.

This might seem to be quibbling, but the point is that we have very little sense from Gavin's book of just who shared James's interest in vagueness and what it indicates about the period and culture he emerged from and helped in turn to shape. A more ambitious, less discipline-bound book than Gavin's might have exploited the contextually implications of James's thought in the direction of a more historical account that would tie James's interest in vagueness to broader cultural currents. It might also have hazarded some responses to the question the author asks early on, "How can one be articulate about the inarticulate, or clear about the vague, without undermining or 'explaining away what it is that one wants to preserve?" (4). Clearly, Gavin's own somewhat disembodied account of ideas leaves him without a fully adequate antidote to what James's attacked as "vicious intellectualism."

David Miller
Allegany College


This is a short book that promises much. It promises a "new way" (p. vi) of writing about Edwards and to be the "first to take advantage of all the new material" on Edwards in Yale University Press' The Works of Jonathan Edwards, of which the author has been General Editor since 1963. Its hard to imagine doing such a thing
in less than 145 pages of text with only a minimum of footnotes. As for a "new way" of writing and taking advantage of "new material," the author wants his readers to know that his book is rooted in Perry Miller's Jonathan Edwards written in 1949. A glance through the index and footnotes shows that the author had no intent "to draw from the most recent available scholarship" as the back-cover advertisement proclaims. For example, there is no mention of Norman Fiering's works, the collection of essays in Jonathan Edwards and the American Experience (Oxford University Press, 1988), or even Patricia Tracy's Jonathan Edwards, Pastor (Hill and Wang, 1980). The "Life and Times" chapter recommends only three biographical sources to readers: Miller's 1949 biography, Ola Winslow's 1940 biography, and an essay on Edwards' life written in 1830.

The book is intended to re-invigorate Miller's central theme that Edwards' thought is rooted in Locke's. Miller was certainly right to see Locke as a major influence on Edwards; and John Smith is probably right to assert that many critics have oversimplified Miller's interpretation. Perry Miller was sometimes his own worst enemy since he could write with such majesty that his readers failed to see his subtlety. However there are serious problems with Miller's biography largely because of the way Miller viewed Locke. Miller's biography was controversial from the beginning, and the criticism of William Sparkes Morris in 1955 summarizes the problem: "A twentieth-century Edwards is fashioned out of the discipline of a Locke Interpreted, most onesidely, in terms of nineteenth-century sensationalism" (The Young Jonathan Edwards (Carlson, 1991, p.9). Miller's and Smith's views on the influence of Locke on Edwards are hard to accept primarily because their take on Locke seems so out-of-touch with the early eighteenth century and the late twentieth century. Lockean studies was then and is now a field of vigorous debate, between it was stamped into what Louis Loeb calls "the standard theory" which gets taught in every freshman textbook (From Descartes to Hume: Continental Metaphysics and the Development of Modern Philosophy (Cornell University Press, 1981, pp. 25-76).

Putting aside the influence of Locke and the many tributes to Miller, the summaries of Edwards' thought are clear and concise. The chapters on religious affections and freedom of the will would be useful to undergraduates and seminary students. The editorial forward by Brian Davies OP asks for the book to encourage readers to think about what great Christian thinkers have said and judge whether they engage modern problems: "Does it provide a vision to live by? Does it make sense? Can it be preached? Is it believable?" (p. vi). John Smith offers a book that appreciates Jonathan Edwards as a viable theologian for today whose ideas can be proclaimed in the pulpit. This short and serious discussion of Edwards will serve the editor's purpose.

Rick Kennedy Indiana University Southeast
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