

BOOK REVIEWS

Encountering the Old Testament. A Christian Survey. By Bill T. Arnold and Bryan E. Beyer. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1999, 512 pp. + Interactive CD-ROM, \$49.99.

Finding a suitable textbook for undergraduate college surveys is an arduous task, but this has become somewhat easier with Arnold and Beyer's *Encountering the Old Testament*. This is the second in Baker's ongoing Encountering Biblical Studies series of texts, surveys, and collections of primary-source documents directed specifically at undergraduate college freshmen, and it should serve its intended audience well. (See the review of the NT *Encountering* volume in *JETS* 43/3 [Sept. 2000] 540–43.)

The book's 34 chapters of about 14 pages each (with the exception of chap. 2, which is 28 pages) would fit well into a standard semester and still leave room for test days, review sessions, and the occasional canceled class.

The first chapter deals with questions of canon, how the Bible was written, transmission of the text, and basic issues of hermeneutics. Chapter 2 focuses on the geographic and historical context of Israel and the ancient Near East and includes a half-dozen maps, a summary chart of relevant archaeological periods, and a 12-page summary of the OT under the heading "What Events does the Old Testament Describe?" Four chapters are devoted to introductions to the Pentateuch ("The Birth of God's People," chap. 3), the Historical Books ("The History of Israel's Nationhood," chap. 10), the Poetic Books ("The Literature of God's People," chap. 19) and the Prophets ("Voices of God's Servants," chap. 24). These chapters contain brief summaries of the individual books and basic treatments of such items as critical questions of authorship and date, theological themes or issues, the nature of Hebrew poetry and prophecy, and the literary and historical contexts in which the biblical material emerged. Each of these chapters has numerous charts, illustrations, and excerpts from the relevant biblical and extrabiblical literature.

The remaining 28 chapters cover specific textual units of the OT, either individual books (e.g. chap. 14, "2 Samuel: David's Reign"), parts of books (e.g. chap. 25, "Isaiah 40–66: Great Days Are Coming!"), or combinations of books (e.g. chap. 23, "Ecclesiastes and Song of Songs: Israelite Faith in Everyday Life"). Each has a section on the outline of the biblical content, specific issues the text raises (e.g. "The Servant Passages in Isaiah 40–66"; "Problems of Interpretation in Daniel: Bilingualism, The Four Kingdoms, The Vision of the Seventy Weeks, and Historical Questions"; "Classification of the Psalms"; and "Parallels from the Ancient World: Hittite Parallels, Treaty Structure of Deuteronomy"). Each chapter also contains sidebars that highlight a summary of the content, lists of key terms, people, and places mentioned in the chapter, brief excerpts from some related extrabiblical text, study questions that relate to specific issues in the chapter, and suggestions for further reading. These bibliographies usually contain six to eight books, many from an evangelical perspective, but always including the standard texts from a broad spectrum of authors. For example, the suggestions for Daniel range from Joyce Baldwin's Tyndale Commentary and D. J. Wiseman's *Notes on Some Problems* (IVP) through E. J. Young's 1949 commentary (Eerdmans) and Gordon Wenham's *Themelios* article "Daniel: the Basic Issues" (1977), to the commentaries by D. S. Russell (Westminster, 1998), John Collins's volume in the Hermeneia series (Fortress, 1993) and John Goldingay's *Daniel* (Word, 1989).

Two examples illustrate the nature and scope of these chapters. Chapter 5, “Genesis 12–50 The Patriarchs: Ancestors of Israel’s Faith,” begins with a definition of “Patriarch,” a page on the background of the patriarchal narratives and their chronological setting, an outline of the Genesis chapters, about three pages of text on the Abraham and Isaac stories, not quite a page on Jacob and his twelve sons, about a half page on Joseph, a bit more than a page on the “Theology of the Patriarchal Narratives” that gives brief treatments of the themes of election, promise, and covenant, and finally a half-page sidebar that summarizes the unit in nine statements. Two other sidebars give material on “The Use of Slain Animals in Ancient Treaty Ceremonies” (a letter from Mari, *ANET*, p. 482c, and an excerpt from an 8th-century Assyrian treaty between Ashurnirari V and Marti’ilu of Arpad, *ANET*, p. 532) and “The Gift of a Wife’s Slave Girl” (Laws #144 and 146 from Hammurapi [*sic*], *ANET*, p. 172, and an excerpt from one of the Nuzi letters on adoption, *ANET*, p. 220). The “Key Terms” include *patriarch*, *patriarchal narrative*, *Middle Bronze Age*, *promise*, *covenant*, *Messiah*, and *election*, and the “Key People/Places” are Hammurapi (*sic*), Ur, Haran, Moreh, Bethel, Negeb, Damascus, Mari, Nuzi, and Moriah. The last two sidebars contain a series of study questions based on the text and the key terms, and a brief, six-title, annotated bibliography. The chapter also includes a good clear map of Abraham’s journeys and photographs of the marshland near Ur, the tomb at Machpelah in Hebron, and the traditional site of Mamre.

Although there is nothing in the book that mandates using a chapter per class, this seems like too much material for a single session. In my own freshman classes, I normally spend four class sessions on the Abraham to Joseph material. The importance of the patriarchal narratives as foundational, and the strong theological issues of covenant and promise, demand more than cursory treatment. This is particularly important in light of the “Binding of Isaac” theology in Judaism and current events in the Middle East as they impact the theology of the land.

A second example is chap. 17 “First and Second Chronicles: A Look Back.” The title indicates the perspective the authors bring to these two books: The Chronicler’s “look back” is intended to reassure the demoralized postexilic community in Jerusalem that God has not abandoned them. Three pages are devoted to developing this theme in relationship to the Samuel and Kings material, and the place of Chronicles as probably the last of the OT books to be written. Three additional pages outline the text and summarize the content, noting that the emphasis is always on the positive elements in the Davidic/Solomonic history, ignoring such episodes as David’s adultery with Bathsheba, all of the Solomonic problems listed in 1 Kings 11, and an almost complete ignoring of the northern kingdom. The extended treatment of Hezekiah’s reforms, Manasseh’s repentance and Cyrus’s decree restoring the nation to the land underscore the hope of continued blessing if the nation remains faithful to Yahweh. Two pages on the “Themes of the Book of Chronicles” deal with the “Davidic Dynasty” and “The Temple and the Worship of God.” These sections give an adequate summary of the roles of David and Solomon in building the temple and restoring the temple worship in Israel. The three sidebars in the chapter contain the summary, ten study questions, and seven suggestions for further reading. The one crucial element that I find missing in this discussion of the theology of Chronicles is the central role of David in drawing together the royal and priestly lines. His active involvement in restoring the Ark of the Covenant to Jerusalem, his appointing “some of the Levites” to minister (1 Chr 16:4), and his extensive involvement in the temple planning and the division of labor among the Levites (1 Chronicles 22–28) all suggest an important role for David in combing the royal and priestly elements of the covenant that come to clear fulfillment in Jesus, David’s son our great High Priest.

Baker has also included an interactive CD-ROM developed by Chris Miller and Phil Bassett that supplements the written text with video clips, exercises based on the text, still photographs, and brief "movies." There is a unit for each chapter that provides the student with the opportunity to review the key points of the chapter, and in most cases, has one or more self-test items that should be useful for exam preparation. The video clips that begin most chapters are short commentaries on the significance of the biblical material and a verbal summary of the key theme of the book. The other video clips, accessed through the "Movies" icon, give a more comprehensive idea of a site than a single photo can. Unfortunately, they are often not of the best quality, being underexposed and moving too rapidly over the terrain. The still pictures are of much higher quality. Six of the picture sets are geographically specific: northern, central, southeastern and southwestern Israel, and a double sequence on Jerusalem that couples pictures from the "Jerusalem Model" with actual pictures of the modern city and some of the archeological sites. The seventh is a 12-picture set on the "Animals of Israel." In a classroom equipped with computer-based projection equipment, these could be used as a useful supplement to regular presentation.

I have a couple of caveats about the CD, one simply procedural, the other concerning content. The "Installation Procedures" instructions say to insert the CD into the CD drive, then "double click on the icon for NLDTEST.A4r," but no such icon appears on the desktop. Fortunately, most of our students are more computer-literate than we old-timers, so they will likely be astute enough to simply select one of the two application icons and proceed from there. But there will probably be a few students for whom computers are an alien world and who will be frustrated enough to abandon the whole project. That would be unfortunate, because the material on the CD is a valuable addition to the learning process.

The other issue is more important. In the sections on "Key Terms," when an item is selected, a window appears with definition of the term and an illustration (textual or pictorial) related to the term. There is also an audio clip that gives the correct pronunciation of the word. But frequently in the definition section, there are other words (often Hebrew) or place names that would also benefit from being heard. For instance, in the Deuteronomy unit, under "covenant," the word *bērit* is used, and under "suzerainty" the place-name *Bogbazk'y* (*sic*) appears, but in neither case is there any indication of the pronunciation of these terms.

There is a 12-page subject index and a ten-page Scripture index, but the publishers have continued the practice of putting the notes at the end of the volume instead of at the foot of the appropriate page (or at worst at the end of each chapter). With computer-based front-end layout programs used almost universally in the industry, there is no longer any need for this abominable practice to continue.

The publisher indicates in the preface (p. 14) that, in addition to the CD-ROM included with the book, there are two other supplementary resources available: (1) an *Instructor's Resource Manual*, which includes test items, chapter outlines, lists of objectives and summaries, key terms, master transparencies, lecture outlines, and media resources. The *Instructor's Manual* is available on a floppy disk, but given the industry's move away from floppy disk drives on their newer machines it may be wise to make it available on a CD. (2) The second item is a paperback volume, *Readings from the Ancient Near East: Primary Sources for Old Testament Study*, arranged in canonical order. The lack of extended readings in the extrabiblical literature in the current volume is probably explained by the availability of this collection. I have not had access to either of these items for this review.

G. Lloyd Carr
Gordon College, Wenham, MA

Christians and Roman Rule in the New Testament. By Richard J. Cassidy. New York: Crossroad, 2001, 146 pp., \$25.95.

This work is part of the “Companions to the New Testament” series, which is intended to “unite New Testament study with theological concerns in a clear and concise manner” (ix). The writers in the series are academics from multiple denominational identities. Richard Cassidy is Professor of New Testament at Christ the King Seminary. His earlier volume, *Jesus, Politics, and Society*, has informed his approach, and he often makes reference to that title.

Cassidy seeks to illuminate the tensions and challenges that Christians faced during the first century as they lived in the Roman Empire. He first describes the characteristic features of Roman imperial rule beginning prior to and proceeding through NT times. The remaining chapters provide a discussion of the following: (1) Jesus’ teaching that related to Roman rule in the Gospels; (2) the apostles’ attitude in Acts; (3) Paul’s changing position vis-à-vis Rome in his earlier and later epistles; and (4) the message of the Apocalypse in regards to the limits of Roman power.

One of the great strengths of Cassidy’s book is his very clear organization and writing style. He begins each chapter with an explanation of what he will attempt to do and ends each chapter with a summary of his conclusions. His book ends with a brief “agenda” of how his conclusions have relevance for “disciples of Jesus living under highly varied political conditions of the third millennium” (p. 132). Unfortunately, Cassidy’s clear writing style is marred by serious problems with his research methodology and exegetical conclusions.

Students of Christian history in the Roman world will quickly acknowledge the seminal contribution of A. N. Sherwin-White’s *Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament*. Sherwin-White, an Oxford don, displayed his highly-regarded expertise in Roman jurisprudence and administration in his Sarum Lectures of 1960–61, which were then published under the above title. Even though Cassidy provides a bibliography of nearly fifty books and articles, Sherwin-White’s work is not even mentioned. Furthermore, the classic work by Oscar Cullmann, *The State in the New Testament* (London: SCM, 1957), while included in the bibliography, is nowhere else referenced in Cassidy’s book. It is a serious deficiency that two major contributions on this subject are not interacted with during Cassidy’s discussions. It should also be noted that the conclusions of Cassidy are at variance with the conclusions of these respected scholars.

At the outset, Cassidy mentions that Luke 22:24–27 “will exercise a lapidary influence” in his later conclusions (p. 1). He proposes that Jesus’ “humility-service model” is set over against the Roman “domination model” (p. 19). Particular points made by Cassidy that raise serious issues for critical evaluation are: (1) Jesus probably did *not* pay Roman taxes (p. 27); (2) the famous “tribute” parallels (Matt 22:15–22; Luke 20:20–26) do *not* teach that there are two realms to be respected—God’s and Caesar’s. He concludes: “If Caesar is proving to be a reliable steward in terms of those things that God would have accomplished, then taxes may appropriately be given in support of Caesar’s stewardship. However, if Caesar’s policies and practices are antithetical to the things that God desires, then no obligation exists to pay the demanded taxes” (p. 29). This leaves the door open a bit too wide for refusal to pay taxes whenever we conclude that Caesar is deficient in his policies. At what point does Caesar become an “unreliable steward”? Cassidy does not answer that question.

Even more problematic is Cassidy’s view about the attitude of Paul toward Rome in his epistles. Recognizing the difficulty of harmonizing Paul’s teaching in Rom 13:1–7 with the above mentioned limitations on tax-paying, Cassidy simply deals with the problem by positing a change in the apostle’s attitude on this subject between the time he wrote Romans (AD 54) and the time he wrote further about similar matters in Phi-

lippians (ca. AD 64). Cassidy argues that Phil 3:20 (“our citizenship is in heaven”) cancels out his earlier counsel on unqualified obedience to Caesar in Romans 13. What is Cassidy’s explanation for this change? Cassidy’s answer is that Paul wrote to the Romans when he was free and wrote to the Philippians when he was “in chains” ten years later. “The Paul who authored Philippians as a chained prisoner in Rome effectively set aside the premises and the counsels he had earlier expressed in Romans 13:1–7” (p. 102).

Christians and Roman Rule in the New Testament is part of a cadre of modern works that delight in discovering tensions and contradictions in the NT and then exploiting them for the authors’ own purposes. Cassidy’s purposes *may* include a social program that serves more the agenda of liberation theology than biblical fidelity. In the meantime the interested reader can find better help in this area from Sherwin-White and Cullmann.

William Varner
The Master’s College, Newhall, CA

The Quest of the Historical Jesus. By Albert Schweitzer. Edited by John Bowden. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001, xlvi + 562 pp., \$33.00 paper.

Most seminarians have heard of this book. They learn that the gifted German theologian, musician, and later missionary doctor to Africa chronicled in 1906 a vast array of studies produced during the nineteenth century on the historical Jesus, showing how so many were merely the products of the philosophical schools of thought of their authors. Then Schweitzer, the champion of thoroughgoing eschatology, fell into the identical trap of remaking Jesus after his own philosophical image.

But few ever read the book; it would seem that many teachers and textbook writers who repeat the above summary have not read it either. If they did, they would discover that it is only for the end-of-the-century liberalism that Schweitzer makes his famous generalization, and that at least as influential in his thinking as eschatology was his conviction of the progress of humanity’s moral spirit—a notion he does not ascribe to Jesus—but relies on to explain how one can still be “Christian” in the wake of Jesus’ failed eschatological expectations.

One would also learn that Schweitzer championed “either-or” distinctions. One either accepts the Synoptics or John; either all of Mark or none of it; either an entirely futurist understanding of God’s kingdom or complete history-of-religions skepticism. Schweitzer wrote in an age when Markan priority still had to be vigorously defended, when inappropriate psychologizing of the Gospels was still common, and when the insights that would lead to full-fledged form criticism were still incubating, so that one could almost entirely rewrite Gospel chronology. Schweitzer combats the first two of these problems but creates his own version of the third, believing that Jesus sent out the twelve convinced that the kingdom would come before their mission in Israel was complete (Matt 10:23). When it did not, he radically shifted his thinking, imagined that his own death would usher in the kingdom, and began to strategize as to how he could go to Jerusalem to die.

All this and much more has been plain to any reader of W. Montgomery’s 1910 English translation of Schweitzer’s first, 1906 edition, entitled in German, *Von Reimarus zu Wrede* (“From Reimarus to Wrede”). In 1913, however, a second edition appeared, now entitled, *Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung* (“History of Life-of-Jesus Research”). In it, Schweitzer lightly touched up most chapters, added significant, improved material on the nature of the Judaism of Jesus’ day (an area on which he had been severely criticized) and on the state of research at the end of the nineteenth century, and composed

three new chapters altogether. "The Most Recent Disputing of the Historicity of Jesus" surveyed the recent works of followers of Bruno Bauer who denied Jesus ever lived, while "The Debate about the Historicity of Jesus" chronicled a voluminous response to those works. Stressing that historical research by definition can never prove completely conclusive, Schweitzer nevertheless demolished the position of total skepticism. A lengthy chapter entitled merely "1907–1912" surveyed publications during that period, of which the two most important Schweitzer believed to be Loisy's (somewhat following Weiss) and Maurenbrecher's (somewhat following Wrede). The conclusion still ends with his famous, final paragraph ("He comes to us as one unknown . . .") but much more clearly explains how the only rational task for contemporary Christians is to strip off the eschatological husk of Jesus' teaching to preserve the ethical kernel which centers in love.

John Bowden, well known to biblical scholars as a prolific translator of German works, explains that this English edition was begun a quarter-century ago. "However, various publishing problems arose, and the project was abandoned. Moreover, the translation [by one Susan Cupitt] 'disappeared' only to "reappear" in 1998 (p. xi). And that's all we are told! When the project was revived, the newly enlisted Bowden discovered that Montgomery's translation at many points was overly bombastic and occasionally in error. So he worked through the entire German text, modifying Montgomery's wording wherever he felt it necessary, incorporating Cupitt's much more adequate material, and translating himself what remained to be done.

Dennis Nineham, the very liberal British *Neutestamentler*, adds a lengthy foreword to this "complete edition," most of which is a lightly-disguised soapbox for Nineham's own theological convictions: like Schweitzer, he has long been convinced that historical research has demonstrated the impossibility of adhering to a supernatural Christianity and is upset that most church life continues to ignore this "fact." One may also read a brief appreciation of Schweitzer written by the American co-chair of the Jesus Seminar, Marcus Borg, significant in that Borg's eschatology is almost diametrically opposite Schweitzer's, along with the English translations of the prefaces by Schweitzer to his first two editions and to what is called the sixth (and last) edition of 1950, though it is a mere reprinting of the second. In it, Schweitzer, too, waxes eloquent about how all the issues and options remain relatively unaltered after half a century; just the names and titles change.

For English speakers who have never read Schweitzer, this is obviously now the edition to consult, and the translation is much more modern and fluent. Given the number of German works that are never translated into English at all, however, one wonders whether this was the best use of the valuable time of one of our best theological translators. If making accessible turn-of-the-century German scholarship of enduring significance was the central objective, I for one would have much preferred finally having any or all of Adolf Jülicher's *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu* ("The Parables of Jesus") in English.

Craig L. Blomberg
Denver Seminary, Denver, CO

Jesus Against Christianity: Reclaiming the Missing Jesus. By Jack Nelson-Pallmeyer. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2001, xvi + 368 pp., \$20.00 paper.

This book is both academically and theologically shallow. Academically, the author's reading in the area of Jesus studies is extremely limited. He studied under Walter Wink and refers to him and Jesus Seminar authors and supporters (Crossan, Horsley, Borg, Funk, Spong) almost exclusively. When on occasion he mentions other scholars (Fred-

riksen, Yoder, Luke Timothy Johnson), he disagrees with them. Though he deals extensively with the OT, the only OT scholar he seems to depend on is Richard Elliott Friedman. Indeed, he admits that much of what he says has been gleaned from Friedman's *Who Wrote the Bible?* Many of the endnotes to the book's 25 chapters repeatedly mention one or two authors. For example, chapter 20 contains 28 endnotes, 27 of which refer to William Herzog's *Parables as Subversive Speech: Jesus as Pedagogue of the Oppressed!*

Theologically, Nelson-Pallmeyer, Assistant Professor of Justice and Peace Studies at the University of St. Thomas, has a single string. He believes in a Jesus who talked of an absolutely nonviolent God: "We see in and through Jesus glimpses of a God who is incapable of imposing justice, whose power is invitational rather than coercive, non-violent rather than violent, a God whose very essence is compassion" (p. 327). Therefore, everywhere in both Testaments where God is "violent," the Bible is wrong. The God of the OT, for example, is repeatedly rejected for destroying the whole human race in the flood, sending she-bears to kill rude children, killing men, women, and children in war, and encouraging mothers to boil their children for food. He rejects all biblical authors who adopt apocalypticism, especially the "apocalyptic Daniel," Paul, and Revelation. God would reputedly destroy Israel's enemies, but when he failed to do so, the apocalyptic Daniel argued that God would still destroy them, but not until the end times. Jesus began by accepting such a view, but then came to reject it, concluding that all violence is wrong.

