NOTE: A seminar syllabus will sometimes go through more than one version, reflecting scheduling updates and/or the addition of detail as the course unfolds. The document footer indicates the version #. Students are responsible for the latest version of the syllabus which will be made available along with email notice in Moodle.

Seminar Facilitators

Dean G. Blevins, Ph.D.  K. Steve McCormick, Ph.D.
dblevins@nts.edu  smccormick@nts.edu
816-268-5481  816-268-5486

Seminar Description

This seminar explores a Wesleyan understanding of the being and mission of the Church. A variety of models for the Church’s mission to the world are examined. Theological issues considered include the character and mission of God, soteriology, eschatology, and the means of grace—all with a view toward their implications for ministry in today’s world.

Seminar Narrative

This seminar course will examine the being and mission of the Church by focusing on two basic questions: What is the Church? What on earth is the Church for? Unfortunately, almost from the Church’s inception these two have become disjoined. This course will work through these two questions and the soteriology of the Gospel for ‘reconnecting’ them by examining the Trinitarian and Christological Faith of Nicea and Chalcedon. Mapping through the terrain of diverse ecclesiological traditions, this course will seek to understand Ecumenism’s failure ‘to be’ after the likeness of the Holy Trinity, and ‘to live’ in the missio Dei as the ‘one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church.’ Specific attention throughout this seminar will be given to the soteriology of John Wesley’s ‘missional-ecclesiology’ and how he ‘connected’ the being and mission of the Church with the Trinitarian category of koinonia and the ‘means of grace.’

Seminar Outcomes (SO) for the Course

Upon completion of this course student will:

1. Develop a greater understanding of the Wesleyan tradition for theologically informed mission and ministry (Assignment #1,2,5)
2. Demonstrate an ability to assist with peer learning methods (Assignment #3,6)
3. Integrate theological reflection with ministry practice (Assignment #2,3,4,5,7)
4. Demonstrate critical and creative research skills for lifelong learning (Assignment #2,3,6,7)

**Seminar Required Reading** (The listing in each subsection is the recommended sequence for reading in that subsection; McCormick articles will be posted in Moodle)

**Readings in Wesleyan Theology**


Blevins, Dean G. "Practicing the New Creation: Wesley’s Eschatological Community Formed by the Means of Grace" *Asbury Theological Journal* 57, no. 2 and 58, no. 1 (Fall 2002/Spring 2003), 81-104. 24pp.


**Ecclesial Mission/Participation**


**A Trinitarian Theology of the Church**
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McCormick, K. Steve. ‘The Church after the Likeness of the Holy Trinity is the Church after the Missio Dei.’ 12pp.

**One book selected from the Supplemental/Primer Reading Lists below for Pre-Seminar assignment #3**

Total required reading 2,984 pages + supplemental/primer book choice
Total Cost of books: $314.00 + supplemental/primer book choice

**Seminar Standards**

This seminar requires internet access to NTS Moodle for instructional information about assignments and electronic assignment submission. Unless otherwise instructed, do not send assignments to the professors via email. Your electronic submissions will automatically be linked to the “Grades” area of Moodle to which you have access for viewing your grades. Contact support@nts.edu with technical questions or for assistance.

All formal written documents are to be carefully proof-read for correct spelling and grammar before submission; it is the responsibility of the student to ensure “clean” copy, even if it means securing assistance. Students will observe Inclusive Language usage guidelines as found at http://www.wynkoopcenter.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=53&Itemid=85.

All research-based written documents are to be formatted (and will be evaluated) utilizing Turabian, Kate L. *A Manual for Writers of Research Papers, Theses, and Dissertations: Chicago Style for Students and Researchers*, 7th edition, Revised by Wayne C. Booth, et al. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007). This is the style required for the DMin Pastoral Research Project document.

