



A Retreat from Reason

Gregory Boyd's Judgmental Response to Discernment

by G. Richard Fisher

Some writers get better with each new book. Others go from bad to worse. Such is the case with Gregory A. Boyd and his new book, *Repenting of Religion*. Boyd's 2000 offering, *The God of the Possible*, proposed that God could not know all the future and thus was limited in knowledge.¹ Boyd took the Bible's anthropomorphisms literally and ended up describing a deity not much better or smarter than humanity. Boyd aligned with the heresies of open theism and presented a vulnerable, compromised being devoid of sovereignty. He views God as an extremely intelligent — but not omniscient — chess player.

Book-length answers to Boyd's heretical views followed. Bruce Ware's *God's Lesser Glory* and *Their God is Too Small*; Norman Geisler's *Creating God in the Image of Man*; and John Tal Murphree's *Divine Paradoxes* were just a few.

Boyd is right when he states, "If our mental picture of God is skewed, our relationship with God, with ourselves, and with others will be skewed as well."² However, it is Boyd's view of God that needs straightening out.

Repenting of Religion is a 238-page paperback with the subtitle, *Turning from Judgment to the Love of God*. In his book, Boyd stacks the deck by presenting "religion" in a negative light and implies that anyone who disagrees with his premise possesses this bad form of "religion."

Boyd's unbiblical premise is stated in the preface, where he writes, "We love only insofar as we abstain from judgment."³ He also asserts that "judgment is the 'original sin'"⁴ and, "Our only job is to love, not judge."⁵

Even the usually lenient *Christianity Today* went negative on Boyd and — probably in his view — sinned by negatively judging him. John Wilson wrote:

"A judgmental assessment of judgmentalism is, predictably, full of contradictions. ... Such judgment, Boyd argues — based on his Bonhoeffer-influenced reading of Genesis — is in fact the primal sin from which all other sins derive. ... Perhaps these quotations from Boyd's book will suggest what a strange brew it is, a book riven by self-contradictions and flawed by a hermeneutic so naive it beggars belief. Railing against judgment, Boyd issues sweeping judgments against the church throughout its entire history — judgments that rest almost entirely on sheer assertion. ... Mocking other Christians for their 'system' of evaluating and ranking sins, he himself establishes a hierarchy that collapses all sin into the sin of 'judgment,' the defining sin of 'religion.'"⁶

If judgment had been the original sin, then Jesus and Paul were guilty of

commanding us to commit it. In Matthew 7:15, Jesus instructed us to make judgments with regard to false prophets and wolves in sheep's clothing. In 1 Corinthians 5-6, Paul commanded that sin be judged *in the Church*. Peter, in his second epistle, took to task false prophets and false teachers. Even a cursory study of the Old Testament reveals hundreds of judgment passages directed at Israel and the surrounding nations.

DELIVER US FROM JUDGMENT

Boyd states his thesis and calls it a paradigm shift for most Christians:

"The thesis of this book is that love is the central goal of creation and thus of the Christian life, and that its main obstacle is our getting life from our knowledge of good and evil — from our judgment."⁷

In Boyd's view then, "judging" is an obstacle and an impediment to love. The Bible never sets up a false dichotomy between love and judgment, as Boyd does. God who is love is also justice and judge.

Boyd did not get these views from the Bible and he reveals to his readers some of his sources. One source was Dietrich Bonhoeffer; another was a mystical experience he says he had at a shopping mall.

(continues on page 11)

novel, *More Than a Skeleton*, by Paul Maier, (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 2003), pg. 156.

2. Chuck Smith, *Calvary Chapel Distinctives*. Costa Mesa, Calif.: The Word For Today Publishers, 2000, pg. 134.

3. *Ibid.*, pg. 137.

4. Louis Berkhof, *Systematic Theology*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: William Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1975, pg. 500.

5. Charles Hodge, *Systematic Theology*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 1999, Vol. 3, pg. 42.

6. *More Than a Skeleton*, op. cit., pg. 119.

7. Dave Breese, *Know the Marks of Cults*. Wheaton, Ill.: Victor Books, 1975, pg. 45, italics in original.

8. *Ibid.*, pg. 47.