For the author, Jesus is only a human being who proclaimed nonviolence. "Jesus was not born of a virgin, was not born in Bethlehem, was not from David's family, and did not walk on water or turn water into wine as the Gospels or Christian creeds claim" (p. 334). Matthew "places threatening words on the lips of Jesus in order to express his own passionate hatred of Jews who rejected claims that Jesus fulfilled messianic promises related in the Hebrew Scriptures" or "to encourage and reinforce proper behavior within the Christian community" (p. 292). Violent Romans, not Jews, were responsible for Jesus' crucifixion. Not the Bible but only the nonviolent historical Jesus is God's Word. "The biblical writers project so much pathological violence onto God as to leave us no alternative but to challenge scriptural authority" (p. 277). Jesus' death was the result of his opposition to a domination system controlled by Rome and Temple: "A compassionate God is, in my view, incompatible with all atonement theories" (p. 224). There is no resurrection, and the post-resurrection appearances are myth.

Nelson-Pallmeyer admits, "No one can say for sure that Jesus was nonviolent" (p. 216). Yet then it becomes impossible to take this work seriously since the author bases his whole book on the belief that he was.

Leslie R. Keylock

Tyndale Theological Seminary, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Mark. By Edwin K. Broadhead. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001, 163 pp., \$57.50, \$19.50 paper. *Mark*. By Timothy J. Geddert. Believers Church Bible Commentary. Scottdale: Herald, 2001, 454 pp., \$24.99 paper. *Gospel of Mark: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. By Ben Witherington III. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001, xxiv + 463 pp., \$35.00 paper.

Broadhead's thin volume is not so much a commentary as a guide to the reading of Mark which employs "the insights of narrative criticism" and seeks to "unveil . . . the strategies at work in these stories" (p. 13). He insists that the "most productive . . . interpretation is found in the interplay between what the text offers to the reader and

what the reader brings to the text" (p. 14). Although his emphasis is upon Mark as literature, he also insists that it must be treated as a sacred text. In view of his literary approach, his frequent use of form criticism is surprising (little use is made of redaction criticism). Broadhead looks upon the text as evolving in Galilee over a number of years and reaching its final form about the time of the Jewish War. It was "the foundational document by which [the Galilean Christian] community lived" (p. 16). The Gospel is divided into nine major divisions, each of which is followed by a section entitled "The Story Thus Far." The commentary itself is upon the various subdivisions. Space permits only a few examples of Broadhead's interpretation. He says very little about the parable theory of 4:10–12, only that those on the outside will find Jesus' teaching enigmatic. He refers to the interpretation of the Parable of the Soils (he never names it) in 4:13–20 as a "second reading" which shows the flexibility of parables to speak to the current situation of the readers (p. 45). The Eschatological Discourse in chap. 13 (again Broadhead gives no name to it) is mainly a warning that the temple will be destroyed. With reference to the last half of the discourse, the author says only that it "moves beyond earthly events and historical time" (p. 101). The author looks upon 16:8 as the intended end of the Gospel. "Because the plot line is broken off and remains unfinished, the story of Jesus is opened up to the reader" as a demand to complete the book by proclaiming the gospel message (p. 138).

Geddert states clearly his approach: "This commentary will not focus on historical-critical, source-critical, form-critical, or redaction-critical matters. I find that the tools of literary criticism and reader-response criticism contribute most directly to helping readers interpret the message of Mark" (p. 23). He indicates briefly and without much evidence that John Mark was the author, that Peter was a source of information, and that the Gospel was written in Rome about AD 65–70; but he also claims that these things matter little in interpretation. The author divides the Gospel into two major divisions, 1:1–8:26 and 8:27–16:8. These are then divided into sequential subdivisions. In these subdivisions there are the following items: preview, outline, explanatory notes, the text in biblical context, and the text in the life of the church. The last two items deal with various topics within the particular subdivisions. At the end of the book are some brief essays on various subjects which are relevant to the Gospel generally. As for the parable theory in 4:10–12, Geddert says that Jesus did not exclude anyone but that he did speak in such a way that unbelievers would not understand. It follows then that 4:14–20 is not an interpretation of the Parable of the Sower but an answer to the question in v. 13. How can one understand any parable? By correct hearing. "Jesus deliberately did not make things as clear as possible, and Mark models himself after Jesus" (p. 99). Chapter 13 is entitled "The Beginning of the End." The chapter "is not about signs and timetables. It is about discernment, not being fooled by people with timetables and signs. It is about allegiance to Jesus . . ." (p. 300). Geddert does believe that 13:24–27 deals with the return of the Son of Man but that the time of this event is completely indeterminate. With reference to the abrupt ending (16:8), "there is no basis here for finding fault with Mark" because of his choice not to report resurrection appearances, a commission to evangelize the world, and Jesus' ascension (p. 391). He alludes to them earlier in the Gospel. Such an ending is "profound" and "brilliant" (p. 391). "We long for more until we realize that there will only be more if *we* continue the story. . . . How the story continues depends on whether we will do . . . the divine messenger instructs" (p. 400).

Witherington's methodology is indicated in the subtitle. Nevertheless the commentary is not consumed with sociology and rhetoric; attention is also given to grammatical and historical matters. Witherington's book begins with 62 pages of helpful introduction. Mark is an example of ancient biography, and such works usually had known authors—in this case John Mark. Peter was a source of information. The Gospel was

written from Rome about AD 66–70, probably closer to the latter date. Many other subjects are discussed in the introduction, such as structure, Christology (including the Messianic Secret), and discipleship. The Gospel itself is divided into 12 divisions, most of which are further subdivided. Some of the titles of these are somewhat sermoniac, e.g. “Levi’s Genes” (2:13–17), “Sow Far, Sow Good” (4:1–20), “Gennesaret Gets a House Call from the Great Physician” (6:53–56), “Long Day’s Journey into Night” (11:1–15:47), and “The End of the Beginning of the Gospel” (16:1–8). Each section of commentary begins with the author’s literal translation. For example, the Greek historical present is translated by the English present rather than the English past tense as in even the very literal NASB. Also *Iakōbos* is transliterated “Jacob” rather than the traditional “James.” Much of the commentary is verse-by-verse, although the teaching of each division is also developed. Various subjects are treated along the way, e.g. “Synagogues in the Time of Jesus?” (pp. 88–89) and “Mark’s Theology of Miracles” (pp. 92–93). At the end of the commentary on each division, there is an item called “Bridging the Horizons,” which is also sermoniac in nature. Witherington’s positions are usually traditional and conservative. He attributes 4:10–12 and 13–20 to Jesus and not the early church. Chapter 13 deals with both the destruction of the temple and the return of Christ. Nothing after 16:8 was written by Mark, but Mark did not intend to end with 16:8. (This is very strongly argued.) His ending has been lost. The work ends with an appendix, “Mark’s Perspective on the Disciples.” It is a thorough survey which emphasizes Mark’s balance in treating the disciples, but it does not satisfactorily explain why Mark is often so negative towards them.

All three of these new commentaries make a contribution to the interpretation of Mark. Witherington has a good introduction and more and better exegesis plus a good account of Mark’s rhetoric and sociology; Geddert has more sensitivity for and insight into the overall message Mark intended to convey. Broadhead is a brief reader’s guide, which is generally helpful but not in the same league as the other two.

James A. Brooks
Bethel Seminary, St. Paul, MN

The God of the Gospel of John. By Marianne Meye Thompson. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001, x + 269 pp., \$22.00.

The present volume has the distinction of having received an award of merit in biblical studies from the *Christianity Today* 2002 book awards. At the outset, it should be noted that not all the material included in *The God of the Gospel of John* appears here for the first time. Two of the five chapters (chaps. 2 and 5) were previously published (in *The Promise of the Father* and the journal *Semeia* respectively). A partially overlapping volume entitled *The Promise of the Father: Jesus and God in the New Testament*, was released by Westminster John Knox in 2000.

In the introduction to her book, the author recalls lamenting to her friend, Professor Andrew Lincoln, that every time she tried to write about God she ended up writing about Jesus. Dr. Lincoln’s response was: “And what does that tell you?” Undeterred by such counsel, Thompson has not abandoned her original thesis (reviving the argument of C. K. Barrett) that John’s Gospel is theocentric rather than Christocentric. As Thompson herself concedes, her thesis represents a minority view, as is amply documented by a 1985 *Forschungsbericht* by Robert Kysar, who sketched the virtual consensus among Johannine scholars that the heartbeat of John’s theology is his Christology.

Thompson devotes five chapters to demonstrating her thesis: The Meaning of “God” (chap. 1); The Living Father (chap. 2); The Knowledge of God (chap. 3); The Spirit of God (chap. 4); and The Worship of God (chap. 5). Chap. 1 focuses on the uses of the word “god” (*theos*). Correctly understood, Thompson notes, “god” is not a proper name but a predication, often used in relation to those claiming allegiance to a deity. The term is also (in a limited number of instances) applied to human beings entrusted with a divine commission. Defying the conventional distinction between a “functional” and an “ontological” Christology, so Thompson, John describes Jesus’ nature by his exercise of divine prerogatives (e.g. 5:25–27).

Epithets for God in John’s Gospel include “the only God” (5:44), “God the Father” (6:27), “the only true God” (17:3), and “my God and your God” (20:17; cf. 20:28). The frequently repeated relational description “the Father who sent me” corresponds to the portrayal of Jesus as the Son. The Gospel also contains several crucial ascriptions of deity to Jesus and repeated affirmations of his unity with God (esp. 5:23, 25–26; 10:30; cf. 5:18). Having said this, however, even the climactic acknowledgment of Jesus as “my Lord and my God” in 20:28, according to Thompson, does not eclipse John’s characterization of Jesus as dependent upon and authorized by the Father.

Chap. 2 turns to the most common designation of God in John, that of “Father.” Thompson notes that the expression is used foremost by Jesus to describe his unique relationship to God. In keeping with Jewish culture, “father” conveys the notions of origin of life, authority, and loving care. Each of these aspects (as in the OT and Second Temple Judaism) is related to Jesus in the Fourth Gospel. Further topics of discussion are the expression “the living God” (within the framework of Johannine “realized eschatology”), the “I am” sayings (against the backdrop of Exod 3:14 and Isaiah 40–66), and the phrases “the Father who sent me” (in relation to the Son’s role as emissary or agent) and “the Father loves the Son.”

Concerning the Father’s sending of the Son, Thompson favorably cites P. Meyer’s contention that the Fourth Gospel features not so much a sending Christology but a theology of the one who sends. Yet it seems precarious to pit a “theology of one sending” against a “theology of one sent.” The potential relevance of the possible Christological designation “Sent” in 9:7 should also be considered here. In addition, Thompson takes exception to viewing 14:28 (“The Father is greater than I”) as an example of Johannine “subordinationism,” considering it fallacious to view the Father-Son relationship primarily in hierarchical terms. Rather, the Father is presented as “the source of the Son’s life” and as “the origin of the Son’s very being” (p. 94). This “solution,” however, seems to raise more problems than it solves, for it raises the specter of the Father’s ontological superiority, a notion universally rejected by Christological orthodoxy.

“Knowledge of God” is the topic of chap. 3. Under this rubric, Thompson investigates the role of “seeing” and “hearing” in John and explores several ways in which the Gospel conceives of the manifestation of God’s presence in the world. Regarding the former issue, Thompson differs sharply with Bultmann (who argued that in John “hearing” is central and the preferred way of coming to faith), contending that the supreme good in John is rather that of seeing God. (Too little is made, however, of 20:29.) The second question taken up is John’s portrayal of Jesus in relation to agency figures. The author concludes that Johannine Christology is framed primarily in terms of divine attributes (Word and Wisdom) rather than human mediator figures (prophets or legal agents). However, in light of obvious parallels with Moses and other figures, one wonders if this dichotomy is unduly disjunctive.

Chap. 4 is devoted to the Spirit of God. Here Thompson challenges the conventional focus on the Christological rather than theological dimension of the Spirit in John. She is also critical of a unilateral focus on chaps. 13–17 and of a primarily historical approach, preferring to study the issue more synthetically and theologically. Thompson proceeds to investigate Jesus and the descent of the Spirit (1:32–33); the Spirit as life-

giving (3:3–8); Jesus as the giver of the Spirit (3:34–35; 6:63–64); the Spirit and the risen Christ (chaps. 14–16); and the Father and the Spirit. Contrary to the prevailing Christological consensus, Thompson finds that John portrays the Spirit foremost in relation to the Father's life-giving power.

The fifth and final chap. deals with the worship of God. In it Thompson sets out to reexamine relevant passages utilizing a taxonomy of contemporary Jewish polemics concerning worship derived from a study of Second Temple literature. This taxonomy ranges from assimilationist (acquiescing to Antiochus Epiphanes) to nonassimilationist (Philo, Josephus, *Sib. Or.*), separationist (*Jos. Asen.*, *1 Enoch*, *Jub.*, *Jdt.*), and sectarian (DSS). Johannine polemic, according to Thompson, does not charge Judaism with idolatry but rather confronts it with its need to keep up to date. In recognition that the eschatological hour of fulfillment has come in Jesus, the proper focus of Jewish worship must now be on him.

Thompson, against the grain of much of recent Johannine scholarship, also calls for a nuancing of the common understanding that Jesus "replaces" or "supersedes" Jewish festivals such as Passover, preferring instead to describe the nature of Jesus' work as Passover clarifying and illumining (p. 219). Thomas's confession of Jesus as "my Lord and my God" is viewed as John presenting Jesus "as the one *through* whom worship is directed to God" (p. 225). This, however, does not seem to do full justice to the confession of 20:28 which implies direct worship of Jesus as God rather than presenting him as merely a vehicle or means through whom God may be worshipped.

To summarize, if Thompson had her way, Johannine scholarship would need to view Jesus in terms of Word and Wisdom rather than prophet or legal agent and drop the distinction between a "functional" and an "ontological" Christology (chap. 1); desist from speaking about a "sending" as well as a "subordinationist Christology" (chap. 2); focus on "seeing" rather than "hearing" God in Jesus (chap. 3); conceive of the Spirit in John in primarily theological rather than Christological terms (chap. 4); and understand Johannine worship as primarily theologically rather than Christologically oriented (chap. 5). If correct, this would significantly alter the landscape of Johannine studies.

Apart from whether or not all of Thompson's theses are judged valid (indeed, her efforts to bring about a paradigm shift on the subject represents a veritable *tour de force*), she ought to be commended for her original, thought-provoking work and for her grasp of the vast body of scholarly literature on the subject. In several cases Thompson's findings serve to correct, or at least to help nuance, conventional stereotypes. Space does not permit a detailed critique of each of the above-summarized theses. A brief word on the author's general thrust, a reorientation from a primarily Christological to a properly theological reading of John's Gospel, must suffice. Is Thompson correct in urging such a shift?

While she has doubtless shown that God is often not given his due in the study of John's Gospel, I remain unconvinced that the evidence presented by Thompson calls for a paradigm shift, for the simple reason that the entire Gospel rather transparently appears to be focused on Christology, from the identification of the Word—Jesus—as God to Thomas's climactic confession of Jesus as his Lord and God followed by the purpose statement calling on people to believe that the Christ and Son of God is Jesus. The distinctive difference between Johannine Christianity and Judaism is hardly belief in God; rather, the central question is Christological: is Jesus who he claimed to be or not?

By choosing not to challenge directly the almost self-evident Christological nature and focus of John's Gospel, Thompson largely leaves the foundational Christological framework of the Fourth Gospel intact, which is why I question whether in the end she will succeed in overturning the scholarly consensus on this issue. What, then, is the answer to Barrett's famous question regarding John's Gospel, "Christocentric or Theocentric?" Or, to put it differently, was the question that foremost occupied the fourth evangelist and his readership, "Who is God?," or was it, "Who is Jesus?" Despite

Thompson's valiant effort, I believe the answer must continue to be the latter rather than the former.

Andreas J. Köstenberger
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Wake Forest, NC

After Paul Left Corinth: The Influence of Secular Ethics and Social Change. By Bruce W. Winter. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001, xvi + 344 pp., 7 plates, \$28.00 paper.

"Now, concerning your question about meat sacrificed to idols . . .," and so Paul begins to address issues raised by Corinthian believers. Yet, why had Paul failed to deal with that problem during his previous eighteen months of ministry in Corinth? Why is it now suddenly an issue? This puzzle is by no means new to exegetes. Early in my academic studies, we blamed gnosticism (so Hans Jonas, later W. Schmithals). The failure to prove the existence of first-century gnosticism or even that of the more palatable "incipient gnosticism" has led others to seek alternative explanations. An over-realized eschatology (so W. Schrage, later Fee) or even an over-zealous Paul has been blamed (see e.g. J. C. Hurd, Jr., *The Origin of 1 Corinthians* [London: SPCK, 1965]). Stoicism (so Herbert Braun) or more recently (and more creatively) Jesus himself has been blamed for the problems at Corinth. David Wenham has argued that the Corinthians were familiar with Jesus tradition and Paul strongly objected to how these traditions were being applied by the Corinthians to new situations not encountered in Palestine.

Bruce Winter wishes to bring the skills of the social historian, using archaeological and sociological data from Corinth, into this debate. He argues that "Paul did not deal with many of the problems reflected in 1 Corinthians because either they had not arisen during his time in Corinth, or they had done so in a way different from that in which they were now encountering them" (p. 4). These social changes raised new issues, and some church members responded to the issues with "accepted" Corinthian ways of doing things, ways Paul and some other Corinthian Christians found objectionable.

Winter begins by arguing, "whether rich or poor, bond or free, the cultural milieu which impacted life in the city of Corinth was *Romanitas*" (p. 22). This is in opposition to both Meeks and Murphy-O'Connor, who argue that underneath a Roman veneer, "the real world in which Paul moved," the real Corinth, was thoroughly Hellenistic in language, culture, mores, etc. Meeks cites inscriptional evidence (the early Latin inscriptions by freedman with telltale Greek-derived names) to maintain that "Romanization" was a public affectation not representing the true population (W. A. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983] 47). Murphy-O'Connor (*St. Paul's Corinth* [Collegeville: Liturgical, 1983] 123) cleverly uses Apuleius's *The Golden Ass* (which describes second-century Corinth well) as a basis for his model of Paul's Corinth. Winter rebuts both arguments by maintaining that a "major shift" in the cultural milieu of Corinth occurred in the late first or early second century. Corinthians shifted from a strong like of all things Roman (with a concomitant ridicule of the Greeks) in the first century to becoming Hellenophiles in the second century (an attitude reflected in, among other places, Apuleius). Winter weaves his argument not with the overtly public inscriptions and literature, but rather with less-noticed data: potters had Latin names in the Latin alphabet until the mid-first century AD; the famous Façade of the Captives in Corinth's Forum, commemorating Roman's conquest of Corinth in 146 BC, portrays the Greeks as weak, effeminate with a curly hairstyle, and so on.

Winter's argument here is not entirely persuasive. He admits problems caused by, among others, (1) the numerous Greek ostraca; (2) the use of Greek in all but one of the lead curse inscriptions in the temple of Demeter; and (3) the early shift to Greek by the potters. Although Winter praises Paul as a premier source of information about first-century Corinth, he has trouble with Paul's use of the ethnonym "Greeks," since with Winter's thesis seemingly the Corinthians would have preferred "Romans." (Winter maintains "Greeks" is just a synonym for "Gentiles.") Nevertheless, Winter has demonstrated *Romanitas* was more than a mere veneer in Paul's Corinth, although I would hesitate to describe all Corinthians as misohellenists.