**Pre-Seminar Assignments (350 Points)**

1. Reading of all required texts and periodicals (SO-1)
2. Write an annotated bibliography of all required readings due Monday January 3rd before the first day of class. Students may “bundle” assigned articles according to author (Blevins and McCormick) and offer one annotation per author. See appendix for guidelines, estimated size 1500-1750 words (6-7 pages). 100 points (SO-1, 3, 4)

3. The student shall write two 1250 word (5-page) professional book reviews selecting:

   a. One of the required books and
   b. One book from the supplemental or primer lists given below.

   **Readings should be determined no later than October 15th** based on first come, first served basis... or books will be assigned. Reviews due Monday January 3rd before the first day of class, no two reviews may cover of the same book. See appendix for guidelines. 100 points each (SO 2, 3, 4)
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4. **Preliminary Reflection paper: issues of the Church.** Each student will prepare a 750-1250 word (3-5 page) review detailing key issues facing the church as a result of the reading. Due: Tuesday, January 4.  **50 points (SO 3)**

**During the Seminar (300 points)**

5. Every student is expected to attend all sessions of the class and be fully prepared to engage in critically reflective conversation with the professors and the rest of the class as we discuss the materials from the Required Reading. Informed classroom participation is expected and ‘needed’ from every member of the class, and will inform the majority of the seminar participation grade.  **(SO 1, 3)**

6. Every student will provide an **oral presentation** of their **supplemental or primer book review**, providing the thesis of the book and how it expands our discussion about the being and mission of the Church. The presentation will be no more than 30 minutes. After the presentation, the class will engage the presenter with ongoing conversation and critique. The **class presentation** will count a part of the seminar participation grade.  **(SO 2, 4)**

**Seminar Schedule:**

**Monday, January 3:** 5:30pm Opening dinner with returning students, new students, Seminar faculty, and NTS administration.

**Tuesday, January 4 – Friday, January 7; Monday, January 10 – Wednesday, January 12:** Class sessions will begin on Tuesday morning, Jan. 4th at 8:30am and will conclude on Thursday afternoon, Jan. 13th at 12:00 noon. The daily schedule will generally follow this outline except for Thursday Jan 13th when class ends at 12:00 noon:

- 8:30 a.m. – Devotions Prayer
- 9:00-10:30 a.m. – Session One
- 10:30-11:00 a.m. – Morning Break
- 11:00-12:15 p.m. – Session Two
- 12:15-1:45 p.m. – Lunch Break
- 1:45-3:00 p.m. – Session Three
- 3:00-3:30 p.m. – Afternoon Break
- 3:30-4:30 p.m. – Session Four

**Saturday, January 8, 2011** (no class)

**Sunday, January 9, 2011** We will be attending church on Sunday morning (from a different ecclesial tradition) and debrief following; the seminar schedule will include approximately 4 hours for this event.

**Thursday, January 13** Class begins at 8:30 and ends at 12:00 noon
Post-Seminar Assignments (350 points)

7. This Post-Seminar Assignment consists of taking the material from the assigned readings, class discussion and presentations, and further implementing those insights and contributions into the ministries of your local church setting. This research paper will work with a ‘thesis’ that is developed out of your current ministry and local setting. Integrate your thesis and the assigned readings with the broader theological meaning of the being and mission of the Church. This Post-Seminar paper should be approximately 5000-6250 words (20-25 typewritten pages) and is due no later than Wednesday, March 30. The paper will be assessed according to several basic categories including the following:

   a. **Introduction/Clarity of Thesis** (This criterion examines the student’s ability to introduce the context, state the practical problem that generated this research, and provide a clear thesis of the essay as well as explain how the paper unfolds)
   
   b. **Description of Sources** (This criterion evaluates the student’s ability to describe in her or his own language the position of the theologians cited.)

   c. **Comprehensiveness of Sources** (This criterion evaluates the student’s breadth of sources used in composing essays.)

   d. **Critical Engagement with Sources** (This criterion examines whether a student’s work has taken the step beyond mere description and critically engaged with the sources she or he has drawn upon by subjecting them to a critical theological analysis.)

   e. **Development of Position and a Coherent Theme** (This criterion determines not only if a student has critically assessed the sources and arguments present in an essay, but also if he or she has done this through the development of her or his own coherent position.)