9. *Ibid.*, pg. 56.

10. Alan Morrison, *The Serpent and the Cross*. Birmingham, England: K&M Books, 1994, pg. 493, italics in original.

11. Curtis I. Crenshaw, *Man as God: The Word of Faith Movement*. Memphis: Footstool Publishing, 1994, pg. 236.

12. U.S. Catholic Conference, Foreword by Pope John Paul II, *Catechism of the Catholic Church*. New York: Doubleday, 1995, pg. 59, italics in original.

13. See, for example, *The Watchtower*, Dec. 1, 1981, pg. 27.

14. Robert M. Bowman Jr., *Understanding Jehovah's Witnesses*. Grand Rapids, Mich.:

Baker Book House, 1991, pg. 47.

15. *The Watch Tower Reprints*, April 1, 1919, pg. 6414.

16. Bob McKeown, host, "Do You Believe in Miracles?," CBC News, Nov. 3, 2004.

17. See further, G. Richard Fisher, "Back to the Source, The Truth About Smith Wigglesworth," *The Quarterly Journal*, January-March 1995, pp. 1, 11-14.

18. Smith Wigglesworth, compiled and edited by Wayne E. Warner, *The Anointing of His Spirit*. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Vine Books, 1994, pg. 27.

19. *Ibid.*, pg. 35.

20. *Man as God: The Word of Faith Movement*, op. cit., pg. 54.

21. Kenneth Copeland, *The Force of Faith*. Fort Worth: KCP Publications, 1983, pg. 10.

22. *Man as God: The Word of Faith Movement*, op. cit., pg. 4, italics in original.

23. G. Jeffrey MacDonald, Religion News Service, "Reformed Protestants No Longer See Images as Idolatrous," *Christianity Today*, Dec. 6, 2004, emphasis added. Document available at: www.christianitytoday.com/ct/2004/149/12.0.html.

24. Leonard George, *Alternate Realities*. New York: Facts on File, 1995, pg. 101.

25. *Ibid.*, pg. 102.

26. David W. Cloud, "Worshipping Dung," *Christian News*, Dec. 6, 2004, pg. 3, capitalization in original.

27. The Associated Press, "Church can serve sacred tea," Dec. 11, 2004. Document available at: www.kansascity.com/mld/kansascity/news/nation/10390553.htm.

28. Promotional DVD, copy on file.

29. Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, op. cit., Vol. 3, pg. 43.

30. James I. Packer in Everett Harrison, Editor, *Baker's Dictionary of Theology*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Book House, 1973, pg. 208.

31. Charles C. Ryrie, *The Ryrie Study Bible*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1976, annotation for Hebrews 11:1, pg. 1850, italics in original.

32. Berkhof, *Systematic Theology*, op. cit., pp. 501, 503.

33. Packer in *Baker's Dictionary of Theology*, op. cit., pg. 211, italics in original.

34. R.E. Nixon in Merrill C. Tenney, Editor, *The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan Publishing House, Vol. 2, 1975, pg. 483.

35. T. Ernest Wilson, *Mystery Doctrines of the New Testament*. Neptune, N.J.: Loizeaux Brothers, 1975, pg. 15.

36. *Ibid.*, pg. 16.

37. Edgar P. Stites, "Trusting Jesus."

38. Edward Mote, "My Hope Is Built on Nothing Less" ("The Solid Rock").



A RETREAT FROM REASON

(continued from page 4)

Regarding Bonhoeffer, Boyd is clear when he states, "my thesis has been greatly inspired by my reading of Bonhoeffer. Indeed, this work can be understood as a consistent interaction with his thought."⁸ It's clear that Boyd must have made some kind of judgment that Bonhoeffer was a safe guide to be trusted and followed. Boyd's lack of discernment — or judgment — betrays him here. We are only as good as our sources.