The more interesting element in Winter's book is his contention that three major social changes had occurred in Corinth. These changes (or the church's response to the change) precipitated the issues Paul addresses in 1 Corinthians. The first change involved official dinners for Corinthian citizens with all the accompanying prestige, whether to celebrate the imperial cult (instituted ca. AD 54 and celebrated annually in Corinth) or to begin the Isthmian Games (moved from Corinth to Isthmia, possibly in the early fifties AD, prompting the then-president of the Games to host an inaugural dinner for all citizens of Corinth). These meals created the problem of Christians eating in temples as well as the problem of immorality with the prostitutes provided for "after-dinner entertainment." Skipping the more immediate context of 9:1-3, 5-7, Winter connects the discussion of "the right to food and drink" in 1 Cor 9:4 with the right of Corinthian citizens to partake in these official meals (8:10).

Second, three severe grain shortages occurred in Corinth, which Winter equates with "this present distress," arguing that Christians saw a nexus between famine and the tribulation (Mark 13:8). Winter's point is quite similar to, for example, Marvin Pate's equating "this present distress" with "the Messianic Woes." This is perhaps Winter's strongest argument. The famines provoked an apocalypticism in the church, resulting in the unusual stances on marriage (pp. 215-68).

Third, Winter argues that, possibly following Rome's lead (Acts 18:2), Corinth closed the Jewish meat market, which had previously provided a source of meat free from contamination with idols. This last scenario is largely conjecture with scant evidence, as Winter himself concedes.

In addition to his provocative thesis, Winter provides *very* insightful background material on "veiled men/unveiled women," dinner parties in temples, and *malakos/arsenokoitēs* (1 Cor 6:9) as a pair of specific terms differentiating the dominant from the receptive partner in a homosexual relationship.

As we have come to expect from Bruce Winter, this is a well-researched, carefully documented, insightful discussion of relevant, ancient resource material. Scholars dealing with 1 Corinthians will need to answer the challenges Winter himself has thrown out to us (p. 28): (1) Is the evidence adequate to demonstrate that these social changes occurred? (2) Could these social changes have precipitated the problems addressed by Paul?

E. Randolph Richards
Ouachita Baptist University, Arkadelphia, AR

The Reverse of the Curse: Paul, Wisdom and the Law. By C. Marvin Pate. WUNT 114. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2000, xxii + 536 pp., \$110.00.

In this work, Pate describes first-century Christianity as a tension between two major apostolic movements, with a third attempting to moderate. Drawing upon his

impressive command of intertestamental, Qumranic, and other sources, he argues that pre-Christian Paul identified the preexistent Wisdom with Torah (so also Windisch, W. D. Davies), resulting in a nomism and a particularism (the restoration of national Israel). While W. D. Davies contended that Paul reasoned “Wisdom=Torah=Christ,” Hengel, Seyoon Kim, and others have persuasively rejected this, arguing that Paul never equated Torah with Christ. Pate keeps both ideas alive by dividing early Christianity. He argues that all early Christianity maintained a Wisdom=Christ framework. Most early Christians also held Wisdom=Torah=Christ, resulting in a modified nomism and particularism. This view, Pate contends, is reflected in the Apostolic Decree, the Petrine party at Corinth, and elements in most churches (Galatia, Corinth, Philippi). These Judaizing Christians “believed themselves to be enjoying the covenantal blessings attained through the righteousness of the law and the genuine restoration of the land to Israel” (p. 315).

Pate’s major contribution comes in what he does with Paul. According to Pate’s thesis, Paul accepted “Wisdom=Christ,” but divorced Wisdom from Torah, the earlier Jewish underlying assumption. This divorce is what caused his tension with the other Christian elements. Thus Paul argued that Torah is portrayed in Scripture as failing from the beginning (the golden-calf incident) to produce the intended blessings. Torah failed by increasing sin until sin reached its zenith in the execution of the innocent Messiah. Moreover, Torah condemned itself by erring in misjudging the Messiah (Deut 21:23) and thus lost its place in God’s salvation history (pp. 312–13).

The bulk of the book is an extensive and detailed exegesis of all relevant Pauline passages. (Although holding to a 13-letter corpus, Pate restricts himself to the undisputed Paulines.) Pate argues that Paul writes to remove the connection of Torah with Wisdom. While Wisdom traditionally helped us to keep the Torah and thus inherit the blessings, Christ is now the Wisdom that leads us to the blessings. Keeping the Torah leads to the Deuteronomic *curse*s rather than the blessings: “Cursed are those who keep the Law,” rather than “Cursed are those who do not keep the Law”; hence Pate’s title: *The Reverse of the Curse*.

As Pate reconstructs it, Paul’s opponents, the Judaizers, are those Jewish *Christians* (and their later Gentile *Christian* converts) who kept the Wisdom=Torah=Christ structure. These Judaizers maintained that “belief in Christ” grants to believers the indwelling Spirit who enables us to keep the Law and thus to inherit the Deuteronomic blessings (p. 300). For Paul, then, it is not the pagan Gentiles but rather these Judaizers who are the “dogs”: their god is their belly (food laws), their glory (circumcision) is in their shame (nakedness), whose minds are on earthly things (the restoration of national Israel).

Pate’s exegesis is thorough. Although on occasion I found it forced (e.g. Paul’s listing of the “fruit of the spirit” was intended to parallel the Deuteronomic blessings), overall his exegesis demonstrates great skill. His connections of Pauline passages to the Deuteronomic blessings/curses is clear at times (e.g. Deut 21:23 in Phil 2:8b, “even death of a cross”) but less clear at others (e.g. Gal 3:19 “the Law was added because of transgression” as a parallel to the Messianic woes, building off Allison’s excellent description of the early Church’s interpretation of the death of Jesus as the birth pangs of the Messiah, the Messianic Woes). Nevertheless, Pate argues that the divorce of Torah from Wisdom is not just a theme that can be found in Paul, but rather is a fundamental, shaping presupposition. It is a major—if not the major—tenet in Pauline theology. To support this claim, Pate seeks to demonstrate this idea in the background of all of Paul’s Law passages. While we might agree with Pate’s reading of one passage and question his reading of another, his thesis is that it is not any *one* passage that demonstrates this motif but that the theme bubbles up in *numerous* places throughout the undisputed Paulines because this motif was a fundamental concept in Paul.

When Pate draws the finished picture of first-century Christianity, he has Matthew (not James), then, as the quintessential Judaizer, representing the position Paul so adamantly opposed. James and Peter (and Luke) are the moderating elements in the church attempting to reconcile these streams (by appealing to the Noachian Law, etc.) as seen in the Apostolic Decree, which Paul soundly rejects (p. 275, following Räisänen, Dunn, Hurd, Cathpole, Barrett, Davies, Segal, *et al.*). Pate realizes labeling Matthew a Judaizer challenges the Gospel's place in the canon, an awkward position for an evangelical scholar like Pate. He defends Matthew's place in the canon in a long appendix.

Pate's well-researched and well-crafted arguments have given me serious pause and deserve widespread discussion. Let me add a final benefit of the book. Buried treasure is found in his many surveys, summaries, and critiques of current research on various subtopics in Pauline studies. For example, the DSS=Essenes debate is well summarized on p. 104, n. 21. The current state of the discussion over the pesky genitive, the "obedience of faith," is nicely outlined on p. 138, n. 26. The major items in the discussion of possible influences of 1 Enoch on Paul, particularly in the Corinthian letters, are concisely summarized on p. 183, n. 30. The identity of the "rulers" of 1 Cor 2:6-10 is usually "demonic" (Kingsley Barrett, Judith Kovacs) or "demonic behind governmental institutions" (Cullmann, Caird, MacGregor). The current status on the background of the Philippian Hymn is thoroughly summarized in an excursus, pp. 306-8. Such footnotes are very helpful in these days when publishing often outstrips our abilities to stay current.

In sum, I found Marvin Pate's work a delightful, engaging read. His ideas were provocative but not outlandish, grounded both in the literary milieu and in careful, reverent exegesis. He has forced me to think outside the lines. It is the most helpful book on Paul I have read in several years. He is to be commended.

E. Randolph Richards
Ouachita Baptist University, Arkadelphia, AR

The Letters to the Thessalonians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary. By Abraham J. Malherbe. AB 32B. New York: Doubleday, 2000, xx + 508 pp., \$50.00.

For more than thirty years, Abraham Malherbe has produced meticulous research on the social and rhetorical setting of Paul's letters, especially the Thessalonian correspondence. This commentary can be fairly said to represent the summation of his life's work. Careful, thorough, and insightful, it will not disappoint those who have anticipated its appearance.

Malherbe's introduction to each letter treats the critical issues completely but without pedantic rehearsal of every conjectural variation. In drawing conclusions, he resists the Sirens of novel hypotheses. Affirming Paul's authorship of both letters (no longer an easy move with 2 Thessalonians) and insisting on the integrity of both letters, Malherbe also affirms the general consonance of the letters with the narrative of Paul's Thessalonian mission in Acts. On the specific problem of the composition of the Thessalonian church, he argues that the letters themselves appear to be addressed to Gentile readers only, acknowledging a tension with the picture in Acts 17 of Paul's activity among Jews in Thessalonica but averring that the tendentiousness of Acts does not disqualify it as a reliable source about Paul.

Malherbe's insistence that the audience of 1-2 Thessalonians is Gentile is consistent with his evaluation of the letters' genre and social setting. He finds plentiful

parallels between the letters and Greco-Roman philosophical and epistolary literature. These lead him to conclusions that will not surprise those familiar with his earlier articles and monographs. As to genre, 1–2 Thessalonians share affinities with Hellenistic friendship and parenetic letters and are best classed as the first examples of the Christian pastoral letter, evincing as they do Paul's pastoral concern for the readers. In their composition, Paul adapts many philosophical commonplaces, aiming them at his readers' moral exhortation even when he uses them to describe himself. Alert to the differences as well as the similarities between Paul and his environment, Malherbe draws attention to Paul's deviation from Hellenistic convention, mostly in terms found in Judaism or grounded in his gospel.

Like other contributions to the Anchor Bible, this one treats each unit of text under three headings: an original translation, notes on the translation that concern mostly matters of language, and comments that draw implications from the notes and offer wider observations. Malherbe's translation is lucid and idiomatic. The notes, which are best read with a Greek NT nearby, are replete with Hellenistic parallels as well as careful observations about the letters' syntax and diction. Throughout, Malherbe expresses reservations about assigning too much significance to expressions that were commonplaces in Hellenistic literature, understanding their function in their social environment. Conversely, he readily offers suggestions as to the emphasis of Paul's expressions that deviate from Hellenistic norms. The notes are sensitive at all points not only to the referential aspects of Paul's language but also to the affective aspects, as Paul creates pathos and offers exhortations. As is common in commentaries with divisions like the Anchor Bible's, the comments tend to summarize, sometimes repetitiously, the contents of the notes. In the comments, Malherbe sometimes offers observations about fundamental points of Paul's theology that arise in the text, but commentary is not much concerned with the larger synthesis of Paul's theology. Notably absent are any significant observations about Paul's Christology, which, though certainly not a major focus of these letters, might be worthy of greater consideration in the letters that the commentator regards as the earliest extant Christian literature. In part, Malherbe's reluctance to speculate about pre-Pauline elements leads to this lacuna.

The commentary interacts extensively, yet with admirable terseness, with secondary literature on 1–2 Thessalonians and Greco-Roman social history. Most of the conversation partners are from Continental and American university circles, but patristic commentaries often sit at the table as well. Works on Pauline theology are mostly bypassed, as the comments stick rather closely to the immediate issues of the text. While many would hope for a wider bibliography, Malherbe's still-generous selection does not lead to the neglect of significant exegetical issues.

A commentary of this length and quality is filled with conclusions that will interest specialists in these letters. A few can be mentioned here as a sample, all indicative of Malherbe's judiciousness and moderation. The parallels between 1 Thessalonians 1–3 and Greco-Roman philosophical literature suggest that Paul was offering his life as a parenetic example rather than defending himself against opponents as in the Corinthian letters. The tribulation experienced by the Thessalonian Christians was likely more a matter of social dislocation than overt persecution. Similarly Paul's suffering was more a matter of his distress over his converts and his general deprivation. *Skeuos* in 1 Thess 4:4 should be taken as a metaphor for "wife," particularly because of the force of the reflexive pronoun *heautou* in the attributive position. The problem of idleness in the two letters is unrelated to imminent expectation of Christ's return; rather, it arose as some Christians willfully relied on the loving generosity of others. The problem addressed by Paul's discussion of the *parousia* in 1 Thess 4:13–5:11 was likely prompted by the oracles of false prophets proclaiming that the event lay in the distant future, and Paul's correction of their teaching led to the eschatological enthusiasm that he sought to temper in 2 Thess 2:1–12.

Notable and typical is Malherbe's restrained treatment of the Thessalonian *crux interpretum*, the man of lawlessness in 2 Thessalonians 2. Offering nothing novel to identify the referent of the expression, he contributes the trenchant observation that Paul's appropriation of this apocalyptic topos is remarkably unapocalyptic, stressing as it does the nature of the present situation at least as much as the future in order to modify not an imminent futuristic expectation but an over-realized eschatology. He observes further that the force of Paul's language is to focus on the destruction of the lawless one at his revelation, not to imply a heightening of the lawless one's activity between his revelation and his destruction. This line of interpretation tends to ameliorate the difficulties of the text and fits well with the pastoral focus that Malherbe finds in both letters. Had the comments given greater weight to the possibility, offered by Wanamaker's commentary, that in this passage *katechein* used intransitively signifies "prevail" instead of "restrain," the result might be even more coherent.

If this masterful volume has a general weakness, it is a consequence of its main strength. Malherbe's rich references to Greco-Roman literature and social history far outnumber comments informed by comparison to Jewish sources. More than once he observes that Paul's differences from the philosophers are matters of his understanding of God, grounded in Judaism. But the absence of detailed reflection on the Jewish conceptual world tends to diminish otherwise provocative observations. One wonders whether consideration of Paul's Jewish worldview would clarify other points and even alter some conclusions. What, for example, might it mean for Paul the Jew to describe his mission as turning Gentiles to "serve the living and true God," an event expected as a consequence of God's restoration of Israel? What did this reflect of his understanding of his gospel and his call?

Though the Anchor Bible aims at "the general reader with no special formal training in biblical studies," this volume, like many in the series, ranks among the most challenging of technical commentaries. Discussion of the Greek text, for example, though carried out entirely with transliteration, demands more knowledge of lexical and syntactical terminology than most seminary students can muster. The book will be valued most by researchers, for whom it will mark the definitive treatment of these letters in their Greco-Roman environment. While commentaries as demanding as these may not be widely read by those in pastoral ministry, Malherbe's provocative focus on Paul the pastor to the Thessalonians has much to say to those with the same vocation. Likewise, scholars preoccupied with the classic issues of Pauline theology may find that the book neglects their concerns, but its scrupulous delineation of Paul's pastoral method may rescue Paul as he was from Paul as the theologians have made him.

Jon A. Weatherly
Cincinnati Bible College and Seminary, Cincinnati, Ohio

The King-Priest of Psalm 110 in Hebrews. By David R. Anderson. Studies in Biblical Literature 21. New York: Peter Lang, 2001, 342 pp., \$65.95.

Although it is never stated, *The King-Priest of Psalm 110 in Hebrews* was originally presented to Dallas Theological Seminary in 1998 as a dissertation entitled "The Royal and Priestly contribution of Psalm 110 to the Book of Hebrews." Other than the title, differences between the two documents are virtually undetectable. Like the dissertation, *The King-Priest of Psalm 110 in Hebrews* consists of seven chapters (and bibliography) to examine the use of Ps 110:1 and 4 in the book of Hebrews as a means to "delineate the present ministry of Christ" (p. 4).

After his introduction (chap. 1), Anderson offers a presentation of "Sacral Kingship" (chap. 2) in the ancient Near East whereby he resolves that "the history of pre-exilic Israel is begging for any clear evidence that any of the Israelite kings was also a king-priest" (p. 27, cf. pp. 279–80). This separation of king from priest becomes a driving force for Anderson in his subsequent analysis of "Psalm 110" (chap. 3). In summarizing the historical background for Psalm 110, he argues that sometime during David's reign David addresses the psalm to the Messiah about the Messiah's ultimate victory, and thereby Anderson determines the psalm to be directly messianic (pp. 61, 280–82).

Moving from OT historical and literary contexts, Anderson overviews Ps 110:1 in the NT (chap. 4), namely, the Synoptics (Matt 22:41–46, 26:62–65; Mark 12:35–37, 14:62–64a; Luke 20:41–44, 22:66–71), Acts (2:32–36, 5:31–32, 7:55–56) and the epistles (Rom 8:34–35a, 1 Cor 15:25, Eph 1:20–23, Col 3:1, 1 Pet 3:22). Not surprisingly, he muses that "the understanding of both the religious community in Jerusalem and the early church was that the primary referent of Psalm 110 was the Messiah" (p. 113). Thus the epistles identify the Messiah of this directly messianic psalm to be Jesus whose authority and power is "already, not yet" (pp. 282–85).

The preliminaries completed, Anderson attends to the royal contribution (chap. 5) and priestly contribution (chap. 6) of Ps 110:1 and 4 in the book of Hebrews. Ps 110:1 in Heb 1:3d and 13 identifies Jesus as the Son promised to David, who has inaugurated the Davidic Kingdom (pp. 173, 291; cf. pp. 285–88), and Ps 110:4 in Heb 5:6–7:28 identifies Jesus as Melchizedekian Priest (pp. 236, 291; cf. pp. 288–90). These two separate offices are thereby joined together in one person, Jesus, the Son (pp. 231–36). Thus Psalm 110 primarily serves to identify the Son as both a king *and* a priest. The present ministry of Jesus, the Son, is that of a *king-priest who actively exercises his authority and power while awaiting the future consummation of his kingdom*.

In conclusion (chap. 7), Anderson summarizes each chapter (pp. 277–90), identifies various inductive, deductive, and unwarranted conclusions (pp. 290–96), and suggests some theological implications and areas for future study (pp. 296–97).

Evangelicals will have mixed reactions to Anderson's book. In general, the book's lack of indexes limits its usefulness as a resource for further reference. More significantly, disappointment exists in the overdependence on secondary sources, particularly when addressing sacral kingship. Primary sources warrant excavation and citation to substantiate more clearly his resolve for separating king from priest in preexilic Israel. For instance, based upon secondary sources Anderson says, "on one aspect of Hittite kingship there is a distinct consensus of scholarship: the king was the High Priest" (p. 17). Granted, the OT Davidite was not the "high" priest; nevertheless, interaction between the petitions of Hittite kings on behalf of and as a representative of their people (*KUB*, xiv, 8; xxiv, 1; op. cit., Pritchard, *ANET*, 394, 397) and the similar petition of King David (2 Sam 24:10–17) warrant discussion.

Although differences may exist between the king-priests of the ancient Near East and Israel, the OT Davidic king executes priestly functions, though they were not *primary* activities of the Davidite. (David offered sacrifices [2 Sam 6:13, 17–18; 2 Sam 24:18–25; 1 Chr 21:18–28], David exercised authority over the priesthood [2 Samuel 6], and David's sons were called priests [2 Sam 8:18].) Neglecting firsthand interaction with the OT priestly activities of the royal Davidite and the absence of any comparative study with ancient Near Eastern texts concerning priesthood issues weaken Anderson's perspective of sacral kingship.

Dependence on secondary material also permeates Anderson's exposition of Hebrews 1. His dependence on J. P. Meier's ring structure, however, reveals solid examination of the text (pp. 139–76). Nevertheless, Meier's twentieth-century structural analysis could afford firsthand interaction with first-century Jewish literature, theology, and exegesis. In addition, a disproportionate amount of time is spent in Hebrews 1 for

the psalm's two occurrences (64 pp.) in comparison with the psalm's nine other allusions and direct quotations in the rest of Hebrews (72 pp.).