   f. **Implementation** (This criterion examines how well the paper has ‘actually’ integrated and synthesized the rationale of the thesis and its accompanying implications with the ‘way’ they are embodied and lived out in the local Church setting.)

   g. **Presentation** (This criterion evaluates writing style, clarity of prose, basic grammatical and spelling competence, sentence and paragraph flow, as well as headers for key sections of the paper.) (SO 3,4)

---

**Student Learning Hours (6 hour seminar)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-Seminar Hours</th>
<th>Seminar Hours</th>
<th>Post-Seminar Hours</th>
<th>Total Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-face Class Sessions</td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Participation in forums, groups, etc.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Assignments and Learning Activities (Presentation and Church Visit)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exams &amp; Quizzes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DMN915 January 2011 Syllabus (v1), p. 5
Post-Seminar Program Assignments

In-Parish Committee:

If this is your **first** Seminar, select the members for your In-Parish Committee as detailed in the DMin *Handbook* and post a list with their names, titles/positions, reasons for your choices, and the email address of your designated Committee Chairperson in *Moodle* by March 1.

By May 1 all students must meet with their In-Parish Committee and post in *Moodle* the date of the meeting and who attended. The Chair (not the student) will write-up the In-Parish Committee Report and send it to Anne R. Hardy (using the Form and instructions in the DMin *Handbook*), also by May 1.

Pastoral Research Project (PRP):

Resources:
- NTS DMin *Handbook* section on “Research Process” (available online at [www.nts.edu/dmin](http://www.nts.edu/dmin))

Find the assignment below that applies to you, and post it in *Moodle* by March 1:

If this is your **first** Seminar – read *Practical Theology and Qualitative Research* and write 2-3 paragraphs on a possible topic for your PRP and how this book has begun to shape your thinking about your PRP.

If this is your **second** Seminar – read the DMin *Handbook* descriptions of the Research Process, paying special attention to the Topic Selection Form. Review *Practical Theology and Qualitative Research* and write 2-3 paragraphs on your developing ideas of the project you would like to conduct in your own ministry context.

If this is your **third** Seminar – carefully re-read the DMin *Handbook* descriptions of the Research Process, review *Practical Theology and Qualitative Research*, and submit a first draft of the Topic Selection Form.

Electives:

Find the assignment below that applies to you, and post it in *Moodle* by March 1:

If this is your **first** Seminar – read the DMin *Handbook* instructions for the Electives portion of the program, paying special attention to the Electives Proposal Form, and write 2-3 paragraphs describing the area(s) of study you are considering for your Electives and how your Electives may contribute to your PRP.

If this is your **second** Seminar, carefully re-read the DMin *Handbook* descriptions of the Electives, and complete and submit a first draft of the Electives Proposal Form.
If this is your third Seminar – and you have not already done so, submit a first draft of the Electives Proposal Form; if adjustments were required from your first draft, submit those for final approval.

Summary of Due Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday, June 28</td>
<td>Begin ordering books &amp; commence required reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, October 15</td>
<td>Make Supplemental/Primer book selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, January 3</td>
<td>Submit Annotated Bibliography &amp; Supplemental/Primer Book Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, January 4</td>
<td>Submit Reflection Paper on Issues of the Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During the Seminar</td>
<td>Oral presentations on Supplemental/Primer Book Reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, March 1</td>
<td>In-Parish Committee Selection (1st Seminar students only); PRP Write-up; Electives Write-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, March 30</td>
<td>Research Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday, May 1</td>
<td>In-Parish Committee Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grading

1000-901: A  900-801: B  800-701: C  700-600:D  599 or Below: F

Grade Descriptions

“A”-EXCEPTIONAL WORK (strong, significant achievement of course objectives)

“B”-GOOD WORK (basic, essential achievement of course objectives)

“C” or “D”-MARGINAL WORK (inadequate, minimal achievement of course objectives)

“F”-UNACCEPTABLE WORK (failure to achieve course objectives)

Recommended Supplemental Readings
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A Primer of Readings in Ecclesiological Traditions:

**Eastern Orthodox Ecclesiology**
—John David Zizioulas, Vladimir Lossky, Kalistos Ware—

Kalistos Ware, *The Orthodox Church.*
Kalistos Ware, *The Orthodox Way.*
John Meyendorf, *Byzantine Theology: Historical Trends and Doctrinal Themes.*
Vladimir Lossky, *Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church.*
Vladimir Lossky, The Image and Likeness of God.
Schmemann, Alexander, *Year Book And Church Directory Of The Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church Of America.*
John Zizioulas, *Being As Communion.*
Boris Bobrinskoy, *The Mystery of the Trinity.*
Boris Bobrinskoy, *The Compassion of the Father.*
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Roman Catholic Ecclesiology
—Hans Kung, Karl Rahner, Henri de Lubac, Yves Congar, Joseph Ratzinger (Pope Benedict XVI)—

Avery Dulles, *Models of the Church.*
Karl Rahner, *The Dynamic Element in the Church.*
Karl Rahner, *The Trinity.*
Michael Fahey, *Church, in Systematic Theology: Roman Catholic Perspectives*, vol. 2.
Donald J. Gelpi, *Charism and Sacrament.*
Hans Kung, *The Church.*
Henri de Lubac, *The Splendour of the Church.*
Henri de Lubac, *Crisis in the Church.*
Henri de Lubac, *The Church: From Paradox to Mystery.*

Lutheran Ecclesiology
—Wolfhart Pannenberg, Jurgen Moltmann, Carl Braaten, Robert Jenson—

*The Book of Concord. The Large Catechism.*
Martin Luther, *The Babylonian Captivity of the Church.*
Robert Jenson, *Unbaptized God.*
Paul Althuas, *The Theology of Martin Luther.*
*Augsburg Confession.*
Wolfhart Pannenberg, *Systematic Theology*, vol. 3.
Jurgen Moltmann, *The Trinity and the Kingdom.*
Alister E. McGrath, *Luther’s Theology of the Cross: Martin Luther’s Theological Breakthrough.*

Reformed Ecclesiology
—Jurgen Moltmann, Karl Barth, John Webster—

C. Penrose St. Amant, “Reformation Views of the Church,” in *The People of God: Essays in the Believers’ Church.*
Brian Gerrish, *Grace & Gratitude: The Eucharistic Theology of John Calvin.*
Daniel J. Trier and David Lauber (eds.) *Trinitarian Theology for the Church*.
John Webster, *Word and Church*.
John Webster, *Holiness*.
John Webster, *Holiness and Holy Scripture: A Dogmatic Sketch*.

**Free Church Ecclesiology**
—James McClendon, Miroslav Wolf, Jurgen Moltmann—

Paul Basden and David Dockery (ed.), *The People of God: Essays on the Believers’ Church*.
Miroslav Volf, *After Our Likeness*.
James Garrett, (ed.) *The Concept of the Believers’ Church*.
Barry Harvey, *Can These Bones Live?: A Catholic Baptist Enagement in Ecclesiology, Hermeneutics and Social Theory*.

**Pentecostal/Charismatic Ecclesiology**
—Steve Land, Michael Welker, Hans Kung—

A.A. Anderson, W.J. Hollenweger, (eds.), *Pentecostals After a Century: Global Perspectives on a Movement in Transition*.
Steven J. Land, *Pentecostal Spirituality: A Passion for the Kingdom*.
S.M. Burgess and G. McGee, (eds.) *Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements*.
Walter J. Hollenweger, *Pentecostals*.
Michael Welker, *God the Spirit*.
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Kilian McDonnel, *Charismatic Renewal and Churches.*
Kilian McDonnel, *Charismatic Renewal and Ecumenism.*

**Ecumenical Ecclesiology**
—Leslie Newbigin, Robert Jenson, Carl Braaten, Jurgen Moltmann, Wolfhart Pannenberg, Geoffrey Wainwright—