Bonhoeffer was a German Lutheran pastor (1906-1945) who participated in an abortive plot to overthrow Hitler. He eventually was hanged in a German concentration camp on April 9, 1945. Bonhoeffer's thoughts and writings are obtuse enough to inspire even "the ephemeral 'death of God' theologians."⁹

In some instances, Bonhoeffer denied some major fundamentals of the

faith and was ambiguous about others, such as the resurrection of Christ. David Becker has investigated the theology of Bonhoeffer and in the *Christian News* wrote:

"I don't mean to be critical of people, but I do want to speak the truth in love, and one of my pet peeves is when I see people, especially those who consider themselves to be, and present themselves as, theologically conservative, praise Dietrich Bonhoeffer. Bonhoeffer espoused a so-called religionless Christianity, and expressed doubt about God as a working hypothesis. He was a father of the so-called 'death of God' 'fad' of a few years ago. He wrote a lot and also wrote some things that sounded orthodox but he consistently had a low view of the Bible, considering a lot of it myth."¹⁰

Bonhoeffer set up the most unlikely premise by suggesting that while

Jesus may have been without sin, His body or flesh was sinful:

"In his flesh, too, was the law that is contrary to God's will. He was not the perfectly good man. ... The assertion of the sinlessness of Jesus fails if it has in mind observable acts of Jesus. His deeds are done in the likeness of flesh. They are not sinless, but ambiguous. One can and should see good and bad in them."¹¹

Bonhoeffer is contradicted by the Apostle Peter and Holy Writ: "[Jesus] committed no sin and, nor was any deceit found in His mouth" (1 Peter 2:22). Certain Gnostics and the Nestorians divided the humanity and deity of Jesus in much the same way as Bonhoeffer did.¹²

Bonhoeffer called the Virgin Birth a "hypothesis" and added, "It is both historically and dogmatically questionable. The biblical evidence for it is uncertain."¹³ One may choose to deny the Virgin Birth, but to say the biblical

evidence is “uncertain” is ludicrous. Matthew 1:18-25 allows for no other interpretation. From the Spirit’s work in Mary’s womb, (vv. 18, 20), to the Greek word *parthenos* (v. 23), to Joseph’s struggle with divorce, (v. 19), to the clear statement of no marital relations until after the birth of Jesus (v. 25), Scripture is emphatically clear.

Another foundation stone is the resurrection of Jesus (1 Corinthians 15:1-4, Romans 10:9). Yet to Bonhoeffer, even this was ambiguous and uncertain:

“Empty or not empty, it remains a stumbling block. We are not sure of its historicity. The Bible itself reveals the stumbling block in showing how hard it was to prove that the disciples had not perhaps stolen the body. Even here we cannot evade the realm of ambiguity.”¹⁴

In the end, Bonhoeffer was merely an apostle of uncertainty.

Then there is Boyd’s shopping mall revelation. He calls it “**An Experience of Love.**”¹⁵ Boyd describes an existential and subjective mystical experience while, with a Coke in hand, watching people at the mall:

“As I replaced judgmental thoughts with loving thoughts and prayers of blessing, something extraordinary began to happen. I began to *see* the worth I was ascribing to people, and I began to *feel* the love I was giving to them. As I ascribed worth to people, not allowing any other thought, opinion, or feeling to enter my mind, my heart began to expand. In fact, at certain moments I felt as though I would explode with love. I was waking up to the immeasurable value and beauty of each person in the mall that afternoon. Sitting in the mall, sipping a Coke, enjoying God’s creations, I was experiencing the heart of God. It felt like finding home after having been lost for a long while. It was like waking up from a coma. It was like finding undiluted truth when all you’d known up to that point was the watered-

down kind. I felt as though I was remembering something I had long since forgotten or unveiling something I had been covering my whole life. The love, joy, and peace I was experiencing as I dwelt in this place — and it did seem like a mental and spiritual ‘place’ — was beyond description. ... I believe I was in my own way participating in God’s seeing and God’s feeling for people. I believe I was participating in his love.”¹⁶

Subjective experiences are a dime a dozen and notoriously unreliable. Others have claimed to experience God in the opposite way: seeing people in judgment scenes. Ultimately we can get correct views of God and man only from the Scriptures. We can never resort to reductionism where we reduce God to primarily one attribute and all humans to warm, fuzzy love objects. This would be like defining an automobile as a headlight or a house as a door.