Evangelicals who view OT passages in the NT as "this = that" will applaud Anderson's directly prophetic approach. His argument for Psalm 110, however, loses significant force in his evaluation of my article "The Use of Psalm 110:1 in the New Testament" (*BSac* 149 [1992] 438-53). Although he says differently, the very point I make concerning the use of "the Lord" and "my lord" in Ps 110:1 is the one Anderson argues. "The Jews of David's time and the Jews of Jesus' time did not have any . . . concept of a 'divine messianic Lord'" (p. 39). I have argued that David spoke of a human messiah of his day, Solomon. The Jews of Jesus' time were expecting a human messiah figure as well, but instead God sent a greater messiah figure, one who was both human and divine. Unlike Anderson, however, I suggest that Psalm 110 is typico-prophetic (like Bock and others) and *not* directly messianic.

Despite his initial claim that Psalm 110 is directly prophetic, Anderson sends mixed signals about his position (pp. 47-48, 114), but none more clearly than when he concludes, "Psalm 110 is a messianic psalm, if not directly then in a typico-prophetic sense" (p. 290). As a result, he lessens the impact of the historical and revelatory progress concerning the Davidic king-priest evident in Hebrews, namely, the escalation of the Davidite as divine (1:1-14) as well as the escalation of his present function as "high" priest (5:1-7:28) in the order of Melchizedek.

Evangelicals, particularly progressive dispensationalists who view Christ Jesus actively ruling as Davidic king-priest, will applaud Anderson's detailed interaction with Robert and Mark Saucy. Some might conclude that this is the book's greatest contribution. Anderson devotes a great deal of attention to refuting the Saucys' perspective that Jesus exercises a passive rule, which is in keeping with the purpose of the book, "to delineate the present ministry of Christ."

Anderson's work is recommended as a secondary read to James Kurianal's *Jesus Our High Priest: Ps 110,4 As the Substructure of Heb 5, 1-7, 28* (European University Studies; New York: Peter Lang, 2000), which evidences better interaction with primary and secondary sources.

Herbert W. Bateman IV
Grace Theological Seminary, Winona Lake, IN

The Letter of James. By Douglas J. Moo. PNTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000, 288 pp., \$28.00.

The letter of James has its share of hermeneutical conundrums, and Douglas Moo has done an admirable job in dealing with them. This volume is an expansion and reworking of Moo's 1985 work on James published in the TNTC series. Even a cursory comparison of the present work with the 1985 work demonstrates that Moo has not just republished the prior work. For example, the introduction contains an expanded discussion of the theme of James, a general discussion of the implications of pseudographical authorship, an excursus on the kinship relationship between Jesus and his brothers, as well as an updated bibliography. The intervening years of reflection have also led Moo to tweak his outline of the letter, both in the number and location of the major breaks as well as the relationship among the sections. Moo's conservative conclusions related to such issues as authorship, readers, and location have not changed, nor has his conviction "that the heart of the letter is a call to wholehearted commitment to Christ" (p. x).

The structure of James is one of those hermeneutical conundrums that has puzzled interpreters through the years. Moo resists the temptation to force an artificial structure on the letter, opting instead for what he calls a series of “key motifs” that are “often mixed together with other themes in paragraphs that cannot be labeled as neatly as we might like” (p. 45). Rejecting Dibelius’s contention that the letter has no unifying factor, Moo argues that the central concern (“theme” is too strong) of the letter is spiritual wholeness (p. 47).

The format of the commentary is user-friendly. Having the NIV text printed at the beginning of each minor section is helpful, as are Moo’s introductions to both major and some minor sections. Dividing the book into chapters based on the chapters of the canonical text is less helpful, because those chapter divisions seldom correspond to Moo’s outline. The use of transliterated Greek words will help those who do not read Greek.

The major strength of the commentary is Moo’s insightful analysis of the text. Especially noteworthy are the word studies and the scope of references to secondary literature. Moo is generally careful to present the full range of possible uses of words with context being the final arbiter of meaning. His discussions of words are not overly technical but are informed by solid linguistic principles. Moo’s use of secondary literature is also very helpful; works cited range from Homer to Philo, to the Apocrypha, to Calvin, and to contemporary scholars.

Perhaps the best indicator of a good commentary is its helpfulness to students. In two classes where multiple commentaries on James were required, Moo’s commentary consistently received the highest rating by my students. The Pillar editors are to be commended for allowing Moo the opportunity to share with us 15 years of additional reflection on the letter of James.

Charlie Ray
New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, New Orleans, LA

1, 2, 3 John: An Exegetical and Theological Exposition of Holy Scripture. By Daniel L. Akin. NAC. Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 2001, 296 pp., \$29.99.

Editors of a new commentary series argue for its existence in a variety of ways. For instance, the editors of the New American Commentary (NAC), in which Akin’s commentary on the Johannine Epistles appears, see this series as a “continuation of a heritage rich in biblical and theological exposition” begun in the American Commentary series edited by Alvah Hovey. This preceding series was published at the end of the nineteenth century. According to the editors, “All NAC authors affirm the divine inspiration, inerrancy, complete truthfulness, and full authority of the Bible.”

Evidence that the author fits within the evangelical tradition is seen in the introductory chapter. Akin concludes that the apostle John, the son of Zebedee, wrote all three of the Johannine epistles found in the canon. This view sets Akin’s commentary apart from other widely used commentaries. For example, Smalley’s work in the Word Biblical Commentary series and Grayston’s in the New Century Bible Commentary series dispute the traditional view that the apostle John wrote all three epistles. Especially helpful in arguing his point is the author’s discussion of the phrases related to soteriology that are found both in the Fourth Gospel and in the Johannine epistles.

An overview of the recent approaches to studying the Johannine epistles also appears in the introduction, including a brief survey of recent rhetorical and discourse analysis. The relative brevity of this important discussion might be viewed as a weakness in Akin’s commentary.

Structurally, the commentary is organized in a way that makes it remarkably readable. Each section begins with a general outline. Subsequently, the author works through each subsection verse by verse. Akin interacts with the transliterated Greek text in the body of the commentary. The footnotes, however, give a more extensive discussion of the Greek in non-transliterated form. The result is that the author makes this commentary accessible to both pastor and scholar. Akin's approach is unlike the more detailed Greek analyses found in commentary series like the New International Greek Testament Commentary series that presuppose a more sophisticated understanding of Greek. Nonetheless, the Greek discussion, even in the body of this commentary, is sufficiently sophisticated that a pastor with an elementary background in Greek may feel challenged.

Throughout Akin's commentary there are helpful excursuses that explicate key Johannine concepts. For example, the author's excursuses on "Light" in the Gospel of John and "Light" in 1 John are especially helpful.

Akin's commentary is a beneficial contribution to biblical study because of its inclusion of recent scholarly works on the Johannine epistles. While the footnotes indicate awareness of the older recognized works, they also indicate a knowledge of recent scholarly contributions that the reader may appreciate.

The commentary concludes with an excursus that surveys the literature on the *expiation* and *propitiation* debate coming out of 1 John 4:10. Akin concludes that "propitiation" is the correct translation of *hilaskomai*.

1, 2, 3 John: An Exegetical and Theological Exposition of Holy Scripture includes three appendices. The homiletical outlines for all three Johannine epistles may be of special interest to pastors. A bibliography of selected works and three indices are also helpful.

Evangelicals will appreciate the contribution the Akin commentary provides for biblical study. Many pastors will find this work to be an especially welcomed complement to some of the more moderate commentaries on the Johannine epistles.

C. Scott Shidemantle
Geneva College, Beaver Falls, PA

New Testament Themes. By David Arthur deSilva. St. Louis: Chalice, 2001, 151 pp., \$15.99 paper.

The introduction of deSilva's book briefly outlines his plan, proposes four interrelated, dominant themes of the NT (grace, discipleship, the church, and apocalypticism), and states the intended readership—the beginning NT student. At the end of the work he lists recommended books, which generally correspond to the four themes. There are no footnotes, but the book includes a subject index and an index of Scriptures and other ancient literature used.

In chapter one, "Grace: The Favor of God," deSilva handles the context, content, and direction of God's grace, rightly connects God's grace with God's faithfulness to both Jews and Gentiles, and associates God's grace with Jesus' mediatorship. God's grace is conceptualized by Seneca's reference to three goddesses, "the three graces," who dance hand in hand in a circle and who represent three aspects of gift exchange, one for bestowing a benefit, one for receiving it, and one for returning it. DeSilva explains that "the recipient of a favor . . . understood that accepting a favor or gift involved also accepting an obligation to the giver" (p. 8). However, the thought of obligatory repayment confuses the free offer of eternal life by belief in Christ, apart from past, present, or even promised future works.

Chapter two, "Discipleship: The Way of God," gives examples of discipleship without defining it: fulfilling the just requirement of the law (p. 41), bearing the death of Christ in our mortal bodies (p. 51), and calling Jesus "Lord" (p. 63). His argument for living the Christian life is based on the grace-recipient's obligation to do so. He says, "The early Christians, including the New Testament authors, understood that acceptance of a gift also entailed the acceptance of an obligation to the giver" (p. 39). Perhaps this "obligatory" discipleship might better be couched in terms of "oughtness."

In chapter three, "Church: The People of God," Jesus is presented as the determining factor for salvation in Israel's context. DeSilva understands the early church as having continuity with Israel at the time of Christ and also being Israel's chronological successor. DeSilva astutely points out the main sources of communal defilement within the church: moral corruption within the body, doctrinal corruption by false teachers, and corruption from association with "Gentile" culture.

Chapter four, "Apocalypticism: The Triumph of God," sees the teaching of Jesus and the NT writers as an "already, but not yet" understanding of the kingdom and suggests a post-millennial approach, saying, "this age finally dissolves and God's kingdom comes into being" (p. 129). The author does not make a distinction between the coming messianic kingdom and the eternal state.

New Testament Themes is a handy little paperback that summarizes major themes in God's new covenant and encourages reflection on God's amazing plan. However, it should be read thoughtfully.

Anthony B. Badger

Grace Evangelical School of Theology, Irving, TX

God So Loved the World: A Christology for Disciples. By Jonathan R. Wilson. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2001, 213 pp., \$16.99 paper.

Wilson starts by stating his indebtedness to Julian Hartt (author of *A Christian Critique of American Culture: An Essay in Practical Theology* [New York: Harper & Row, 1967]) and writes hoping to answer a letter from Hartt who asks Wilson, "What are you going to make of the kingdom of God?" (p. 9). The book has three major parts, but the kingdom of God, as defined and understood by Wilson, is the ongoing theme throughout the book.

Part 1 addresses Jesus' teachings concerning the kingdom of God, his fulfillment of messianic expectations derived from the OT, and his ontological identity as fully human and fully divine. Wilson relegates the kingdom of God to the present state of Christian affairs, equating it with eternal life and projecting no idea of a future, earthly, messianic kingdom. He surveys Christ's role as prophet, priest, and king and concludes that "[t]o be 'in Christ' is to be in the kingdom of God" (p. 58). Yet he never shows how to equate the two.

Part 2 considers certain forceful images of Christ, Jesus as Victor, Sacrifice, and Example. The image of Christ as conquering "Victor" shows that we are captive victims of humanity in sin's prison and bondage. Christ as "Sacrifice" is explained by considering Anselm's satisfaction theory of the atonement and Calvin's penal substitution theory. Under Christ as "Example," Wilson considers Abelard's example theory of the atonement and Friedrich Schleiermacher's concept of Christ's "God-consciousness." These images forcefully portray Christ's example of life and death and provide a basis for knowledge, love, and power in the Christian life.

Part 3 deals with the disciple's practice in response to Jesus and the gospel. For Wilson the kingdom is present. It is bigger than the church, yet distinct from it. The world is antagonistic to the kingdom. The church is faithful when following the precepts of the kingdom and declaring the kingdom to the world.

The book's value lies in the author's desire to show there is something bigger than oneself and more important than the church corporately. According to Wilson, the kingdom of God ("the place where Jesus' perfect rule is realized" [p. 187]) was revealed at Jesus' first coming and will be consummated at the second advent (p. 171). In this he objectifies the role of discipleship as one of loving obedience to Jesus' rule. While this may be satisfying to those who take an amillennial or postmillennial approach, it will dissatisfy and disappoint those who anticipate the joys of a real, literal, political, physical, earthly kingdom with Jesus on the throne of David. Wilson's book can be spiritually uplifting and informative if references to the kingdom of God are understood to be Christ's rule and the Holy Spirit's guidance in our lives.

Anthony B. Badger
Grace Evangelical School of Theology, Irving, TX

Gift Giver: The Holy Spirit for Today. By Craig S. Keener. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2001, 224 pp., \$16.99.

Craig Keener has won respect within the evangelical precincts of NT scholarship on the merits of his vast encyclopedic knowledge within his areas of research, his seemingly inexhaustible command of bibliographic resources, the meticulously conscientious quality of his scholarly endeavors, the reliability of his exegesis, and the fresh insights he has brought to several arenas of ongoing discussion. Predictably, some of those features are reflected in this work. The main intent of the author is clear. At a time when confusion prevails in churches regarding the relevance of the Holy Spirit to their lives and ministries, Keener wants to formulate a perspective that is moderately conciliatory while challengingly reformist. No mean task for an author known for his irenic approach to porcupine issues.

To bring some order out of this pneumatological chaos, the author first takes on gently the nay-sayers by insisting that the indwelling presence of the Holy Spirit must be recognized and cultivated through the practice of the spiritual disciplines for God's voice to be heard on a personal basis. In terms of ministry, he shows rather convincingly that the gifts of the Spirit were not intended to be time-bound but that they remain essential in sustaining the functioning and the outreach of the contemporary local church. In the process, it is made clear that the spiritual gifts are not provided for individual gratification but for the prosecution of the interests of the kingdom through the advancement of ministry at the level of local communities.

No serious study on the Holy Spirit can avoid dealing with the controversial sticking points of the baptism of the Spirit and speaking in tongues. Keener's handling of these topics may well represent the major contribution of the book. In both cases, he conducts an exegetical *tour de force* that enables him to present a mediating view that will either satisfy opposite sides of the contention or neither. On the basis of the biblical texts that refer to the baptism of the Spirit as a specific time event fulfilled at Pentecost, Spirit baptism is defined as a blessing universally available to believers and concomitant with their conversion. However, because of NT references that describe the Spirit's outpouring on believers, the concept of Spirit baptism is also extended to cover post-conversion

experiences. Keener's pragmatic solution to the contention is that the chronology of the experience is not as important as its results: empowerment to effect spiritual development, to perform kingdom ministry, and to reach out in effective witness. The treatment of glossolalia is similarly conciliatory. While the blessing of tongues is legitimately available today, it does not constitute an evidence of spirituality or even of salvation. Speaking in tongues is a divine gift that enriches prayer life, but it is not a condition for spiritual empowerment.

The numerous autobiographical references to the author's charismatic experiences and commitments that are interspersed in the body of the book should give him high credentials with readers within that tradition. They would be viewed as an aberration by anti-charismatics and as a curiosity by non-charismatics. This fact alone and the hortatory zeal that permeates the author's presentation seem to indicate that the book was primarily written as a passionate call for charismatics not to isolate themselves from the mainstream of evangelicalism.

Gilbert Bilezikian
Wheaton College, Wheaton, IL

Icons of Evolution: Science or Myth? Why Much of What We Teach About Evolution Is Wrong. By Jonathan Wells. Washington, D.C.: Regnery, 2000, 338 pp., \$27.95.

"As I was finishing my Ph.D. in cell and development biology . . . I noticed that all of my textbooks dealing with evolutionary biology contained a blatant misrepresentation," writes Jonathan Wells (p. xi). He is no stranger to the debate surrounding Darwinism and Christian theology. He earned a Ph.D. in religious studies from Yale, where he wrote a book concerning nineteenth-century Darwinian controversies. He subsequently earned another Ph.D. from Berkeley in molecular and cell biology. In this work Wells compares well-known "icons" of evolution with published scientific evidence to demonstrate that much of what is taught about evolution is false and misleading. The main focus of the book is to examine the use of these icons in textbooks and classrooms so as to illustrate the manipulative way in which Darwinism is taught to the public. However, the book also points out that if Darwinists rely upon these icons as the evidence for their theory, then the false or misleading nature of these icons should call into question whether Darwinism is science or myth. In this way Wells elevates the debate to a new level of scientific accountability.

Wells examines ten well-known evidences commonly believed to prove Darwinism beyond a scientific shadow of doubt. Each chapter is a fascinating and revealing look at both the logical and empirical contradictions in these familiar proofs that have taken on the nature of icons for Darwinists. Wells deals fairly with the evidence and presents an up-to-date evaluation based on the writings of leading biologists and textbook writers. For instance, in the second chapter Wells looks at the Miller-Urey experiment that is often acclaimed as having produced life by simulating earth's early atmosphere. Wells points out that this experiment did not produce life but only simple amino acids, and the atmospheric conditions assumed in this project are not now believed to have existed. The atmosphere that is now believed (by Darwinists) to have existed on the early earth would not have allowed the production of amino acids in the way demonstrated by the experiment, due to the presence of oxygen. In the fourth chapter Wells identifies circular reasoning in the claim that similarity in vertebrate limbs proves a common ancestor. Because homology is defined by Darwinists as similarity due to a common ancestor, it cannot be used to prove a common ancestor. Even in light of this obvious case

of question begging, many textbooks use vertebrate limbs as examples of the evolutionary process. In chapter five Wells reveals that the picture of embryos drawn by Haeckel and used to support descent through modification is a fake. Wells claims that such experts as Stephen Jay Gould have known this for years and yet have not objected to their being used in textbooks as proof of Darwinism.

Continuing with examples, in the eighth chapter Wells explains that Darwin's finches do not offer support for descent through modification in that the adaptations to their environment fluctuate rather than progress towards a new species. The finches were documented as "evolving" thicker beaks during a drought brought on by *El Niño*, but their beaks returned to the original thickness when the drought ended. The finches also produce hybrids between the species, calling into question whether they are actually different species at all. Finally, Wells explores the evolution from apes to humans, which he calls the "ultimate icon." He quotes from Arizona State University anthropologist Geoffrey Clark: "We select among alternative sets of research conclusions in accordance with our biases and preconceptions—a process that is, at once, both political and subjective" (p. 223). Wells's argument here is that there is no objective proof for the relationship between apes and humans, and the common picture of five figures illustrating the move from hunched over ape to upright human is not based on evidence. Rather, this is materialist philosophy masquerading as empirical science. Wells argues that if such thinkers as Stephen Jay Gould and Richard Dawkins want to promote their materialist religion, they have that right to do so but not under the pretenses of science.

Wells states that the question for Darwinism is whether we can account for all species now existing through descent with modification. After examining these icons he concludes that the proof invariably found in biology textbooks is not objective empirical proof but rather subjective interpretation (at best) or outright fraud (at worst). Wells quotes Oxford historian John Duran in saying, "Could it be that, like 'primitive' myths, theories of human evolution reinforce the value-system of their creators by reflecting historically their image of themselves and of the society in which they live?" (p. 221). It is in this sense that these evidences for Darwinism are closer to myth than empirical science. In the last chapter "Science of Myth?" Wells points out how seriously close this comes to fraud, and quotes Phillip Johnson in saying that if a stock promoter were to engage in this sort of deception he would land in jail. This leaves open the question concerning what to do with biology textbooks that use this evidence to support what is a materialist philosophy rather than an empirical science. Wells gives a number of possible paths to take, including involving the government, putting warning labels on the misleading textbooks, and making the counter-evidence presented in this book known to as many people as possible. This includes experts in the field, as Wells points out that many of them are not aware of the problems he presents.

While this book makes a substantial contribution towards understanding the evidences used to support contemporary Darwinist cosmology, it does not purport to be a proof for a non-Darwinist position. While seriously undermining the empirical proof used to support Darwinism in modern textbooks, Wells does not put forward any arguments against the materialist philosophy that he sees behind the Darwinist agenda. This does not leave the book wanting; it impressively fulfills its stated purpose. However, this reviewer finished the book wondering whether the best approach to this issue is through evidences. It seems doubtful that the Darwinian cosmology will be removed from its place of cultural authority without Christianity first taking philosophical materialism captive to Christ by showing that the material world reveals the eternal power and divine nature of God.

Owen Anderson
Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ

Religion and the New Republic: Faith in the Founding of America. By James. S. Hutson, ed. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2000, viii + 213 pp., \$22.95 paper.