*A Documentary History of the Faith and Order Movement 1927-1963.*
Harding Meyer, *That All May Be One: Perceptions and Models of Ecumenicity.*
The Dictionary of the Ecumenical Movement, edited.
Harding Meyer and Lukas Vischer (eds.), *Growth in Agreement and Agreed Statements of Ecumenical Conversations on a World Level.*
Robert Jenson, *Unbaptized God.*
Michael Kinnamon and Brian E. Cope, (eds.), *The Ecumenical Movement: An Anthology of Key Texts and Voices.*
C.G. Patelos, (ed.) *The Orthodox Church in the Ecumenical Movement.*
Heindrich Holze, (ed.) *The Church as Communion.*
G. R. Evans, *The Church and the Churches: Toward an Ecumenical Ecclesiology.*
Jerome Hamer, *The Church Is a Communion.*
Appendices: Guidelines and Grading Rubrics

WRITING AN ANNOTATION
(Adapted from websites listed below)

Cite the book, article, or document using the appropriate style. Annotation summary should run 100-150 words.

An annotation briefly restates the main argument of a source. An annotation of an academic source, for example, typically identifies its thesis (or research question, or hypothesis), its major methods of investigation, and its main conclusions. Keep in mind that identifying the argument of a source is a different task than describing or listing its contents. Rather than listing contents, an annotation should account for why the contents are there. Write a concise annotation that summarizes the central theme and scope of the book or article. Include one or more sentences that (a) evaluate the authority or background of the author, (b) comment on the intended audience, (c) compare or contrast this work with another you have cited, or (d) explain how this work illuminates the class theme or your bibliography topic.

For more information see the following web-based guidelines
http://www.library.cornell.edu/olinuris/ref/research/skill28.htm#annot
http://www.utoronto.ca/writing/annotatebib.html

WRITING A BOOK REVIEW

(Guidelines adapted from Christian Education Journal available online at http://wisdom.biola.edu/cej/downloads/cejbookreviewguide.pdf)

Of course, not all of the following questions need to be addressed since space is often limited by the guidelines of book reviews (many reviews limited to 1,000 to 2,000 words). Select which issues are important and relevant in light of the kind of book it is. In the classic work on reading books—How to Read a Book by Mortimer Adler—we learn the task of the reviewer involves two main parts: first understanding the argument of the author, and then evaluating it. Reviews can take on various formats, though in general a summary of the book will precede the evaluation component.

A. UNDERSTANDING
Before evaluating a book, we first must understand it. This aspect is more descriptive and factual—perhaps up to 50% of the review. Summarize the subject matter and contents of the book. Give the reader a sense of the scope of the whole work.

A1. Overview: What is the main subject matter or topic of the book? Provide a brief overview (by chapter if possible) of book contents (scope). How is the book organized (sequence) (e.g., chapters grouped together within parts?) Is there a main organizing framework or model being followed, explicit or implicit? What kind of book is it (e.g., scholarly-technical? textbook? trade/popular?)
A2. Main Thesis, Conclusion(s): What is the main problem/question being addressed? What main claim/conclusion is proposed? What argument is offered to support these proposals? What are the major sub-claims of the book? Have the author’s intentions been clearly understood?

B. INTERACTION AND EVALUATION

This aspect involves your professional judgment regarding how well the author carried out his or her project, related to the intentions of the author. This aspect is an essential contribution that transforms a plain "book summary" into a "book review." This task is the more difficult one, yet it can become easier with increasing breadth of knowledge of the field and depth of critical thinking.

B1. Author’s Qualifications: What is important to tell us about the author and his or her qualifications to write this book?

B2. Assessment of the Argument: How well did the author develop the argument to support the main conclusions, claims, proposals? How well does the author deliver on his or her promises to address the problem(s) posed? [Also see "B5" below.] Any strengths of the argument to highlight? Any weak elements or limitations to note? For points of important disagreement, did you offer a reason: (a) if the author was uninformed (unaware of relevant information)? or (b) misinformed (in error)? or (c) illogical (a conclusion that does not follow)? (For guidelines see brief explains below and also Anthony Weston. 2000. A rulebook for arguments. 3rd ed. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett, 87pp.) Is the book title accurate? Can you suggest a better title?