One only need ask how God would have felt that day at the shopping mall about, for example, the unrepentant child predator who walked past Boyd. When we unconditionally love criminals and are non-judgmental, we refuse to shelter and protect the innocent. Life is not lived at the mall in ecstatic experiences; they are not a paradigm for Christian living. We must constantly make evaluations between good and evil, “Test all things, hold fast to that which is good,” Paul declares (1 Thessalonians 5:21). We are sanctified — not by warm feelings — but by the Word of God (John 17:17).

Here is where Boyd should have followed his own advice:

“We therefore must not try to make our own imprint of God by projecting onto him conclusions about what he is like deduced from our own life experiences, conceptions, and expectations.”¹⁷

Yet this is exactly what Boyd has done.

Boyd’s view draws us into a world-view and perspective diametrically

opposed to the Scriptures. The Bible is set up in terms of antitheses, contrasts, and opposites. We are to think in terms of good and evil, darkness and light, God and Satan, and heaven and hell. Proverbs is full of judgment and contrasts between the fool and the wise, the moral and immoral, anger and patience. God’s love is not unconditional. Christ had to pay a price. He met the conditions of justice. Forgiveness is based on confession; salvation is based on repentance and faith.

Beyond this is Boyd’s commitment — via Bonhoeffer — that judgment is the original sin. He believes that because the first couple ate from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, judgment and evaluation of others’ behavior constitutes continuing to eat from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil:

“Our fundamental sin is that we place ourselves in the position of God and divide the world between what we judge to be good and what we judge to be evil.”¹⁸

In fact, Boyd wants us to return “to a state where we don’t live by our knowledge of good and evil.”¹⁹ Remember that Boyd says that “Our only job is to love, not judge.”²⁰

Boyd goes so far as to say:

“My conviction is that we have neglected the biblical teaching that the origin and essence of sin is rooted in the knowledge of good and evil.”²¹

Jesus, though sinless, had the knowledge of good and evil as he faced the temptations and onslaughts of Satan in the wilderness. It is the choice of evil that is the essence of sin, not just an awareness of it.

There is nothing inherently wrong with the knowledge of good and evil. God has this knowledge (Genesis 3:5). King Solomon prayed for this knowledge: “Therefore give to your servant an understanding heart to judge your people, that I may discern between good and evil” (1 Kings 3:8) and God gave him what he asked for (v. 13). The knowledge of good and evil is commended and likened to the wis-

dom of angels (2 Samuel 14:17). Christ Himself had this knowledge (Isaiah 7:15). The issue is not possession of this knowledge of good and evil, but how we have acquired it and what we do with it.

Boyd misconstrues the doctrine of sin and what was happening in the Garden at the time of the Fall. The real point was that God wanted Adam and Eve to get their views of good and evil *directly from Him*. Adam chose another way to acquire such knowledge. He selected another route rather than God. He also ignored God's timing for the unfolding of knowledge and sought to get it summarily through an act of disobedience. The knowledge itself was not evil, but rather the source apart from God. The crux of the Fall is choice — a choice to distrust God. It was all about choice: Would Adam get his views of God and morality from God, or trust his own wisdom and his right to choose in another direction and bypass God?

This issue of the nature of sin, the Fall, and its relationship to choice is so important it warrants a lengthy quote from C.F. Keil and F. Delitzsch:

“God had given such sacramental nature and significance to the two trees in the midst of the garden, that their fruit could and would produce supersensual, mental, and spiritual effects upon the nature of the first human pair. The tree of life was to impart the power of transformation into eternal life. The tree of knowledge was to lead man to the knowledge of good and evil; and, according to the divine intention, this was to be attained through his not eating of its fruit. This end was to be accomplished, not only by his discerning in the limit imposed by the prohibition the difference between that which accorded with the will of God and that which opposed it, but also by his coming eventually, through obedience to the prohibition, to recognize the fact that all that is opposed to the will of God is an evil to be

avoided, and, through voluntary resistance to such evil, to the full development of the freedom of choice originally imparted to him into the actual freedom of a deliberate and self-conscious choice of good.”²²

The ability to choose is what makes us human and became the staging ground for Adam to obey or disobey:

“By obedience to the divine will he would have attained to a godlike knowledge of good and evil, i.e. to one in accordance with his own likeness to God. He would have detected the evil in the approaching tempter; but instead of yielding to it, he would have resisted it, and thus have made good his own property acquired with consciousness and his own free-will, and in this way by proper self-determination would gradually have advanced to the possession of the truest liberty. But as he failed to keep this divinely appointed way, and ate the forbidden fruit in opposition to the command of God, the power imparted by God to the fruit was manifested in a different way. He learned the difference between good and evil *from his own guilty experience, and by receiving the evil into his own soul*, fell a victim to the threatened death. Thus through his own fault the tree, which should have helped him to attain true freedom, brought nothing but the sham liberty of sin, and with it death, and that without any demoniacal power of destruction being conjured into the tree itself, or any fatal poison being hidden in its fruit.”²³

UNCONDITIONAL LOVE

Boyd has a penchant for making up definitions, but never gives linguistic or any other kind of documentation to support his assertions.

He uses the term “unconditional” love. He says, “There is a kind of love that is universal and unconditional, however. It is the kind of love referred to by the word *agape*.”²⁴

The term “unconditional” love springs from the secular psychology of Carl Rogers, who lapsed into occultism in his later years. Biblical counselor and author Dave Powlison takes issue with the notion:

“I also have felt uncomfortable with the term ‘unconditional love.’ I rarely use the term because God’s love is so much different and better than unconditional. Unconditional love, by contemporary definition, starts and stops with sympathy and empathy, with blanket acceptance. It accepts you as you are, with no expectations. You can take it or leave it. But think about what God’s love for you is like. God does not benignly gaze on you in affirmation. God cares too much to be unconditional. ... I’m uneasy with the term unconditional love because it so frequently sidesteps reality. It keeps company with teachings that say to people, ‘peace, peace,’ when, from God’s holy point of view, there is no peace (Jeremiah 23:14,16f). If you receive blanket acceptance, you need no repentance. You just accept it. It fills you without humbling you. It relaxes you without upsetting you about yourself — or thrilling you about Christ. It lets you bask without reckoning with the anguish of Jesus in the garden and on the cross. It is easy and undemanding. It does not insist on or work at changing you. It deceives you about both God and yourself. Most people speak of and aspire to unconditional love containing a large dose of this cultural baggage.”²⁵

Paul Brownback also caught the flaws in the secular and evangelical varieties of unconditional love and acceptance:

“We need to be clear that we are not just talking about accepting a person as he is when he comes in his contrition, his sorrows of heart for the past and his desire to change, to reach out for help to affect that change. We are also

talking about acceptance of the person who is bent on continuing in his sin without remorse. That is the implication implicit in the idea of unconditional love."²⁶

Linguist W.E. Vine sees Christian love differently:

"Christian love has God for its primary object, and expresses itself first of all in implicit obedience to His commandments, John 14:15, 21, 23; 15:10; 1 John 2:5; 5:3; 2 John 6. ... Love seeks the welfare of all."²⁷

At times when we seek the welfare of others, it may involve honest, loving confrontation. *That* may be the loving thing to do as we seek the highest good of others.

It is commendable that Boyd exalts God, the Trinity, and the deity of Christ in chapter 1, "Dancing with the Triune God."²⁸ He is misleading, however, because he teaches that God's love is "universal and unconditional." Plus, Boyd never fully explains what he means by "dancing" with God.

OUR WORTH IN GOD'S EYES

Boyd seems to have assimilated secular psychological theories when he writes of "*Our Unsurpassable Worth before God*."²⁹

He further explains:

"This is why we can say that the worth God ascribes to us, which is to say the love God has for us, is *unsurpassable*. And precisely because it is unsurpassable, the act of God ascribing worth to us reveals the perfect, eternal love of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit."³⁰

Then he adds, "We are invited to receive the worth God ascribes to us in Christ and are called and empowered to extend this worth to ourselves and all others."³¹

And then this:

"By sacrificing himself for us, God ascribes unsurpassable worth to people who in and of themselves have little apparent worth."³²

Paul exalts the love of God not because of our worth, but because of the very opposite in that He loved us when we were worthless — while we were yet in our sins (Romans 5:8).