In the face of supposed cultural decline, Americans often lament the disputed maxim that we have “drifted from our Christian roots.” Undisputed is the fact that religious faith, at least some form of it, played a role in the founding of America. The degree to which this faith influenced the founders is often misunderstood and misrepresented. Composed of papers delivered at a Library of Congress symposium in 1998, the essays in *Religion and the New Republic* examine, from a state and national perspective, the function of religion in the founding period.

Jon Butler, in “Revolutionary America Wasn’t a Christian Nation,” asserts that roughly a century prior to the American Revolution stark presentations of specifically Protestant Christianity came through an intensification of church/state relationships, revivalism, and denominational growth. Yet, as Butler convincingly argues, by the time of the Revolution roughly 80% of colonial adults were not church members. While the laws of America prompted citizens to Christian virtue, “the law did not measure the Christian commitment of the people” (p. 192).

Locating Christianity and its Jewish roots in the thinking of the Founding Fathers, Michael Novak shows the relationship of liberty to virtue, one that was informed by religious proclivities. He correctly observes that this type of thinking emerged not specifically because the founders were Christians (indeed, most of them were not) but because American society in general was biblically literate and the Founders understood that religion was indispensable to the success of the new republic. A civil society, they believed, rested upon a public virtue (reason), which was to be shaped by religion (revelation). Thus, the “religious and moral habits” of a nation’s people will establish its foundation, not the establishment of a national religion. Making these sentiments relevant in our own day, Novak accurately notes the Founders’ warning of eminent societal decay should the “nonestablishment of religion” be replaced by the “erasure of religion” in public life altogether.

Mark Noll seeks to establish the historical precedence for modern-day Protestant mobilization in “Evangelicals in the American Founding and Evangelical Political Mobilization Today.” Using survey data Noll argues that “evangelicalism turns out to have an interesting, but not overwhelming connection with political choice. By contrast, evangelical convictions that take shape in a conservative Protestant environment have a much stronger political connection” (p. 143). Weary of a pervading “secular America” and an encroaching federal government, Noll correctly notes that evangelicals mobilized in an effort “to reproduce their own culture sheltered from modernizing influences” (p. 145). In a valiant effort to produce a balanced understanding of the past, Noll says “better history” acknowledges that “the founders guidelines for religion and society came out of a situation that was much more theistic than some modern liberals admit, but also out of a situation that was much less explicitly Christian than modern evangelicals with it had been” (p. 154).

Catherine Brekus points out that eighteenth-century women were lauded for their “Zeal, Faith, Purity, Charity, [and] Patience” (p. 118) and far exceeded men in Protestant church membership. Yet, their *political* activity in ecclesiastical affairs was greatly curtailed. Only dissenting bodies (Baptists, Quakers, Separates) allowed women “gospel liberty” (p. 120). Interestingly, Brekus notes that a woman’s “gospel liberty” was composed of “[voting] in church meetings, serv[ing] on church disciplinary committees, choos[ing] new ministers, and speak[ing] as evangelists” (p. 120). Their pious, quiet morality was acknowledged as “the glue that held the republic together” (p. 124). Brekus brilliantly links these sentiments with the impetus for “women’s religious activism” that shaped discussions of slavery, children’s right, sexual morality, and temperance.

These early tremors in American culture paved the way for women's ecclesiastical and political equality to men.

Looking at the political and religious philosophies of James Adams, John Witte, Jr. tells the story of "A Most Mild and Equitable Establishment of Religion" in Massachusetts. Witte's keen observation that Adams would not sanction public funds for congregational ministers allowed Massachusetts delegates to conclude that "no subordination of any one sect or denomination shall ever be established by law" (p. 13). This confirmed Adams's "slender" establishment of public religion which was "tempered" by freedom of conscience. Witte convincingly links this weak structure of public religion to the 1833 ruling that "outlawed the institutional establishment of public religion" (p. 29) in Massachusetts.

Thomas Buckley reveals how church-state discussions in nineteenth-century Virginia factored into the larger national framework. Church-state policy as prescribed by Thomas Jefferson caused heated debate when Methodist deacon Humphry Billups was elected to the [lower] House of Delegates in 1826. Not a minister in any formal sense, Billups was twice denied his elected seat on the grounds that "the foregoing clauses shall not be so construed, as to permit any Minister of the Gospel, or Priest of any denomination, to be eligible to either House of the General Assembly" (p. 45). Buckley persuasively demonstrates how Virginia legislators sometimes took Jefferson out of context to provide support for or antagonism against formal religious establishment. By implication Buckley helps to shape twenty-first century discourse when he notes that the application of church-state issues "has and always will be culturally contextualized" (p. 55).

Along the same lines Daniel Driesbach chronicles the history of the "wall of separation" metaphor invoked in church/state discussions. Using Thomas Jefferson's historic letter to the Danbury (CT) Baptists, Driesbach highlights the political motivation behind the letter as Jefferson sought to "diffuse" pervading notions that he was an "enemy of religion." Like Buckley, Driesbach's instructive essay is pertinent to contemporary discussions as the "wall metaphor" has been subject to constitutional wrangling in our day.

This new and refreshingly balanced collection of essays by first-rate scholars is a must read not only for students of American history but for those who seek true understanding of how religion accented the birth of the United States. These essays help to expunge false notions of a "Christian America" while recognizing that religion was indeed active in the founding period.

Phillip L. Sinitiere
Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, TX

The Starting Point of Calvin's Theology. By George H. Tavard. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000, ix + 199 pp., \$20.00.

In this new interpretation of Calvin's early career, Reformation historian George Tavard focuses on Calvin's little-studied *Psychopannychia* written in 1534 but not published until 1542. This was Calvin's second treatise following his ill-fated commentary on Seneca's *De Clementia*. The *Psychopannychia* was a critique of the Anabaptist doctrine that after death the soul "sleeps" rather than coming into the direct presence of the Lord. In this book, Tavard seeks to discover the origins of Calvin's theology, arguing that it developed out of the broad humanist training that he gained at the University

of Paris. Tavad asserts that Calvin remained within the fold of reformed-minded Roman Catholics and that, only later around 1535, did he join forces with the Protestants in their anti-papal diatribes.

Tavad seeks to answer why Calvin, the author of the classic theological treatise *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, would devote his first theological work to the peripheral doctrine of soul sleep. His main protagonist, after all, was the Roman Catholic Church. Tavad speculates that Calvin might have been concerned by the state of his own soul. Furthermore, the *Institutes*, following Augustine, are organized around the topics of the knowledge of God and the knowledge of the self. If we are to know God, we must first understand ourselves, and it would make sense that the issue of the immortality of the soul would be a good starting point for Calvin in his foray into theology.

One very interesting aspect of Calvin's authorship of this treatise is that, prior to its publication, he sent it to some very well-known reformers such as Wolfgang Capito and Martin Bucer for comment. Capito discouraged the publication of this work, arguing that it would provide undue publicity for a little-known sect and might actually promote the idea of soul sleep. In any case, Tavad speculates that Calvin probably revised the treatise based on comments from these experts but delayed publication until 1542, well after the first edition of the *Institutes*. After the initial publication, Calvin revised the work again, and it was republished in Strasbourg in 1545. It should be noted that the book was published in Latin, indicating that it was designed primarily for an academic audience. Calvin finally came out with a French translation in 1558 at the request of Guillaume Farel, and it sold well.

The issue of the immortality of the soul was an important issue in the high Middle Ages when the Christian world came into contact with the full body of Aristotelian literature. Major theologians such as Thomas Aquinas attempted to "Christianize" Aristotle on such issues as immortality. Bonaventure had denounced Aristotle for rejecting immortality, while Aquinas so revered the "philosopher" that he argued that Aristotle did, indeed, believe in the immortality of the soul. While Bonaventure was correct on the matter, it points to an area of overlap between theology and philosophy in which there seemed to be significant contradictions that any respectable theologian had to resolve. Tavad analyzes Calvin's work on immortality within the tradition of medieval literature on the subject.

In the *Psychopannychia*, Calvin dealt with three major options concerning the state of the soul after death: (1) The soul sleeps and is unconscious as it awaits the resurrection of the dead at the end of times; (2) at death, both the soul and body die, but are brought back together at the resurrection; (3) the soul lives in the presence of God and performs spiritual acts that do not require the presence of the body until its final resurrection. Calvin chose the third option arguing that the soul is a unique substance in and of itself and apart from the body. If the soul were not a substance, it could not survive the death of the body. In this view, the soul after death possesses awareness and intelligence. A key biblical passage to support Calvin's view is 1 Pet 3:19 where Christ preached to the dead. Since Christ preaches to them, they must have the ability to understand and, therefore, could not be asleep.

The author goes into great detail of how Calvin interacted with his medieval forebears of the mystical tradition, important figures such as St. Bonaventure and Richard of St. Victor. Calvin at times disagreed with his predecessors, but also borrowed much from them. For example, he agreed with the mystical tradition that the soul makes progress in this life, but all of the divine gifts are not provided at the same time. The soul must also wait until after death to receive some of these gifts.

Tavad, in a broader sense, is interested in the catholicity of the early Calvin. The *Psychopannychia* was not a polemical anti-Catholic treatise, and when it was finally published in 1542, after Calvin's return to Geneva and after the *Reply to Sadoletto*,

Calvin did not edit it to include anti-Roman Catholic material. In addition, the author interprets Calvin's description of his "sudden conversion," as detailed in the preface to his 1557 *Commentary on the Psalms*, to a true piety rather than to the Reformation cause. As a result, Tavard sees in the early Calvin one who was not predisposed against the Roman church, but one who truly desired to grow closer to God without regard for institutional affiliation.

Tavard goes on to interpret the early editions of the *Institutes* within an ecumenical context. Calvin's objections to the Roman system were not that substantial and focused primarily on the late-medieval language of merit, which Calvin saw as essentially semi-Pelagian. Tavard argues that Calvin could have found much affinity within the diversity of Roman Catholic thought on this topic, and this might have provided a basis for some kind of reconciliation with Rome.

Tavard has composed an interesting argument based on Calvin's early thought for providing a basis for agreement among the Protestant and Roman traditions. In my opinion he overstates his case by arguing that Calvin had two sudden conversions, one to the humanist tradition within Roman Catholicism and the other to the partisan cause of the Reformation. I see no evidence of a "two-conversion" theory. Calvin's early writings reflect the desire to reform the abuses of the late-medieval church and to restore it to a purer form in continuity with the apostolic era. The later anti-Roman polemics arose out of specific controversies such as Bishop Sadoletto's letter to the Genevans and the need for a formal response to the charge that the early Protestants were theological innovators. Here, Calvin argued that the Reformers taught a theology that was clearly reflected in Scripture and in the early church. This is a fundamental argument in favor of the Reformation and one that we must still keep close to our hearts as evangelicals.

Martin I. Klauber

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

The Papacy: An Encyclopedia. By Philippe Levillain, general editor. 3 vols. New York and London: Routledge, 2002. Vol. 1, xxxiv + 613 pp.; vol. 2, vii + 611 pp.; vol. 3, vii + 380 pp.; \$395.

This formidable three-volume set impresses at first sight by its size, its weight, the quality of the materials used, perhaps even by its striking color (lavender), and even more by the list of contributors, which fills six pages with more than two hundred names, all of them persons of competence. The original French-language edition of 1994 was inspired by events of the year 1978, the year of three popes. When Pope Paul VI died (August 6), John Paul I was elected (August 26) but died only a month later (his funeral was September 28). John Paul II was elected on October 16 and has been in office since then.

Evidently the project of producing a massive encyclopedia on the papacy was motivated in part by the perception, after the Second Vatican Council of 1962–65, that the papacy and the Church were in a crisis. After the death of Pope Pius XII, his successor, Paul VI, at first attracted favorable attention for socially sensitive and progressive ideas, but he created a shock when he promulgated *Humanae vitae* on July 25, 1968. This strong restatement of the Roman Catholic position on contraception led to widespread dissatisfaction and opposition within the Church. Unable to deal with the controversy, Paul issued no more encyclicals after *Humanae vitae*. When he died ten years

later, much of the Church hoped for a breath of fresh air with his successor. The hopes that John Paul I aroused were rudely shattered by his death only weeks later.

The election of the first non-Italian pope since the Reformation, the unusually gifted and courageous Karol Wojtyła, Archbishop of Cracow, surprised a Catholic and general public already shocked by the sudden death of his predecessor. At the time of Cardinal Wojtyła's accession, it was widely felt, both within the Church and outside of it, that the papacy and with it the entire Roman Catholic Church was in a crisis from which it would be difficult to emerge. The new pope surprised the world with his vitality, energy, and originality. Regarded as a progressive moderate during Vatican II, he soon appeared as more than that, for he combined new departures of various kinds with a strong commitment to Catholic tradition, including veneration of the Virgin Mary, traditional sexual morality, and priestly celibacy. To all these he has held firmly in the face of all obstacles. John Paul II was to be the storm center for change and transformation in Church and state (v. Poland and the USSR). The fact that the papacy could play such a role in world affairs and *Realpolitik* in the twentieth century certainly helps to explain the intense energy devoted to his massive project.

The choice of the popes to be covered (all of them) in this three-volume work is not surprising; but the choice of some of the lesser people and things is. Some surprising details appear, and many that might have been expected do not. For example, the first entry, "Abbreviator," tells of lesser officials, scribes employed as assistants to the papal notaries and given the task of drafting, in an abbreviated form, the minutes of a document before it was to be recopied in its final form. The office was abolished by Pope Pius X (1903–1914); it is mentioned here only to say that there is no evidence that any abbreviator was ever at work on this *maximum opus*.

The entry on John Paul II is one of the longest (seven pages), compared, for example, to three pages for the pope famous for his social thought, Leo XIII (1878–1903). Both articles are by the general editor, Philippe Levillain. His article on John Paul II includes a very thorough bibliography with several entries in English. For comparison, the first pope to confront Martin Luther, Leo X (1513–1521), receives only three pages. Luther, for his part, is not in the table of contents, although together with England's King Henry VIII and numerous others he appears in the entry on the Reformation.

Some people and institutions that profoundly affected the Roman Church and its head are barely mentioned, if they appear at all. The Emperor Constantine the Great is prominent, but to find his Holy Roman successor Charles V it is necessary to consult the general index. The same is true of John Hus and the Hussite movement, which might be regarded as the first enduring challenge to papal authority before 1517. The Reformers Martin Luther and John Calvin do not appear in the list of entries, but they receive fair treatment in the six-page entry "Reformation (1517–65)." This article goes on to end with a note of hope (from the Roman Catholic perspective) represented by a brief introduction to the Catholic counter-attacks at the Council of Trent and afterwards. Wittenberg, where the trouble started, is not an entry, not even in the index, but Rome, from the republic to the modern city, is treated very fully indeed, perhaps a reflection of the fact that this church really is Roman.

The Papacy is comprehensive and thorough, even if selective, with an entry for every pope, including the fictional female Pope, Joan. "Abbreviator" aside, there are other interesting articles and omissions. After the long and very solid entry on the Emperor Constantine, there is a reliable discussion of the *Donation of Constantine*, i.e., of the document attributed to him and addressed to Pope Silvester I, supposedly granting the successor of St. Peter primacy over "all the churches in all the world" as well as "all provinces, palaces and districts of the city of Rome and Italy and of the regions of the West." This document is not attested before the middle of the ninth century, and its gen-

uineness was hotly contested from an early date, but it continued to have influence until it was rather thoroughly demolished by the humanist Lorenzo Valla in 1440. It was not officially abandoned by Rome until the nineteenth century. Valla's publication by the German humanist Ulrich von Hutten in 1518–19 is mentioned, an example both of the authors' attention to detail and of their willingness to expose problems in the institution they clearly admire, the infallibility of which is nevertheless succinctly presented in a way presupposed in a seven-page entry, "Infallibility."

The Papacy gives evidence of high quality throughout. After criticizing its selectivity, it is necessary to remember that it is the papacy that not only is the subject of but also the inspiration for this impressive work. French scholarship is most frequently represented, and there are many German contributions as well as articles by scholars from other nations. The Continental orientation of the work is evident from the bibliography appended to each article, with a predominance of references to works in French, followed by those in German, Italian, and only occasionally in English. The flavor is that of the French academic world, where a particular kind of precision is favored more than it is in our Anglophone circles.

As would be expected, this encyclopedia leaves the reader with a high opinion of the papacy. It does not gloss over unsavory details such as numerous bastard offspring of professedly celibate popes and countless other cases where not even the mandates of the gospel, not to speak of the vows of celibacy and poverty, were kept. Because the papacy has been deeply involved with the state(s) from the time of Constantine the Great onwards, the authors frequently offer its preoccupation with important political matters at least as circumstances to mitigate our condemnation of particular pontiffs. With respect to Pope Honorius I (625–38), whose acceptance of the compromise with monophysitism expressed in the *Ekthesis pisteos* of the Emperor Heraclitus led to his condemnation at the Council of Constantinople in 680 and furnished ammunition for those who would oppose papal infallibility twelve centuries later, the entry is very discreet. All this is mentioned, but the shadow it cast on the doctrine of papal infallibility promulgated at the first Vatican Council is not, even though the *causa Honorii* led to the succession of "Old Catholic" groups. The encyclopedia manages to say good things even about the most notorious pope of all, Alexander VI Borgia (1492–1503), who "conscientiously handled his papal obligations," was enthusiastic about the Crusades, and was popular with pilgrims. *De mortuis nil nisi bonum*.

It appears that the great majority of the contributors is made up of Roman Catholics, although they are not identified as such. Some authors will be recognized as belonging to other confessions. Even more than the preponderance of French names—and of course being French is anything but a guarantee of being Christian, not to mention orthodox or true to the papacy—is the fact that critical details are not ignored but dealt with in an evenhanded way, and for the popes at least, mitigating circumstances are regularly offered. It cannot be said that *The Papacy* conceals all disgraceful details, but it does not place them on center stage. In fairness we must note a similar evenhandedness in its dealing with the Protestant Reformers, whose treatment at the hands of other Catholic historians is not always charitable.

For the student of church history, these three volumes commend themselves for the accuracy and balance that they exhibit on every subject chosen. For the Protestant, it will be a bit disappointing in view of what is left out or skimmed over. For me, it was a pleasure to consult, reminding me of what it is like to do research in books rather than on the Internet. It will certainly be an asset to any good library.

Harold O. J. Brown
Reformed Theological Seminary, Charlotte, NC

Thy Nature and Thy Name is Love: Process and Wesleyan Theologies in Dialogue. Edited by Bryan P. Stone and Thomas J. Oord. Nashville: Kingswood, 2001, 396 pp., \$25.00 paper.

This book continues a dialogue that has emerged during the past generation between process and Wesleyan theologies, featured so far only in the pages of the *Wesleyan Theological Journal* and a previous Kingswood book (Theodore Runyon, ed., *Wesleyan Theology Today: A Bicentennial Theological Consultation*, 1985). This is an important conversation to which evangelicals need to pay attention, especially given the current debate regarding open theism within evangelical circles. Given the synergistic model that informs Wesleyan thinking regarding the God-world relationship, the attraction of many Wesleyans to relational theologies should come as no surprise. As such, that Wesleyan thinkers have been exploring the benefits and debits of process philosophy for the theological task reflects their long-standing quest for a metaphysics that undergirds John Wesley's own vision for a "reasonable faith."

As this volume documents, such a quest is rooted deep within the Wesleyan tradition, receiving its impulses from Wesley himself and continuing through early Wesleyan theologies such as those of Richard Watson and William Burt Pope (as traced by Randy Maddox in his essay "Seeking a Response-able God"). This quest intensified with the emergence of personalist alongside process philosophical visions during the late nineteenth and into the twentieth centuries (as Oord demonstrates in "Wesleyan Theology, Boston Personalism, and Personal Thought"). The contemporary dialogue has continued to explore the viability of a process-Wesleyan convergence without abandoning the convictions of classical and personalist Wesleyan thought.