B3. Compatibility within a Wesleyan or Evangelical Protestant Perspective: What theological or worldview perspective is/seems to be evident in the book? From what perspective is the author addressing the issue? Perhaps keep in mind a traffic light analogy for potential integration within an Wesleyan or evangelical Protestant Christian perspective (e.g.: "green" [compatible], "yellow" [concerns, issues needing further study], "red" [clearly competing, incompatible]). Any problematic claims/critical concerns worth mentioning? Do any major claims fit within a "yellow" or "red" zone? Explain. Also, what is the style, tone of the book?

B4. Contribution: Is there a real need for this book? Why? Any distinctive or novel contributions/proposals in the book worth mentioning? conceptually? practically? (of personal interest to you?) Any quotes worth including? How does the book and its specific contents relate within the broader context of books from the same field of study? Is the treatment of concepts, issues, authors cited, subject matter similar or different? How so? What is the quantity and quality of the citations?

B5. Reviewer’s Conclusions: Do you finally agree or not with the conclusion? Based on Adler’s How to read a book have you indicated either: (a) General agreement with major proposal(s)? (b) Agreement as far as the argument was developed? (c) Agreement in the main with only minor disagreements? (d) Or disagreement with the main conclusion(s)? (See Chapter 11 in Adler’s How to Read a Book for help here, a briefly explained below; reviewers might also find Chapters 4-10 helpful.) For whom do you think the book was written/target audience or for what use (e.g., undergraduate, masters, doctoral, layperson; as a primary text or supplemental)? Was the book well-written, or did you experience any difficulty in reading the book? Can you recommend the book? Are there any qualifications to note?
ADLER’S GUIDELINES ON AGREEING AND DISAGREEING WITH AN AUTHOR

Note: The following is taken from Mortimer J. Adler and Charles Van Doren’s (1972), How to read a book, (revised). New York: Simon and Schuster. Ultimately a reviewer can either agree or disagree with the author’s main argument. (Adler admits that in some cases it may be necessary to withhold judgment so one can study the issue more before rendering a judgment.) When a reviewer generally agrees with the main argument, Adler outlines three possible options:

1. Basic Agreement without qualifications.
2. Agreement as far as the book goes—the analysis is correct, but incomplete. The author has not solved all the problems he or she started with
3. Agreement with the overall argument, but there is disagreement on a minor issue (see below for what kind of disagreements Adler identifies).

When a reviewer generally disagrees with the main argument, Adler also outlines three possible options. Also, a reviewer may agree with the main argument, but disagree with some sub-points for which these same categories of disagreement apply. Adler notes, "When you disagree, do so reasonably, and not disputatiously or contentiously" (145):

1. Disagreement with the argument because the author is uninformed, lacking information relevant to the problem. (Yet, is this an intentional or unintentional omission?)
2. Disagreement with the argument because the author is misinformed and in error, asserting "what is not the case" (157). The facts are wrong.
3. Disagreement because the author’s argument is illogical, the reasoning is fallacious. The conclusions cannot follow from the reasons offered (non sequitur), or the conclusions are inconsistent with other conclusions in the book. When possible, identify the specific logical fallacy (ies). (For help here, see Anthony Weston. 2000. A rulebook for arguments. 3rd ed. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett, 87pp.)

A final note: Do you have any personal reactions to the book? What are they based on specifically? Also be careful that underlying reactions do not pervade the texture and tone of your review. Be honest, yet fair and gracious. Avoid the crimes identified by John Timmerman, "Reforming the Reviewers" Christian Scholars Review, 30 (3), Spring 2001, 323-28:

(a) Misunderstanding author’s intention about the book or proposing how the book should have been written;
(b) Quoting out of context;
(c) Wrong passion—the review is mainly about reviewer’s prejudices or the review "gushes" as if it was a publisher’s publicity piece, and
(d) "Ego" centered review (too many "I"s).

Please keep the focus on the book and not on the reviewer. Is the tone objective, fair and gracious? Is the writing style appropriate for the readership?