Two decades ago, Jay E. Adams wrote that such talk comes out of the old worth movement and self-esteem theories. He calls this view a "false belief that borders on heresy."³³

Did God redeem man because of his great worth? Not a chance, says Adams. This view loses sight of grace:

"In an attempt to exalt man, by supposing him to be of infinite worth, God's grace is unwittingly

and all of orthodox Christianity ever since) is that it was not because of anything God saw in man that He redeemed him, but out of pure mercy and His determination to set His love on him. God's love was not the response to man's loveableness!"³⁴

It certainly is commendable that Boyd emphasizes our position in Christ and the importance of the Church and fellowship within the Church. However, he then proceeds to slice and dice the Church for its failures, attributing these to churches being too judgmental. Boyd is doing the very thing he accuses others of.

Paul exalts the love of God not because of our worth, but because of the very opposite in that He loved us when we were worthless — while we were yet in our sins (Romans 5:8).

denied. This denial is unintentional, I presume, because those who assert the false doctrine would in other contexts profess to believe that it was not because of anything in us that God sent His Son, but that He did so only out of pure, unmerited favor and unwarranted love. ... The point is that God saved man not out of pure grace, totally apart from anything in man that would commend him to God, but rather because of some 'redeemable value' He saw in him. That is to say, man was too valuable to lose, and *that* is why Christ came to die on the cross! The actual teaching of the Bible (and that of the sixteenth-century reformers

Romans 2:1 warns, "Therefore you are inexcusable, O man, whoever you are who judge, for in whatever you judge another you condemn yourself; for you who judge practice the same things." Apparently, Boyd is the only one allowed to judge.

Cultic leanings can begin very subtly. One thing that sends many groups on their way to culthood is segmented biblical attention, where one verse, phrase, or concept is stressed and becomes an obsession at the expense of balanced biblical doctrine. Boyd goes overboard on love. And, as important as that is, love is not the only fruit of the Spirit, or the only character quality insisted upon in the Scriptures. Reading Boyd, one

would think so as he states, "Love is the central biblical truth."³⁵

It is difficult to understand what Boyd means when, speaking of the command to love, he writes that "there really isn't any other commandment."³⁶ That is really a biblically irresponsible statement. While we would never deny the importance of loving God and one another (Matthew 22:37-40, John 13:35), we can never divorce love from truth ("speak the truth in love," Ephesians 4:15) and discernment ("that your love may abound...in all discernment," Philippians 1:1). Boyd's segmented biblical attention causes him to ignore pertinent passages, qualifiers, and, yes, even commands to judge as in Matthew 18.

All through the book Boyd creates a false dichotomy of love vs. judging, never indicating that there are right and wrong ways of judging.³⁷ God, who is perfect, is perfect love and perfect judge. God is perfect compassion and perfect justice, so the two need not be exclusive. Wrong ways of judging may be evil, but judging in and of itself is not. Jesus said if we examine ourselves and are willing to take the log first from our own eye, we can see clearly to evaluate (judge) and help others with their specks (Matthew 7:4-5). We are to make judgments as Jesus said and "do not give what is holy to the dogs" (Matthew 7:6).

Boyd needs to give heed to *balanced* biblical attention, not segmented biblical attention. He is so far out of balance he claims that "the concern to balance love with any competing command is misguided. It is, in fact, *unbalanced*."³⁸

In Boyd's world, to attempt to be balanced is to be unbalanced! In fact, Boyd says anything that "competes with love as our first and foremost concern, it becomes to this degree evil."³⁹ Boyd so stacks the deck that he wants us to believe that to put doctrine, truth, and holiness on the same level as love is to create evil.