Upon perusing the list of contributors, it may surprise some evangelical readers to find that all of the essayists of this volume write and theologize from within the Wesleyan tradition. This includes well-known advocates of process philosophy such as Schubert Ogden ("Process Theology and the Wesleyan Witness"), Marjorie Hewitt Suchocki ("Coming Home: Wesley, Whitehead, and Women"), Tyron L. Inbody ("Reconceptions of Divine Power in John Wesley: Panentheism and Trinitarian Theology"), Jay McDaniel (with John L. Farthing: "Wesleyan Theology, Process Theology, and Consumerism"), and John B. Cobb, Jr. ("Human Responsibility and the Primacy of Grace"). Yet the Wesleyan sympathy for process modes of thought is also expressed by many others. Stone writes about "Process and Sanctification." Maddox's essay dovetails well with Cobb's, except that the former is more historical and the latter more theological. Oord's other contribution is an attempt to develop a process Wesleyan theodicy focused on "Freedom, Embodiment and the Almighty God." Michael E. Lodahl explores "Creation Out of Nothing? Or is *Next* to Nothing Enough?" from biblical, theological, and philosophical perspectives. John Culp sounds out a Wesleyan process epistemology, and Kenton M. Stiles develops a Wesleyan process aesthetics.

The foregoing essays are robustly conceived at the theoretical level. At the same time, the fecundity of the process-Wesleyan theological convergence for Christian praxis is also evident from the essays in this volume. Besides the contributions of Suchocki, Stone, and McDaniel, there are also essays on ecumenism ("Black Theology and a More Protestant Approach to Wesleyan-Process Dialogue," by Theodore Walker, Jr.), pastoral and spiritual praxis ("Compassion and Hope: Theology Born of Action," by Mary Elizabeth Mullino Moore), and social responsibility ("Spirituality and Social Transformation: Perspectives on Wesleyan and Process Theologies," by Henry James Young). In each case, central soteriological, ecclesiological, and practical themes are developed drawing from both Wesleyan and Whiteheadian paradigms of interpretation.

That the conversation is genuinely dialogical in this volume is best exemplified both by the fact that Wesleyan adoption of process perspectives is critically undertaken and

by the fact that Wesleyan perspectives are in turn brought to bear in the transformation of process ideas. The former approach is most evident in the admonitions by Alan Padgett ("Putting Reason in Its Place: Wesleyan Theology or Ontotheology?") and Samuel M. Powell ("A Trinitarian Alternative to Process Theism") that are intended to temper Wesleyan enthusiasm with process metaphysics. The latter approach is seen in the detailed attention paid to Wesley's biblical theology, especially in his sermons, by almost all essayists in exploring the possibilities of a Wesleyan-process collaboration.

For those who are looking for stimulating theology, this volume is a must. This is creative, exploratory, and cutting-edge theology (only two of the seventeen essays—those of Ogden and Suchocki—have been previously published), if such be defined as the attempt to reflect on and witness to the gospel in contemporary idiom. My only recommendation for the revised edition (if one follows) is the compilation of both a person and subject index.

Amos Yong
Bethel College, St. Paul, MN

The God Who May Be: A Hermeneutics of Religion. By Richard Kearney. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2001, ix + 172 pp., \$19.95 paper.

In *The God Who May Be*, Richard Kearney proposes a new definition of God that he is willing to "wage" will help solve the problems he sees in historic theism. He has studied with such thinkers as John Caputo and Jacques Derrida, and their influence is visible. Kearney's goal is to encourage humans to live in a way that reflects love and justice, and in so doing this makes the possible God increasingly actual. He gives three reasons to support his view and to give it viability. First, it will help us overcome our prejudices by reminding us that there is no preprogrammed future and that the job of making the Word become flesh is not finished. Second, it solves the problem of freedom and evil in that God does not know the future but is hoping for the best outcome with us. Third, it explains how the impossible can be possible—how we can have hope that justice will be made actual out of the now present injustice and despair. These reasons serve as support for Kearney's position but also reveal key assumptions that shape his thinking and the criteria he uses to judge a system's truth or falsity. The following review will explain this book by focusing on Kearney's thesis, exploring his method and an example of its application, and finally taking note of Kearney's phenomenological approach. Kearney's view of God differs in important ways from historic theism; as such, it indicates the direction that contemporary thinking about God is taking, particularly in phenomenological circles.

Kearney opens with this introduction: "God neither is nor is not but may be. That is my thesis in this volume" (p. 1). He concedes that his perspective is phenomenological, that this shapes his interests and desires in terms of constructing a worldview, and that this affects how he approaches the text of Scripture. His desire is to revive a philosophical question from the stagnation it has suffered due to the scholastic metaphysics: "In this wager, I subscribe to that new turn in the contemporary philosophy of religion which strives to overcome the metaphysical God of pure act and ask the question: what kind of divinity comes after metaphysics?" (p. 2). It does seem to be the case that the God "proven" by the scholastics is not the God of the Bible but rather the God of the philosophers. However, the view that Kearney wishes to replace appears to include historic theism (such as the doctrine of God found in the *Westminster Confession*). He supports his view of God as opposed to other possible views by claiming that it best realizes

the three points noted above. While Kearney's hope to reopen the question of God should be encouraged, he appears to struggle with some of the traditional questions within theism without explaining why he rejects the answers that have been given. If his answer is that the historic position does not give us the three points mentioned above, his argument becomes circular in that these points are used to prove his view of God, and then his view of God is used to show us that these points are desirable.

Kearney defines his method thus: "My approach remains, in spite of invoking several scriptural and patristic texts, that of a phenomenological-hermeneutic retrieval rather than that of theological exegesis *per se*" (p. 39). This comes out clearly in his explanation of Moses and the burning bush; this account is used to show how a person changes after an encounter with the possible God. In this case, Kearney tells us that Moses longed for the God of justice and liberty and wondered if the god who spoke to him from the burning bush was just such a god or was instead the mercurial tribal god who spoke to Abraham and Jacob. Here again is circularity in that Kearney's reading of the text only makes sense from the phenomenological perspective, but then this reading is used to support his view of God and thus validate his method. God says to Moses in Exod 3:6: "I am the God of your father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." Because Kearney is only concerned with the personal, subjective effect on Moses, however, he does not address this point in the text but gives a mental dialogue of his own that he attributes to Moses. It seems difficult to believe that Moses would have had this dialogue in Exod 3:14 if he had believed what God said in v. 6. But given the phenomenological approach adopted to Kearney, such textual alterations are not a concern as long as the new reading supports the proposed view of God. Once again this phenomenological approach leads to circularity and presses the question to a more basic level: why adopt phenomenology as an epistemological method?

Furthermore, the results of love and justice for which Kearney aims are kept out of reach by his phenomenological approach. It seems appropriate to ask just what love and justice are. Phenomenology does not appear to be able to provide definitions for these terms in that it can only rely on the personal and subjective for proof. A common problem for phenomenology is that it makes communication impossible (in that communication involves propositions). The transformation of the person, which is the aim of many phenomenological systems, is brought about by a subjective experience. By its very nature such an experience cannot be explained to another person, even if that person claims to also have had an experience (once the experience is said to "mean" something, this meaning is expressed in propositional form). This means that the individual who has been transformed cannot purport to tell others what to look for, nor can he tell others that this experience gives objectively true knowledge. Any such explanation or claim is an interpretation of an experience, and other possible interpretations can be given; the question is not whether there was an experience, but which interpretation is true. If the phenomenological account of personal transformation is correct, the individual who has been transformed cannot tell the rest of us what to look for, because he will not know what subjective states in us will correspond to his own experience. The philosopher who proposes such a system cannot even hope to successfully communicate his ideas, in that he does not know what experience his words will cause in the other person. For this reason many who adopt this position or similar positions make the move to silence.

To conclude, while Kearney's desire to reopen the question of God is a good idea, the method of phenomenology does not provide a successful format in which to do so. Without raising exegetical questions about the text or even utilizing historic responses to similar views of God, the circularity involved in establishing this position needs to be worked out. Why should this view be adopted? Why should these three points (noted above) be the standard for a system? What is justice and love? Ultimately, these issues

must be resolved in the question "How do we know?" If there are remaining problems in the historic Christian view of God (as set forth, for example, in the *Westminster Confession of Faith*) they must be solved through a greater understanding of how God has made himself known to humanity. The apostle Paul affirms that God is known through general revelation, and this is not a bare knowledge but involves God's eternal power and divine nature. As the Church strives for unity, a greater understanding of God's nature as revealed in general revelation is required to avoid the inherent problems of systems like phenomenology.

Owen J. Anderson
Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ

The Future as God's Gift: Explorations in Christian Eschatology. Explorations in Contemporary Theology series. Edited by David Fergusson and Marcel Sarot. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000, ix + 252 pp., \$29.95 paper.

The Future as God's Gift is an annual volume in the Explorations in Contemporary Theology series, produced by the Society for the Study of Theology. Each year the Society's annual conference is theme-centered; Christian eschatology (the theme of its 1999 meeting at the University of Edinburgh) clearly played off the fascination with Y2K. From the proceedings of that conference, certain papers and responses were selected for inclusion, along with two essays solicited for this volume.

To overview the sixteen chapters that comprise the volume, following an introduction by Fergusson there are six main papers, three conference responses, four short papers, and the two solicited essays. The most noteworthy are the following: (1) the Society's presidential paper by Anthony Thiselton, "Signs of the Times: Toward a Theology for the Year 2000 as a Grammar of Grace, Truth and Eschatology in Contexts of So-Called Postmodernity"; (2) Richard Bauckham and Trevor Hart's "The Shape of Time"; (3) a translated essay by Jurgen Moltmann, "Is the World Coming to an End or Has Its Future Already Begun? Christian Eschatology, Modern Utopianism and Exterminism"; (4) the conference's "Dogmatic Theses on Eschatology," as edited by Colin Gunton; (5) Niels Henrik Gregersen's "The Final Crucible: Last Judgement and the Dead-End of Sin"; and (6) Christoph Schwobel's concluding "Last Things First: The Century of Eschatology in Retrospect."

The strengths of *The Future as God's Gift* are many. First, this volume is rich in fresh and creative theological reflection, some of which was helpful for the extraordinarily eschatologically-curious period just before the year 2000. Second, Thiselton's critique of the different forms of postmodernism in the American vs. the European contexts is insightful, particularly his assertion that the American brand is basically neopragmatic. Third, Bauckham and Hart's treatment of issues related to understanding time is appropriate, especially given the bold advances of the openness of God viewpoint on this front. Fourth, it was interesting to track Peter Scott's thinking as he expanded eschatology to include ecology. Much of what he developed, however, was well beyond the bounds of an evangelical theological comfort zone. Indeed, some of it steers close enough to a perception of pantheism that Scott feels it necessary to state in so many words, "This is not pantheism" (p. 105). Fifth, Van den Brom's assertion that the theological perspectives of Pannenberg and Moltmann are "determinism without decrees" (see esp. pp. 163-65) is an angle worth pursuing. Sixth, Schobel's survey of "The Century of Eschatology," though offering relatively few fresh or piercing insights on any of the major developments, does conclude with five thoughtful lessons from the many

and varied eschatological twists and turns of the 1990s that should be considered “before we can discuss the opening hours of the eschatological office in the twenty-first century” (p. 241).

Several weaknesses stand out as well. First, there is astonishingly little in-depth biblical exegesis. Of the 241 pages of text, only about 40 of them (some 16%) contain any sort of biblical reference, and half the chapters in the book make no obvious use of Scripture. So, while there is much creative and in-depth theological reflection in this volume, if (as is traditionally understood) theology is no stronger than the exegesis upon which it is founded, then much if not most of the theology articulated in this volume appears to lack foundation. Second, a good bit of the theological reflection is apparently pushing ongoing issues of theological trendiness on the British/European scene. These issues include annihilationism, feminism (and wider liberation theologies, notably the thinly-veiled vantage point of Kim Yong-Bock’s “Practice of Hope: The Messianic Movement of the People Who Practice Hope in Asia”), and ecology. Third, the philosophically-fueled discussion about hell, by Gregersen (see above) and Wilko van Holten (in his “Eschatology with a Vengeance: Hell as the Greatest Conceivable Evil”), although fairly interesting, ranges far from a solid biblical mooring. Though Gregersen does discuss key Scriptural references early on in his essay, it is highly unlikely to be merely coincidence that, when he arrives at the point of laying out the annihilationist theory he champions, all biblical references disappear. Fourth, oddly, there is very little here that deals with what most American evangelicals would consider staple eschatological issues. Yes, the second advent, the kingdom of God, and life after death are assumed and alluded to, but that is the full extent of their treatment, even in the “Dogmatic Theses on Eschatology.” It is not at all clear as to whether these topics are viewed as mere launching pads to other more interesting issues or as simply passé (or something in between). Overall, therefore, while the various treatments of eschatology in *The Future as God’s Gift* are without question cutting edge, my concern is that much of what is developed appears to have been cut loose from any regulative historic theological rooting.

This volume was clearly designed for the elite ranks of vocational theologians and advanced degree students in that arena. Evangelical theologians should read it, perhaps as much for the analyses and critiques of various contemporary theological and philosophical positions that significantly impact those teaching and doing theology today as anything else. If nothing else, it will help prevent the ever-present tendency to be provincial in our perspective. For those among us who hold to a minutely-detailed doctrinal stance on eschatology, it is healthy to remember that to stretch our thinking and capacity is not the same thing as to broaden our belief structure.

A. Boyd Luter
The Criswell College, Dallas, TX

Sovereign Grace: The Place and Significance of Christian Freedom in John Calvin’s Political Thought. By William R. Stevenson, Jr. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999, xii + 200 pp., \$49.95.

This is an interesting book that views Calvin from a different angle than many other recent monographs, probably because the author is a political scientist rather than a theologian or a historian. Stevenson attempts to build on Ralph Hancock’s work *Calvin and the Foundations of Modern Politics* (1989). He disagrees with Hancock’s argument that Calvin’s emphasis on predestination and divine sovereignty robs the public arena

of spiritual purpose. For Stevenson, the concept of Christian freedom served as the basis for Calvin's political views and as a bridge between his theology and his politics. Rather than limiting the involvement of believers' involvement in the public arena, Christian freedom provides the foundation for participation.

The theme of freedom and slavery is a central issue of theology, and so it is not surprising that it was crucial to Calvin's system. Luther dealt with the issue as well in his treatise *Two Kinds of Righteousness*. How can Christians truly be free while they are responsible to follow at least the moral aspects of the Law? Christian freedom binds believers more closely to God himself as the source of our strength. Calvin developed his doctrine of the third use of the law whereby the moral law, rather than the ceremonial law, is binding upon the hearts of believers. Once they are freed from the penalty of sin, which provides both joy and embarrassment, they are able to respond to God in gratitude by obeying his commands. It becomes their natural desire to fulfill their responsibility before God. There is no conflict between law and gospel because the gospel fulfills the law.

A second aspect of Christian freedom is the activity of believers in the world toward their neighbors. Christians are freed to act for the greater good of society as they obey God's command to love their neighbor as themselves. Furthermore, while believers are freed from the penalty that sin warrants, they are continually aware of the holiness and judgment of God. Although Christians are free to act, they remain under God's watchful eye. The role of the civil government is to promote peace and tranquility. The government also possesses the power of the sword to coerce individuals into proper behavior and to punish them for misdeeds. Calvin believed strongly in the role of the godly magistrate to work with the church in this endeavor. The government should reflect and channel God's earthly care.

The Consistory was an institution that combined the services of both members of church and state. One issue with which Calvin had to deal was gaining the right for the Consistory to excommunicate unruly church members. The Consistory was not granted this right until late in Calvin's career, in 1559. The church, by contrast, supplied the checks and balances on civil government. The church did not carry out corporal punishment, but exercised moral authority.

Stevenson goes on to explain the historical dimension of Calvin's concept of freedom. God exercises his providence in both the political order and the created order. Sometimes believers do not understand why God does certain things; God hides himself for their good. There is an aspect of mystery in God's providence.

Christian freedom also frees believers from attachment to outward things. The author here goes on to describe Calvin's view on *adiaphora* in which believers are free to break local customs and traditions that are not biblically bound for all times and all places.

The most important political issue that Calvin faced was the legitimacy of resistance to a tyrannical king. The *Institutes* was addressed to the French King Francis I and was framed in rhetorical fashion to convince the King of the legitimacy of the Protestant cause. The hopeful result would be either the relaxing of French persecution against the Huguenots or even the conversion of the King to the Reformed movement.

Calvin made a distinction between legitimate and tyrannical government. Tyrannical rulers "give the reins to their lust, and think all things lawful to themselves" (*Comm. Dan.* 2:5). Lawful government administers the affairs of the state in good order (*Comm. Gen.* 49:10). Calvin argued that the victims of a tyrannical government should follow the example of Daniel to dissent from and disobey the government while not provoking it or participating in outright rebellion. In spite of the atrocities committed against the Huguenots, Calvin's voice for resistance was a call to moderation with the hope that the disputes between the French Protestants and the crown could be settled.

Elsewhere, however, Calvin seemed more vociferous in his calls for resistance. In the dedicatory letter to his commentary on the book of Daniel, a section added to the 1559 edition of the *Institutes* during a high point of persecution, Calvin condemned complacent moderates for not resisting the King more strenuously. Scholars have traditionally maintained that the 1559 argument indicates a change in Calvin's thinking. Calvin argued that, constitutionally, lesser magistrates have a legal right to resist tyranny. Calvin denounced the right of private individuals to resist. This lesser magistrate theory opened up the door for a full-fledged theory of resistance that gave rise in the next generation to the French wars of religion.

Professor Stevenson has provided a valuable study on this important topic. He interacts well with the secondary literature on the subject and has broadened our understanding of Calvin's view of Christian freedom.

Martin I. Klauber

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

Reformation and Scholasticism: An Ecumenical Enterprise. By Willem J. van Asselt and Eef Dekker, eds. Texts and Studies in Reformation and Post-Reformation Thought. General Editor, Richard A. Muller. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 2001, \$24.99. *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment.* By Carl R. Trueman and R. S. Clark, eds. Carlisle, U.K.: Paternoster, 1999.

Both of these recently published collections of essays focus on the issue of continuity and discontinuity in theology from the high middle ages through the post-Reformation era. Traditionally, much of the scholarly activity in the area of Reformation and post-Reformation theology has been confessionally based. This volume allows for a wide spectrum of scholarship to take a fresh look at this material from a broader perspective.

The reigning theological method from the twelfth century through the late seventeenth century was known as scholasticism with the interregnum of the Reformation being strongly influenced by humanism. With the development of humanism and the new emphasis on original sources, the Greek and Hebrew texts of the Bible served as the basis for a form of exegesis that challenged many of the doctrines that dominated the late medieval church. The 1550s, however, left Protestant scholars with the challenge of teaching theology in newly formed academies. These theologians had the responsibility of systematizing the exegetical theology of such founding figures as Luther and Calvin. They resorted to the method of teaching systematic theology—scholasticism—that they themselves had learned as students. This new Protestant scholasticism retained the same method used in the Roman Catholic schools, but adopted the doctrinal norms of the Reformation.

Historians have traditionally viewed the post-Reformation theologians as rigid and inflexible, advocating a dead dogmatism that obscured the vital Christocentric approach of the early reformers. This approach has focused on the discontinuity between the Reformation and post-Reformation era and finds its roots in the nineteenth century dogmatists such as Heinrich Heppé who argued that predestination served as the central and controlling doctrine in the theological systems of such important post-Reformation figures as Theodora Beza. Beza placed predestination at the beginning of his *Tabula praedestinationes*, before his discussion of the doctrines of creation and salvation. This organizational change from Calvin's positioning of the topic led, allegedly, to a rigid system controlled by the divine decrees. Such terms as "speculative" or

“rigid” were pejorative when compared to the adjectives such as “vital” or “Christocentric” applied to the writings of Luther and Calvin.

A fresh look at the issue of continuity and discontinuity between medieval scholasticism and the Reformation began with Paul Oscar Kristeller. He argued for a continuity of theological method based upon the integration of Aristotelian material into theology beginning in the twelfth century; this scholastic method reigned until the late seventeenth century, thereby providing an essential aspect of continuity. Kristeller’s outlook was continued in the 1960s by Heiko Oberman and David Steinmetz who moved beyond the surface of Luther’s rejection of the late medieval nominalists as “pige-theologians.” Richard Muller, in the 1980s, applied this approach of continuity to the post-Reformation era, debunking the theory that Calvin’s successors—Theodore Beza, for example—destroyed the vitality of the Reformation and reduced the faith to an intellectual acceptance of received doctrines.

Since Muller, a host of scholars have spent the last few decades sifting through the huge mass of writings of the post-Reformation scholastics, both Lutheran and Reformed, and have largely followed Muller’s lead in arguing for continuity between the first-generation reformers and their successors. As a result, we have gained a much clearer picture of how Christian thought developed in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. These two volumes add fresh insights and provide an important contribution to study in this field.

The first volume by Willem J. van Asselt and Eef Dekker includes contributions by mostly European scholars. The most intriguing aspect of this collection is the ecumenical twist that the authors bring to the table. The editors have included well-written essays arranged around important topics: (1) general discussion of the problem of the definition of scholasticism and its importance for the Reformation; (2) scholasticism in the medieval period and its relationship to Reformation and post-Reformation theology; (3) the use of scholasticism in post-Reformation and counter-Reformation debates; (4) individual examples of the use of scholasticism by important theologians of the post-Reformation period; and (5) the importance of the scholastic method for contemporary theology.

The first essay by Richard Muller encapsulates the current state of scholarship and points to areas of potential further research. Muller argues that the term *scholasticism* should be defined in the way that the sixteenth and seventeenth-century divines used it. They defined scholasticism as the setting and method of doing theology. Using this definition allows for the possibility of disagreement in terms of the content of theology among the major confessional groups—Reformed, Lutheran, and Roman Catholic—and creates the possibility of ecumenical dialogue on the subject. In the use of scholasticism, theologians examined theological topics or *loci* within the context of the Bible and patristic material. Reason was needed to formulate arguments, as theology was applied to debates with various opponents on the content of theology. This process was highly biblical and exegetical. Many of the post-Reformation scholastics also used aspects of humanism, especially the emphasis upon the return to original sources.

Muller warns that scholars who take the traditional approach for granted without doing the hard work of dealing firsthand with the post-Reformation material will find themselves on thin ice. Muller takes particular issue with Alister McGrath on this score for his comments in his book *Reformation Thought* in favor of a central dogma controlling the theological systems of the post-Reformation divines.

This collection covers all the bases with important essays on key post-Reformation Reformed figures such as John Owen, William Cunningham, Gisbertus Voetius, and Girolamo Zanchi. These essays highlight the fact that the post-Reformation scholastics made great use of the medieval writings of Aquinas and others. Many of these citations lauded these medieval forbears, thereby supporting the argument of continuity

between the medieval era and the post-Reformation period. Zanchi, for example, made extensive use of Aquinas and agreed on many of the essential aspects of his doctrine of predestination. Zanchi was not shy, however, about disagreeing with Aquinas's view that the believer is made worthy of eternal life through infused merit.

The collection also includes an important essay on Philip Melancthon, a key figure in the development of Lutheran scholasticism. Although he was trained as a humanist, in his *Loci communes* he organized his topics of theology in an orderly manner and provided the basis for systematizing Lutheran thought.

The importance of this collection is in its ecumenical breadth of contributions and in its fresh look at many significant figures of the post-Reformation era. The essays are well written, well documented and are a recommended read for anyone interested in this topic.

The second volume by Carl R. Trueman and R. S. Clark divides the contributions chronologically starting with D. V. N. Bagchi on Luther and scholasticism and David Steinmetz on Calvin and scholasticism. It moves through the eighteenth century when Enlightenment thought eclipsed the scholastic method and marked a new era in the development of Christian theology and the method of instruction in the Protestant academies.

The focus of these essays is to show continuity between late medieval thought, the Reformation period, and the post-Reformation era. For example, Steinmetz argues that, even though Calvin made great use of rhetoric in the *Institutes*, he did not ignore the need for scholastic argumentation. One of the main differences between Calvin and the medieval scholastics was the fact that Calvin commented on the un glossed Greek and Hebrew text rather than commenting on the glossed Latin. Furthermore, Calvin's theology was more exegetical with less recourse to philosophy than his late medieval predecessors. Another major difference was that Calvin saw the local parish as an appropriate venue for the discussion of theological topics; this required a more educated clergy than was the norm in the medieval period. Even Calvin, however, had to organize his theological discussion around topics and employed scholastic themes in many of his arguments. This included his discussion of predestination, in which he adopted many of his ideas from Scotus.

Richard Muller focuses on Beza's *Tabula*, arguing that the change in the order of discussion of the doctrine of predestination does not mark a change from Calvin. Part of the problem is chronological. Beza wrote his work quite early, in 1555, before the final edition of the *Institutes* was completed. Furthermore, Beza was simply following the apostle Paul's order of decrees in Romans 8 and 9. Muller concludes that Beza's doctrine of predestination was not a controlling central dogma.

Frank James, an expert on the theology of Peter Martyr Vermigli, argues that it is not fair to label Vermigli as a scholastic. Vermigli was one of the first-generation Reformers and had studied at the University of Padua where he learned under the tutelage of many humanists. Vermigli did make great use of the scholastic method, but his theology has much affinity for humanism, especially in his biblical exegesis.

Johannes Cocceius is another interesting figure of this era who has typically been portrayed as an "anti-scholastic." Cocceius is known for his emphasis upon exegetical theology as well as his diatribes against the scholastics. The author, however, argues that one must move beyond first impressions and shows that Cocceius did not condemn all of scholasticism, just a few extremists. In fact, Cocceius himself made use of scholastic methodology and fits in better than many have previously thought with his Reformed scholastic colleagues.

Donald Sinnema, in his article on Andreas Hyperius, argues that the best way to understand the nature of Reformed scholasticism is to see what these theologians themselves said about it. Hyperius made a distinction between popular and scholastic

theology, the former for the laity and the latter for formal students and experts on the subject. Hyperius also saw himself as working in continuity with his Reformation and late medieval predecessors.

There are only two essays on the development of Lutheran scholasticism, so the volume is heavily weighted toward the Reformed side of the ledger. This is unfortunate, because scholars such as Timothy Wengert and Robert Kolb have recently published much literature on the Lutheran side.

What is interesting about the articles in this volume is that the authors attempt to portray Reformers who are generally thought of as “scholastic” as “humanists” and those whom we think of as humanists as scholastics. The point is that almost no figure in this study was either totally scholastic or humanist. All scholars in the period had to make use of both methods; hence, there are some elements of continuity with the Reformation and other elements of discontinuity.

The obvious question is, why is all this discussion of scholasticism and humanism significant? Why should we care if there is continuity or discontinuity between medieval and Reformation thought? The main reason is the argument against theological innovation. The Reformers took great strides to place their ideas within the context of the history of Christian thought. Luther, therefore, did not invent the doctrine of justification by faith, but stood in succession in a long line of theologians going all the way back to the patristic era and Scripture itself. Calvin did not invent the doctrines of predestination and divine providence, and Beza did not markedly alter these doctrines.

Martin I. Klauber

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

Darwin's God: Evolution and the Problem of Evil. By Cornelius G. Hunter. Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2001, 192 pp., \$17.00.

“We need to understand the metaphysical interpretations that are attached to the scientific observations. We need to understand these things because, ultimately, evolution is not about the scientific details. Ultimately, evolution is about God” (p. 175). In this book biophysicist Cornelius Hunter demonstrates the religious nature of Darwinism and the way in which the so-called “empirical evidence” is interpreted to fit the Darwinist metaphysical presuppositions. His aim is to show that Darwin was troubled by the problem of evil: if God is perfect in power and goodness, why would he make a world like this? Darwin concluded that God would not have made the world as we see it, and hence another explanation must be given. But this is not a scientific discovery; it is a solution to the problem of evil. Darwin was giving a theodicy. As such, the author argues that Darwinism is based on the assumption that the world is full of misery and wickedness, and therefore it could not have been the product of special creation by a perfectly good/powerful God.

After explaining the aim of the book, Hunter devotes three chapters to the standard evidence advanced in support of Darwinism in order to show how the evidence is subjectively interpreted to support that theory. In the process, numerous instances of question begging are underscored, such as the use of homologies (similarities due to common descent) to prove evolution (common descent) and the use of small-scale evolution (variations within a species) to support the claim that, if enough time were given, it is conceivable these small-scale differences would result in large-scale evolution. The author also points out that, with respect to the evidence, there is no way to disprove evolution. Relying on W. V. Quine's account of worldviews as webs, Hunter argues that Darwinists

will give up any other part of their worldview rather than consider evidence that calls this cosmology into question: "With punctuated equilibrium added to gradualism, Darwin's theory of evolution has been expanded to the point where it can explain practically anything. Slow change, fast change, no change, and even reverse change can all be given the proper label" (p. 80).

Chapter five presents a historical survey of evolutionists since Darwin with the goal of showing how these thinkers consistently relied on non-scientific arguments to support their theory. Hunter considers arguments for evolution ranging in time from 1888 to 1991, demonstrating that these did not change much during this period. The works of geologist/natural historian Joseph Le Conte are considered first. Hunter shows that most of his arguments were aimed at refuting a specific religious view; therefore, they do not show that evolution is the true view. Turning to zoologist H. H. Lane, Hunter maintains that his arguments relied on the assumption that "God wouldn't have made the world the way we find it" (p. 96). Similarly, Hunter critiques zoologist/biologist Arthur Lindsey for setting out to demonstrate that evolution is logically conclusive while relying on the assumption that God as Creator would not have created species with commonality. He next looks at scientist Sir Gavin de Beer and finds similar assumptions, namely, that God would not have operated in history in a way that interrupted uniformity. Finally, Hunter critiques botanist Verne Grant for relying on a number of claims to support evolution, including one that creationism cannot account for the observed patterns of geographical distribution. Grant assumes that the differences observable in these distributed forms can be accounted for by the mechanism of slow-scale change, and argues that this same mechanism must be the source of large-scale change. Hunter underscores that this claim is not empirical but metaphysical; as such, it is just as religious as creationism (not to mention that it involves an instance of begging the question, as mentioned above).

In chapter six the author looks at the centuries before Darwin and the way in which his predecessors were influenced by what they thought God "ought" to do. Specifically of importance was the problem of evil, both moral and natural, which "increasingly drove thinkers to distance the Creator from his creation" (p. 11), because it was full of misery and wickedness. They accomplished this distancing by placing natural laws between God and the world. Hunter notes the influence of these predecessors on Darwin: "In constructing the arguments for his theory of evolution, Darwin repeatedly argued that God would never have created the world that the nineteenth century naturalists were uncovering" (p. 12).

The seventh chapter considers the Victorians in an attempt to show that the way God was viewed at the time led easily to uniformitarianism and the belief that miracles are impossible. At the same time, the creation was viewed as being orderly and beautiful, and revealing these qualities in God. Darwin saw just the opposite: waste and violence. With miracles out of the way and uniformitarianism in place, Darwin's view of God resulted in naturalism and evolution. In the Victorian world, Darwin could question whether God could produce calamity and whether God really was providentially in control.

In the eighth chapter Hunter explicitly examines the metaphysical premises on which evolution is founded. He shows that metaphysics has been used to protect and justify evolution, while evolution in turn has influenced metaphysical thought. His point is that the evidence is not important because it will be interpreted in light of whatever system is chosen. Thus, what is important are the presuppositions that comprise a worldview and consequently affect the way that evidence is understood. The metaphysical assumptions behind evolution include materialism and the separation of science and religion. The Darwinist claim that evolution is the best explanation is therefore a case of begging the question. What is needed is not better evidence but an examination

of the metaphysical assumptions behind this debate: "Philosophy and science have always been influenced by theology. This is especially true for evolution. The difference is that evolution denies the influence" (p. 160).

The book concludes with responses to Darwinism. Hunter looks at theistic evolutionists who attempt to accommodate evolution with their belief in God. He discusses the case of B. B. Warfield, who was willing to accept the scientific aspect of evolution while rejecting its metaphysical claims. Also considered are Terry Gray and Howard Van Til. Both are seen to have had implicit assumptions about what God would/must do, and this inclined these thinkers to accept evolution as a cosmology. The chapter is called "Blind Presuppositionalism," a seemingly appropriate title given the way that assumptions are not addressed even though they seriously affect the interpretation of evidence.

Darwin's God is an important work for anyone interested in evolutionary theory and the contemporary debate over creation. It makes a substantial contribution to this area of thought by responsibly looking at the proofs advanced for evolution and uncovering the metaphysical assumptions behind them. The contrast between Darwin's view that the world could not have been made by a good/powerful God, and the apostle Paul's claim that the creation reveals the eternal power and divine nature of God, underscores the thesis that there are two radically different worldviews operating in this debate. I found the book to be thought-provoking and hope that it will motivate an increased awareness of the presuppositions behind Darwin's cosmology. As Hunter himself notes, "Meaningful debate between the groups will be possible only when these interpretations are properly acknowledged" (p. 11).

Owen Anderson
Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ

Genetic Turning Points: The Ethics of Human Genetic Intervention. By James C. Peterson. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001, xvi + 34 pp., \$22.00 paper.

The contents of this volume represent a major addition to the current debate surrounding the appropriate limits of genetic engineering. The author is the C. C. Dickson Associate Professor of Ethics at Wingate University.

This work is divided into fifteen chapters and is written so that each chapter can be the subject of one week in a semester-long class on genetic ethics. Chapters one through three establish Peterson's theological foundation for the rest of the work. He approaches the subject from a classical orthodox position, somewhat reminiscent of Thomas Oden. After establishing his context for interaction, Peterson engages in a four-part discussion of genetic research, genetic testing, genetic drugs, and genetic surgery. Each part is divided into three chapters, the first chapter in each section addressing the subject at hand from the perspective of the individual, the second from a family perspective, and the third in relation to the community. The book offers copious footnotes relating to some of the significant literature in the field. Peterson is to be commended for providing a work that has an organization that is friendly to the classroom and has a logical flow that offers the opportunity to discuss genetic challenges in a systematic way.

Peterson basically takes a positive stance concerning the future of genetic intervention. He believes it is one way that humans can exercise their mandate to be good stewards of God's creation. He argues that science and religion need not necessarily be in continual combat with each other and is hopeful that the future will see a lessening

of tensions. At most critical points of decision, Peterson seems to offer a qualified approval for various procedures already in practice. For example, he argues that Christians "might do well to avail themselves of genetic testing when it can help in carrying out their mandate to sustain, restore, and improve their physical bodies and the world entrusted to them, out of love for God and neighbor." He quickly adds a qualification: "However, there will be times when valuable genetic testing might not be advisable, such as if it jeopardizes medical insurance" (p. 170). This example is typical of Peterson's approach.

Though it is evident that Peterson has a high standard of human dignity and a healthy respect for human sin, one wishes that he would have been more assertive of his own position at some points. His discussion of when human personhood begins is a good example. Peterson offers a fine review of various positions on when the presence of a human being should be recognized. He lists the strengths and relative weaknesses of each position beginning at infancy and moving to conception. Peterson appears to argue that neighborly love demands that if we err, we should do so on the side of caution: "An essential part of neighbor love is in its extension, not exclusion. When is someone else also present to be cared for? Careful thinkers on both sides admit that they do not know for sure. To some degree then the discussion shifts to burden of proof" (p. 135). Yet, for all his excellent review, Peterson does not tell us which view he favors. Furthermore, while Peterson offers a good summary argument from those who believe that an individual worthy of protection exists from conception, some of his critique of this position seems to reach too far. Specifically, he says that arguments relating to the virginal conception of Jesus as proof that an individual human person is present at conception are not compelling because "one could affirm that God was uniquely present in bringing about the biological beginning of Jesus of Nazareth without assuming that the human person Jesus of Nazareth was present from the biological beginning" (p. 129). Peterson's critique seems to raise possible questions concerning the unity of Christ's personality. Taken a step further, his critique might remind one of some form of adoptive Christology, a position that one feels Peterson would not affirm.

As a whole, *Genetic Turning Points* is a good introduction to genetic ethics written from a distinctively Christian perspective. The structure of the book makes it particularly useful for classroom purposes.

Alan Branch
Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Kansas City, MO

Introducing Christian Education: Foundations for the Twenty-first Century. Edited by Michael J. Anthony. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2001, 301 pp., \$29.99. *Evangelical Dictionary of Christian Education.* Edited by Michael J. Anthony. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2001, 747 pp., \$49.99.

Christian education is a multidisciplinary field of study that seeks to aid and encourage church and para-church organizations in fulfilling their educational responsibilities. The publication of *Introducing Christian Education* and *The Evangelical Dictionary of Christian Education* mark the addition of two resources in this growing body of literature.

Introducing Christian Education is indeed an introduction to the field. This collection of thirty-one chapters composed by thirty-two authors is designed to introduce the various disciplines that impact and shape one's understanding of Christian education.

The intent of this volume as described by the editor is to begin "with a broad foundation of theological, historical, and philosophical basis for Christian ministry. From there it considers the contributions within the various social sciences such as sociology, anthropology, psychology and education. Each of these areas is explored through the primary lens of biblical teaching before integrating secular theories" (p. 14).

Introducing Christian Education begins as promised with a survey of the broad foundation and then successfully builds on that foundation by providing a helpful overview of the contributions of the social sciences and their implications for educational ministry. The chapters entitled "Jesus the Master Teacher" by Robert Pazmiño, "The Teaching Learning Process" by Ted Ward, "Learning Styles" by Marlene LeFever, and "Adult Ministries" by James A. Davies are among the strongest entries because they offer a biblically grounded and consistent understanding of their topics that is both intellectually and spiritually challenging. Yet, while reading and reflecting on this book, I was plagued by three questions.

First, is Christian education as a discipline rooted principally in the fields of biblical and theological studies or the social sciences? The correct answer of course is "biblical and theological studies." And Klaus Issler's chapter "Theological Foundations" provides a helpful overview of the theological distinctives of evangelicalism and their implications for Christian education. Issler's approach is descriptive in nature. For example, he describes the differences between a covenantal and dispensational approach to Scripture and Christian education, yet he does not evaluate the respective theological systems. This descriptive approach does not provide a clear and coherent theological framework that allows the chapters to be woven together, leaving one with the haunting feeling that the discipline of Christian education is more comfortable as a social science rather than a theological discipline.

Second, if Christian education is rooted principally in the biblical and theological disciplines, then why is there such an intense interest in integrating "secular theories"? Yes, "all truth is God's truth" because "God is the great king over all the earth" (Ps 47:2, 7). Lillian Breckenridge captures this reality in her chapter "Cross-cultural Perspectives on Christian Education" by providing a good introduction to the issue of diversity and the challenges it poses for Christian education. She calls into question the assumptions the Western church and para-church organizations have employed and summons them to take a broader perspective in their ministries. But the "secular theories" which the authors explore in Part 2, "Developmental Perspectives in Christian Education," are accepted as valid too readily. There is no substantive wrestling or critical interaction with the presuppositions that undergird the theories under consideration. This raises a third question.

Can the task of integration truly accomplish its purpose? Shouldn't the field focus on developing a distinctly Christian approach to education that enhances the understanding of the teaching-learning process both inside and outside the covenant community? Nicholas Wolterstorff argues for such an approach in *Reason Within the Bounds of Religion* and challenges Christian scholars towards this end. Sadly, the integrative character of *Introducing Christian Education* is uneven, and sometimes the lens of biblical teaching for integrating various secular theories is out of focus.

In spite of the above questions and concerns, *Introducing Christian Education* is a good *general* introduction to the key theorists and ideas that have shaped the field of Christian education. It is a text that an instructor can build on and draw from in helping students develop a biblically and theologically consistent understanding of educational ministry.

The *Evangelical Dictionary of Christian Education*, also edited by Michael Anthony, is a reference volume for those interested in the field of educational ministries.

The *Dictionary* was a massive undertaking and, in spite of some unevenness in the length and documentation of some entries, which is inevitable in such a volume, it is an excellent resource. The entries are well written and it is evident that the editor sought to guard against oversimplification of complex issues.