Boyd violates his own teaching by condemning overweight people and

those who do not judge them.⁴⁰ By his own criteria he has fallen into the sin of "religion." Other readers of Boyd's volume agree. One customer review found on the Amazon.com web page advertising Boyd's book stated:

"If only the judgmental author could see the speck in his own eye when he attempts eye-surgery on the broader evangelical community he attacks! He should repent of his own 'righteous-than-thou' religious attitude of self-appointed fruit inspector."⁴¹

Another reviewer wrote that Boyd, "Does not balance personal skew with God's holy wrath against sin" and that the "problem is not so much Repenting of Religion, but Repenting of SIN."⁴²

It would take a book-length treatment to address all of Boyd's errors. In calling all forms of judgment or evaluation "religion," he shuts down discussion. He is, in fact, despising the gift of discernment and seeing it as something evil rather than a precious gift from God. Isaiah reminds us, "Woe to those who call evil good and good evil" (Isaiah 5:20). As he leans heavily on Bonhoeffer and his own subjective experience, he distorts Scripture. In doing so, Boyd sounds the call for a retreat from reason.

Endnotes:

1. See further, G. Richard Fisher, "The Infinitely Intelligent Chess Player — Gregory Boyd's Remaking of God in Man's Image," *The Quarterly Journal*, July-September 2000, pp. 4-13.
2. Gregory A. Boyd, *Repenting of Religion*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Books, 2004, pg. 35.
3. *Ibid.*, pg. 9.
4. *Ibid.*
5. *Ibid.*, pg. 18.
6. John Wilson, "All You Need Is Unconditional Love," *Christianity Today*, web site posting, 2/10/2005, italics in original. Document available at: www.christianitytoday.com/ct/2005/002/33.87.html.
7. *Repenting of Religion*, op. cit., pg. 18.
8. *Ibid.*, pg. 10.
9. See A.A. Glenn in Daniel G. Reid, Coordinating Editor, *Dictionary of Christianity in America*. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1990, pg. 173.

10. David Becker, "Dietrich Bonhoeffer Rejected Classical Christology," *Christian News*, June 5, 2000, pg. 7.
11. Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *Christ The Center*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1960, pp. 112-113.
12. See further, Frank Mead, *Handbook of Denominations in the United States*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1965, pg. 102.
13. *Christ The Center*, op. cit., pg. 109.
14. *Ibid.*, pg. 117.
15. *Repenting of Religion*, op. cit., pg. 13, bold in original.
16. *Ibid.*, pp. 14-15.
17. *Ibid.*, pg. 35.
18. *Ibid.*, pg. 17.
19. *Ibid.*
20. *Ibid.*, pg. 18.
21. *Ibid.*, pg. 66.
22. C.F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, *Commentary on the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Vol. 1, The Pentateuch, 1985, pp. 85-86.
23. *Ibid.*, pg. 86, emphasis added.
24. *Repenting of Religion*, op. cit., pg. 24, italic in original.
25. David Powlison, "'Unconditional Love?'," *Counsel the Word*. Glenside, Pa.: Christian Counseling and Educational Foundation, 1997, pp. 80-81.
26. Paul Brownback, *The Danger of Self-Love*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1982, pp. 65-66.
27. W.E. Vine, *The Expanded Vine's Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words*. Minneapolis: Bethany House Publishers, 1984, "agapao," pg. 693.
28. *Repenting of Religion*, op. cit., pg. 23.
29. *Ibid.*, pg. 27, bold and italics in original.
30. *Ibid.*, italic in original.
31. *Ibid.*
32. *Ibid.*, pg. 34.
33. Jay E. Adams, *The Biblical View of Self-Esteem, Self-Love, Self-Image*. Eugene, Ore.: Harvest House, 1986, pg. 87.
34. *Ibid.*, pp. 87-88, italic in original.
35. *Repenting of Religion*, op. cit., pg. 58, italic in original.
36. *Ibid.*, pg. 52, italics in original.
37. See further, G. Richard Fisher, "To Judge or Not to Judge - The Rights and Wrongs of Biblical Discernment," *The Quarterly Journal*, October-December 1996, pp. 1, 11-13.
38. *Repenting of Religion*, op. cit., pg. 58, italic in original.
39. *Ibid.*
40. *Ibid.*, pg. 84.
41. Amazon.com web page, "Repenting of Religion: Turning from Judgment to the Love of God by Gregory A. Boyd." Document available at: www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/ASIN/0801065062/104-3752445-0888723.
42. *Ibid.*, capitalization in original. 