In spite of its many fine articles, there are some intriguing omissions. The entry on postmodernism by Bruce Benson is thorough, balanced and fair. Yet, the *Dictionary* lacks corresponding and related entries on modernism and worldviews. These two topics are touched on in the postmodernism entry, but their implications for Christian education are not adequately examined. Likewise, Walter Kaiser's discussion of eschatology is helpful, yet there are no entries or discussion of dispensationalism, progressive dispensationalism or covenant theology and their implications for Christian education.

The *Dictionary* when used in combination with the other volumes in the *Baker Reference Library* is a valuable resource for introducing and investigating the field of educational ministries for those working in a church or para-church context.

The two resources reviewed are important contributions to the field of Christian education. *Introducing Christian Education* explores a number of areas constructively and in so doing raises important questions that must be considered. The *Dictionary* is an excellent resource and will serve as a premiere educational ministries resource for many years.

Darwin K. Glassford
Montreat College, Montreat, NC
Salt Lake Theological Seminary, Salt Lake City, UT

Earth Habitat: Eco-Injustice and the Church's Response. Edited by Dieter Hessel and Larry Rasmussen. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001, xii + 250 pp., \$20.00 paper. *For the Beauty of the Earth: A Christian Vision for Creation Care.* By Steven Bouma-Prediger. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2001, 234 pp., \$21.99 paper.

Christian responses to environmental issues have largely mirrored those within larger society. These views range from complete apathy to "tree hugging" and the earth as "mother." Evangelical responses, while not reflecting this wide a span, still are amazingly diverse. C. S. Lewis in his science fiction trilogy may have been the first modern evangelical to raise the specter of the Christian's environmental responsibility, albeit obliquely. The late Francis Schaeffer appears to be one of the first prominent modern evangelical theologian/apologists to squarely place the issue of the environment front and center as part of a well-rounded evangelical approach to life, the world, Christian witness, and theology with his *Pollution and the Death of Man: The Christian View of Ecology* (1970).

The maturation of this "ecologically-informed" movement within Christendom and some sense of its continuing impact and challenges can be seen in these two diverse volumes. The World Council of Churches has had a unit concerned with environmental issues for several decades. The WCC, Ecumenical Association of Third World Theologians, Theological Education to Meet the Environmental Challenge, U.S. Ecumenical Women's Network, and Auburn and Union theological seminaries jointly sponsored a 1998 "Ecumenical Earth" conference in New York City that resulted in the papers published in *Earth Habitat*. Three central questions are addressed in whole or in part by the nineteen contributors: (1) How can Christianity and Christian churches rethink themselves and their roles in light of the endangered earth?; (2) What "earth-honoring"

elements does justice-oriented Christianity have to contribute to the common good?; and (3) How can communities and churches respond creatively and constructively on a local level to vast global forces? The contributors are drawn from India, South Africa, Zimbabwe, Canada, Germany, and the United States. Several are well-known eco-theologians who have been actively reformulating theological concerns in a manner that signals the importance of environmental issues.

There is much in this book that merits thoughtful study and engagement, particularly the case studies from various nations. The initial focus of the book is on the nature and mission of the church and how that should/might change if we took ecological issues seriously as Christians. Several contributors rightly point out that ecclesiology has "been a missing locus in the busy circles of ecotheology and ethics, a hole as big as the church itself" (p. xi). The volume aims to recenter discussions of ecojustice around Christian values and theological constructs rather than on "Gaia" or other "natural" constructs. The book does particularly well at discussing global and local environmental issues of import in light of how they impact churches and their communities.

Interestingly, the writers do not make reference to a single evangelical scholar on these topics (e.g. Bouma-Prediger, Schaeffer, DeWitt, Granberg-Michaelson) within the entire volume! The same omission is not committed by evangelicals working in this arena, as Steven Bouma-Prediger's book indicates, because many writers from the wider Christian tradition are cited throughout his book, including the two co-editors of *Earth Habitat*. The absence of evangelical viewpoints in *Earth Habitat* suggests that evangelical scholars still spend too much of their time "preaching to the choir" and not enough time expressing their views within the wider Christian community and engaging in constructive dialogue about the theological and church-society implications of their work. In their defense, many evangelical scholars are deeply involved in the *scientific* conversations about global environmental issues and some serve on key national and international scientific advisory bodies about the environment. Evangelical voices are, however, muted in the theological dimensions of this movement.

Steven Bouma-Prediger, building upon three prior books focused on Christianity and ecological concerns, has produced a masterful evangelical response to the environment. He systematically presents the case for global environmental degradation, makes a sustained argument about how a biblical perspective includes ecological concerns, and crafts an ethic for creation care from a distinctly evangelical perspective, drawing heavily upon the ideas of Joseph Sittler. Bouma-Prediger's book is replete with charts, tables, and graphs about global environmental issues he describes and then rebuts historical arguments that have suggested that Christianity and a biblically-centered worldview justify the degradation of the environment, while acknowledging that some tempered criticism of Christian behavior in the past is justified.

Ten key arguments for the care of the earth, borrowed from other literature but adapted in a uniquely Christian manner, are presented by Bouma-Prediger to frame an ethic of care. They are: (1) if you breathe, thank a tree; (2) on loan from our children; (3) 'tis a gift to be simple; (4) poor and oppressed unite; (5) spotted owls have rights too; (6) value generates duty; (7) we're all in this together; (8) God says so; (9) God's concerns are our concerns; and (10) for the beauty of the earth.

The eco-injustice movement, as symbolized by the essays in *Earth Habitat*, does bring out some glaring omissions in most evangelical considerations of the environment. Evangelical scholars have tended to narrow environmental concerns to the physical world itself and its direct impact on humanity. Eco-theologians working within the wider Christian tradition have tended toward a more expansive view of environmental issues as embracing not only the physical environment but also issues such as fratricide, poverty, genocide, and disproportional access to decision-making structures and

policies that affect local, regional, and global well-being. The Earth Charter Commission's work is endorsed by the contributors to *Earth Habitat*, and the entire document is reproduced in full at the end of the volume. This reviewer has yet to see a sustained popular or semipopular discussion of this document from evangelical scholars concerned with the environment. In a similar vein, neither book addresses alternate views about the earth as expressed by the recently published *Environmental Skeptic* or the lengthy expositions of the late Julian Simon. All contributors appear to believe that there are no valid criticisms against the environmental movement. This oversight is a weakness not only limited to these books but many within this genre.

The evangelical community's use of Scripture itself to build a strong case for environmental stewardship is still not well known outside of evangelical circles. (Whether it would be accepted remains to be seen, but it appears to this reviewer that it really has not been much tried.) The *Earth Habitat* essays in some specific places could clearly benefit from a closer exposition of Scripture itself as an initial starting point. Neither book draws upon the wider and growing theological literature of recent years regarding the relationships among Christianity and, for example, politics, bioethics, economics, sociology, social welfare, criminal justice, and education. Both books are also scanty regarding how theologians have thought historically about issues that are pertinent to the environment ranging through creation, the human arts (one thinks here of Luther, for example), personhood, community, and relations with the world. The narrower focus of these volumes reflects, of course, the overspecialization of our age—at once our strength and our Achilles' heel. It is this reviewer's belief that spreading the theological net a little wider will cause some lines of argument to be strengthened, provide additional examples of how to approach certain aspects of these issues, and perhaps require some positions to be altered or completely rethought.

Dennis W. Cheek

University of Rhode Island, Providence, RI

Life's Ultimate Questions: An Introduction to Philosophy. By Ronald H. Nash. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1999, 395 pp., \$29.99 hardcover.

In *Life's Ultimate Questions*, Ronald H. Nash presents philosophy from an explicitly Christian perspective. That distinguishes *LUQ* from virtually every other introductory philosophical textbook and makes it noteworthy to philosophy teachers at Christian institutions.

Nash's approach, however, yields mixed results. At times, his Christian stance opens valuable perspectives on critical philosophical problems and prompts inclusion of topics that will be of particular interest to Christian philosophers and students. For example, in addressing arguments for God's existence, *LUQ* presents cutting-edge versions of the design argument—like Michael Behe's work on irreducible complexity in cellular structures—and demonstrates the serious difficulty they pose to Darwinian naturalism's rival explanation for apparent design. Also, in covering ethical questions, *LUQ* includes Joseph Fletcher's situational ethics, which constitute a challenge especially interesting to anyone formulating ethics from a Christian basis. At other times, though, the book's aggressively pro-Christian view—or, perhaps more specifically, Nash's presentational method and tone—shortchange the philosophical argument. For instance, in building a cumulative, inductive case for God's existence, Nash utilizes only the confirming evidence. The problem of evil, regarded by many as powerful *disconfirming* evidence, is never addressed—an unacceptable omission for such an argu-

ment. Further, Nash tends to argue in a stridently defensive manner that gives him a hectoring, sometimes even contemptuous, tone, as if he were mistaking Christianity for the only worldview anyone could have reason to accept and conflating his personal perspective with Christian dogma. Consider two illustrative quotes. In dealing with objections to Christian belief in life after death Nash writes, "We should never underestimate how far nonreflective people can be led by claims that beg the question" (p. 382). And in dismissing indeterministic objections to compatibilism regarding human freedom and divine determinism near asks, "If God alters a person's wants, motives, and desires, thus resulting in that person's decisions, dare we say that the person's choices are not free?" (p. 339). In short, while the book's Christian perspective is surely welcome, Nash's strident tone and sometimes-overzealous advocacy constitute a significant drawback.

This is not to say that *LUQ* has little merit, though. Structurally, it adopts a valuable approach by exploring philosophy in three ways: first, through a focus on world view commitments and their implications; second, through an account of historical development, featuring several influential philosophers; and third, through an exposition of some important philosophical problems and issues. This approach allows students to see how a worldview—characterized as covering basic beliefs regarding God, metaphysics (i.e. the nature of the world, generally), epistemology, anthropology (including issues of freedom, mind/body, and the afterlife), and ethics—can be philosophically constructed and tested. The historical thinkers—comprising the early atomist naturalists, Plato, Aristotle, Plotinus, Augustine, and Aquinas—are presented and critiqued as examples of such world view-building efforts. Thus, the specific philosophical issues can then more clearly be understood, and students can both grasp the origins of particular positions and see what worldviews those positions might fit. Pedagogically, *LUQ* has much to recommend it. Nash clearly explains difficult concepts, such as the Platonic Forms, and frequently utilizes helpful charts and diagrams. He also includes optional exercises, such as listing the points of one's own worldview, to stimulate full integration of the material. In the accounts of the various philosophical positions, there are some mistakes and inaccuracies (of course, *no book gets everything right*), but most views are competently presented and some get particularly insightful interpretation. In content, *LUQ* includes some interesting topics—like possible worlds and Reformed epistemology—not normally found in introductory texts. Nash also does a service in showing how concepts from non-Christian worldviews can be adopted and utilized by Christians; for instance, he demonstrates how Aristotle's view of essences can help explain the incarnation. Despite such pluses, however, even while their content is being accurately laid out, views are frequently disparaged through the harsh editorial tone. Moreover, Nash's abrasive tone becomes a problem pedagogically, because it sometimes is directed at the students or readers themselves, as an example from the opening pages shows: "Even though Plato and Aristotle got some things, perhaps many things wrong, chances are their worldviews will generally get higher marks than will those of students reading this book" (p. 14).

In summary, *LUQ* contains many commendable features but also some serious flaws. For me, the latter are too significant to justify using the book. I hope that students will emerge from my introductory classes not only armed with philosophical support for their Christian beliefs, but also understanding philosophy as open-minded inquiry aimed at *truth* rather than simply at argumentative victory. And *LUQ* serves the former goal, but not the latter.

Keith D. Wyma
Whitworth College, Spokane, WA

World Religions in America: An Introduction. Edited by Jacob Neusner. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2000, xii + 273 pp., \$18.95 paper.

"Americans are not only a religious people. We are also a people of many religions," asserts editor Jacob Neusner (p. 1). This book is not concerned primarily with issues of truth but with nurturing empathy in the midst of religious diversity. However, unlike most secularists in the academic arena, both the editor and the contributors believe that religion is "a powerful force in shaping society, making history, and defining the life and purpose of individuals and entire groups" (p. 5).

However, this is not to say that this book should be read with total confidence or without caution.

In sixteen chapters, this revised and expanded edition introduces the reader to the multiple religious traditions practiced in the United States. Although focused on America, most chapters discuss the original context out of which each religion arose.

As well as the expected chapters on Protestantism, Catholicism, Orthodoxy, and Judaism, the volume exhibits keen awareness of the ethnic traditions present in America through chapters devoted, respectively, to the religious perspective of native Americans, African Americans, and Hispanics. An added feature to the revised edition is an entire chapter devoted to the Mormons and another chapter "World Religions Made in the U.S.A.," which groups together Seventh-Day Adventists, Christian Scientists, and Jehovah's Witnesses.

In addition to separate chapters on Hinduism, Buddhism, and Islam, a chapter on East Asian religions treats the multiple religious traditions now taking root in America that were brought to the United States by Japanese, Korean, and Chinese immigrants. Despite some overlap with the chapter devoted exclusively to Buddhism, the range of the chapter is exceedingly broad. It provides an overview of traditional Confucianism, Taoism, Shinto, Shamanism as well as the Japanese new religions and the multiple religious expressions of Buddhism, including Zen and Tibetan Buddhism.

Interesting chapters on American religion as it relates to women, politics, and American society in general round out the book. They seek to answer the questions: What do we learn about religion from the ways in which women are religious? How does religion affect the political life of this country? How does religion shape American life?

Such well-known luminaries as Martin Marty, Justo Gonzalez, Jaroslav Pelikan, and Andrew Greeley (two chapters) are among the contributors. Editor Neusner pens the chapter on Judaism as well as the introduction.

Given the limited scope of this review, I have chosen to delve more deeply into only two chapters: the one on Hinduism and the other on Protestantism. I have selected the former because I have just returned from nearly a month in India where I had the opportunity to interact with Indian scholars, and the latter because it is the tradition I know best.

Gerald James Larson's chapter on Hinduism, though comprehensive in scope and lucid in style, is marred by an unguarded enthusiasm that assures the reader that Hinduism is more monolithic than may be the case. "The *Bhagavad Gita* is known and beloved by all Hindus, and the process of Karma and rebirth . . . widely accepted by all Hindus down to the present time" (p. 132). Also, he tends to gloss over some of the harsher facets of the Hindu system. The attempts to place the burden of the rigid caste system upon the shoulders of the Muslims ignores the reality that the origin of the caste system is much older than the presence of Muslims in India, much less the period of their dominance. Furthermore, it is not opposition to the caste system itself, but to the practice of untouchability, which the Neo-Hindu movements had in common.

Failure to mention the "Brahmo Samaj," the reform movement initiated by Rajaram Mohun Roy, the father of modern India, is a major omission. Moreover, the author

never mentions the original territorial meaning of the word "Hindu." Finally, Larson makes no reference to the ideology and practices of modern politicized and communalized forms of Hinduism. He appears hostile to evangelical Christianity and negative towards the minority communities in India.

In addition, the chapter contains some minor factual errors. India has 26 states and 6 union territories, not 25 and 7 respectively. "Image worship" (p. 130) is translated as "puja," which is simply "worship"; "murthi puju" is "image worship." Rama's wife is not Silo, but Sita. Nevertheless, this chapter is a valiant attempt to simplify and narrate in one single story something incredibly complex and varied. Within the chapter, the section on "Hinduism in Today's America" is especially helpful.

Martin Marty's lengthy chapter on Protestant Christianity is rich in historical and sociological insights. Although generalizations are necessary, distortion is minimal and errors of fact virtually absent.

Rather than a systematic treatment of the core theological convictions that gave rise to Protestantism (the phrase "justification by faith" does not even appear in the chapter), Marty opts for a narrative account of the development of Protestantism from its European roots. He traces its transmission to the colonies and then its Americanization through the Enlightenment and the Awakening up to its contemporary manifestations.

The scope of Marty's treatment is impressive. His attempt to be fair and balanced is evident. Although his sympathies lie with the moderate to conservative stream in mainline Protestantism, he is not hostile to evangelicals.

A great strength of his treatment is his emphasis on the social impact of Protestantism in American culture. Nor does he ignore theology, devoting subsections to the importance of beliefs, the place of creeds, the role of the Bible, and the relationship between faith and works. Still other subsections are devoted specifically to church government and to a broad survey of Protestant worship practices.

Marty's coverage is comprehensive. Few segments of Protestantism are ignored, although his treatment of the evangelical renaissance, the Pentecostal-Charismatic movement, and the global impact of the missionary movement received less attention than this reviewer felt they merited.

While the breadth of Marty's coverage may overwhelm the uninitiated student, this chapter, if wisely supplemented with appropriate lecture materials and adequate discussion, would enable the student at the college or seminary level to make sense of the diversity present in American Protestant Christianity as well as its contribution to the life of the nation.

This volume, first of all, serves as a valuable reference that merits a place on the shelf of ETS scholars and teachers. It is a helpful source of information that reminds us that, even in North America, the religions of the world are at our doorstep. We dare not labor under the illusion that evangelical scholarship that limits itself to intramural dialogue with other schools of thought within Protestantism is adequate for the times in which we live.

Second, this book is an excellent teaching tool. It can be used as a supplementary text in a course on world religions or as the basic text on North American religions. Clear, well-organized descriptions characterize most chapters. Each chapter begins with an attention-catching black-and-white photo and concludes with well-formulated study questions, suggested essay topics, key words for further exploration, and, in some cases, suggestions for further reading. A helpful glossary and a well-done index complete the volume.

Kenneth B. Mulholland
Columbia Biblical Seminary & School of Missions, Columbia, SC

Henry Drummond: A Perpetual Benediction. Edited by Thomas E. Corts. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1999, 141 pp., \$37.50.

This series of essays was originally presented at the 1997 Henry Drummond Centenary Symposium held at the University of Edinburgh and at the 1997 conference "Henry Drummond in America" held at Beeson Divinity School. Both conferences commemorated the one hundredth anniversary of Drummond's death in 1897. Drummond was a Renaissance type of man who is most famous for authoring the essay on 1 Corinthians 13, *The Greatest Thing in the World*, in 1887. This essay was widely read throughout the world and became a classic devotional work. Drummond traveled extensively, including three trips to the United States, where he lectured at such prestigious institutions as Harvard and Yale. He was a close, personal friend of D. L. Moody and a powerful speaker in his own right. His relationship with Moody dated back to 1874 during the Moody-Sanke Crusades in Scotland. Moody was so moved by *The Greatest Thing in the World* that he included it in his volume recording the summer session of his summer conference of college students in 1887. In 1889, Drummond published it as a separate Christmas volume. He continued to publish Christmas pamphlets for several years afterwards. By the time of his death, over 330,000 copies had been sold in nineteen languages.

Drummond studied theology at the University of Edinburgh, but also took courses in science and received a "temporary" appointment as a lecturer in natural science at the Free Church College in Glasgow from 1877–1883. He then went on a missionary journey to the heart of Africa only a few years after the famous Livingstone-Stanley meeting there.

He attempted to reconcile his interest in the fulfillment of the Great Commission with his belief in the progress of science. This attempt at harmonization was reflected in his *Natural law in the Spiritual World* published in 1883. Drummond argued that many of the natural laws of the spiritual world are simply a reflection of the natural order. This idea was highly controversial, as many conservative Christians saw it as a betrayal of foundational doctrines.

Drummond was an evangelist in his own right and, in 1885, he continued the Sunday night revival meetings at the University of Edinburgh after the famed Cambridge athletes, Stanley Smith and C. T. Studd, completed their ministry in Edinburgh. Drummond continued these meetings for nine years, commuting from Glasgow until his terminal illness prevented him from continuing.

The essays in this book cover a wide array of topics. Alexander C. Cheyne places Drummond within the context of the Scottish Presbyterianism of the Victorian era. David W. Bebbington focuses on Drummond's attempt to harmonize the Bible with Darwinian thought. Thomas and Marla Haas Corts discuss Drummond's method as a communicator and also analyze his impact on evangelical belief in the United States. Finally, Robin S. Barbour concludes with an essay on Drummond's view of love as exhibited in *The Greatest Thing in the World*.

This is an interesting volume that includes a helpful chronology of Drummond's life. The editor includes a bibliography but not an index.

Martin I. Klauber
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL