

BOOK REVIEWS

Concordance to the Greek New Testament. By William F. Moulton and Alfred S. Geden. Edited by I. Howard Marshall. 6th ed. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2002, xxi + 1121 pp., \$100.00.

Over one hundred years after the publication of the first edition in 1897 and almost twenty-five years after the appearance of the previous (fifth) edition in 1978, Howard Marshall has prepared the current sixth edition of this time-honored concordance (*M & G*) in order to “fit it for another century of usage” (p. v). In the preface Marshall praises the work for its compact size, its categorization of the usage of many words, its inclusion of all significant textual variants (including those added in UBS4), and its citations of OT passages cited in the NT. The most significant difference between the fifth and the sixth edition is that the fifth edition, like its predecessors, used the Greek text of Westcott and Hort (WH) as the base text, while the new edition adopts UBS4 (essentially identical with NA²⁷) as its base.

Overall, the editorial changes made in the present edition are to be welcomed, particularly the substitution of UBS4 for WH as the textual base. The typeface is still a bit antiquated, though, especially the capitalized Greek headings for each word. Moreover, it must be noted that an exhaustive Greek concordance of the Greek New Testament based on UBS4 already exists: *The Exhaustive Concordance to the Greek New Testament*, edited by John R. Kohlenberger III et al. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1995; *ECGNT*). By comparison, I much prefer the more contemporary page layout of Kohlenberger’s concordance. Also, the new *M & G* costs over twice as much as the *ECGNT*. Another helpful feature of the *ECGNT* is the listing of word frequencies, which is not provided in the new *M & G* edition. Neither is the word listed put in bold font.

A comparison of the entry for *λαός* (listed in Moulton and Geden as ΛΑΟΨ) in these two concordances may be helpful. *ECGNT* provides the total number of occurrences (142) but not *M & G*. *ECGNT* lists nine categories of usage, including number of occurrences and actual references for each category; *M & G* breaks down word usage into five categories but without frequencies or verse listings. *M & G* does, however, provide information regarding OT citations, even printing the Hebrew text, a feature not included in *ECGNT*. The listing of a given reference in *ECGNT* is generally more extensive than *M & G*. While the former includes the six preceding and subsequent words, *M & G*, while including an about equal number of preceding words, often (but not always) cuts off the reference immediately after the word in question. Finally, *M & G* provide more text-critical information.

The two advantages of the new *M & G*, then, are more information on OT citations and on text-critical matters. However, these are in my view more than outweighed by the significantly greater utility of *ECGNT* (not to mention the price), both in terms of frequency listings, more user-friendly type font and layout, and more extensive and explicit categorization of word usage. For these reasons I do not expect the sixth edition of Moulton and Geden to become the first choice of North American students and scholars of the NT, despite its welcome improvements over previous editions. Some scholars may prefer the new *M & G* owing to the above-mentioned advantages, though they may

well choose to supplement *ECGNT* by using other tools on the use of the OT in the NT and on text-critical matters.

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

Justification and Variegated Nomism. Vol. 1: *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism*. Edited by D. A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien, and Mark Seifrid. WUNT 140. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2001, xiii + 613 pp., \$44.99 paper.

This hefty volume stands as volume one of a two-volume set on the relationship of Paul to Second Temple Judaism. The focus is particularly on the validity of "covenantal nomism," the term popularized by E. P. Sanders in his 1977 work *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*. The validity of Sanders's watchword is assessed by surveying the literature and thought of the Second Temple period. There are sixteen contributors to this volume, which serves as background for the projected second volume, *Paradoxes of Paul*, which will deal specifically with Paul. The term "paradoxes" in the title of the projected volume may bring qualms to the minds of those who understand the term to entail a formal contradiction.

The sixteen contributors to this volume comprise an international team of fine scholars who have specialized in the literature of the Second Temple period. Scholars of this stature are generally not plagued by such common foibles as anachronism, reductionism, and parallelomania as they present their findings. Their awareness of the distance between their modern agenda and that of the ancient texts they examine is well expressed by P. Alexander, who contributes a study of the Tannaitic literature: "I have tried to survey in this essay an extensive and complex body of rabbinic literature, posing to it an agenda which has essentially been framed elsewhere (in the study of Paul and of post-Reformation Christian theology), and asking of it questions which it is reluctant to answer. I have been constantly troubled by the feeling that I have, to some degree, been forcing the sources—reading them somewhat against their grain, and imposing upon them a consistency which they do not possess" (p. 298).

The essays all examine specific themes in their respective *corpora* related to covenantal nomism. They vary in length from approximately fifteen to fifty pages. Most of the chapters address a type of literature (e.g. Apocalypses, Testaments), while two handle Philo and Josephus, and two others present topical summaries of righteousness language and the Pharisees. Editor Carson contributes both a brief introduction and a lengthy summary and conclusion. This conclusion is an especially helpful synthesis for non-specialists who are looking for the gist of the book's insights.

Sanders's "covenantal nomism" may be described simply (or simplistically) as the view that Israel's covenantal status originated in divine grace and was perpetuated by obedience to Torah. Thus "getting in," or more accurately "being in" by birth as Enns puts it (p. 510), is a matter of God's initiative and "staying in" is a matter of Israel's response. For Sanders and others who advocate the new perspective on Paul, this notion wholly supplants the reformational perspective that Paul polemicized against a merit theology of salvation by works. The contributors to this volume present a mixed response as to the propriety and clarity of Sanders's thesis when support for it is sought in Second Temple literature. Some find the thesis to be more or less amenable to their portion of the literature, while others pose questions and doubts. The complexity of this variegated literature militates against the likelihood of any single slogan being the key which unlocks every door. Thus the titles of this volume and of the set as a whole

amount to an implicit warning against any reductionistic theory, whether it be traditional merit theology or the new perspective of Sanders.

Those who still find merit in the traditional approach will likely be most interested in portions of the book which plausibly support items (3)–(9) in Carson's concluding reflections, which raise serious questions about the usefulness and validity of covenantal nomism (pp. 543–48). There are several sections of the book which are especially significant for those whose minds are not made up and who still wish to examine the central question. C. Evans's survey of Scripture-based stories in the pseudepigrapha concludes that certain elements in these stories reflect a works-based view of salvation with which Paul would have sharply disagreed (p. 72). R. Bauckham's discussion of 2 Enoch, especially its recurring imagery of deeds being weighed on the scale of justice (44:5; 49:2; 52:15), is also especially relevant to the central question of the book (pp. 151–56). Bauckham's ensuing discussion of 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch also appears to be provocative (pp. 161–82). P. Spilsbury's handling of Josephus argues that the concept of covenant is supplanted by a patron/client relationship between God and Israel. Therefore covenantal nomism is singularly inappropriate in a description of the thought of Josephus (p. 252). P. Alexander's discussion of salvation in the *Tannaim* concludes that this literature does not attempt a coherent systematic theology and can speak of salvation by grace in one place and of salvation by works in another. Yet in Alexander's view Tannaitic Judaism is fundamentally a religion of works righteousness (p. 300).

M. McNamara's treatment of the Targums raises the issue of the proper understanding of a phrase which may be translated either "for the sake of" or "through the merit(s) of" (בזכות or plural בזכות; pp. 326–32). This concern with the merits of the ancestors, as well as the targumic stress on good works (pp. 332–36), seem quite relevant for the understanding of Paul, although the dates of the respective sources must be kept in mind. M. Blockmuehl's study of 1QS finds a preoccupation with works of the law which is not unlike the views later countered by Paul (pp. 413–14). R. Deines's lengthy discussion of the Pharisees concludes that the Pharisees were the most influential religious movement in Palestinian Judaism from 150 BCE–70 CE (p. 503). This runs counter to Sanders's assertion that there was a "common Judaism" during this period which centered on the priesthood and the Temple (pp. 442 ff.; 452 ff.).

The essays in the present volume should be widely read by scholars and graduate students of this period. These essays should provoke much discussion in their own right, but their ultimate value as a foundation for the forthcoming volume is yet to be seen. The depth, precision, and methodological sophistication of the essays in this volume will elevate expectations for the next volume. Any academician who wants a better understanding of current thinking about Paul and his Jewish world will be well served by a careful reading of this book. A bibliography would have increased the book's value for serious researchers.

David L. Turner
Grand Rapids Baptist Seminary, Grand Rapids, MI

New Testament History: A Narrative Account. By Ben Witherington III. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2001, 430 pp., \$26.99.

Witherington (a NT professor from Asbury Theological Seminary) has written a well-conceived history that covers the period from Alexander to Domitian. The subtitle well describes the story that is convincingly reconstructed through integrating the evidence we can garner from ancient materials with the evidence we can reconstruct from the

NT itself. Though packed with information—and sometimes a great deal of detail—the book is immensely readable and constantly interesting, with frequent reminders of long-forgotten pieces of information. Into his narrative, Witherington has also woven the stories of some of the figures of the NT along with their theological contributions. However, there is too often a close and sometimes unacknowledged dependence on *The Jewish People in Classical Antiquity: From Alexander to Bar Kochba* by John H. Hayes and Sara R. Mandell (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1998).

The author begins by explaining how the Jews had become so Hellenized between the end of the OT era and the beginning of the NT era. From there he goes on, in fifteen other manageable chapters, to deal with NT history from the birth of Jesus in the context of the rise of the Herodians and the dawn of the empire to the two decades after the fall of Jerusalem in which there was suffering for Jews and Christians, as well as the writing of a number of NT documents.

Well positioned through the text are a number of helpful aids. There are twenty-five pieces called “A Closer Look,” each covering around two pages on subjects such as “Miracles and History” (p. 120–21), “Acts as a Historical Source” (pp. 174–75), “The Ancient Art of Rhetoric” (pp. 240–42), and “An Ephesian Imprisonment?” (to which the answer is “more than likely,” pp. 285–87). Set in different type, these pages provide information that may otherwise interrupt the flow of the narrative. Unfortunately, material found in the body of the book is too often repeated in these pieces.

Another set of aids strategically placed through the book are twenty-four sidebars, of about a page or less in length, which give information on less important topics ranging, for example, from itinerant doctors in antiquity (p. 256), to Athens (pp. 265–66), to sellers of royal purple cloth (p. 259), or to Rome (pp. 320–21). There are also a number of maps (pp. 81, 112, 190, 230, 251, 279). Charts of dates set out Jewish history before Roman occupation (p. 30), Jewish history during Roman occupation (pp. 50–51), a chronological comparison of Paul’s letters and the book of Acts—in which Galatians 2 and Acts 11 are matched (pp. 171–74)—and Pauline chronology (pp. 196–99) in which there is a good deal more detail than one would expect. For example, Paul’s visionary experience of 2 Cor 12:1–10 is dated at AD 41–42. Generally clear black and white photographs, some of them graphic as in the case of one showing human remains at Pompeii (p. 162), are also scattered through the book helping put the reader in touch with the NT world.

Many of the issues with which NT scholarship grapples, such as authorship and dating, are decided in favor of a conservative perspective: Paul is the author of Ephesians and Colossians (pp. 326–27), for example, and the Pastoral Epistles “were composed very shortly after Paul’s death by one of Paul’s co-workers in their own style and hand, based on authentic Pauline notes and instructions” (p. 352). Similarly, a well-informed discussion on the virginal birth concludes: “it is easier to explain the Gospel evidence on the assumption that the virginal conception was a historical event that the Gospel writers tried to explain, albeit somewhat awkwardly, than to assume that this is a theological idea dreamed up by some early pious Christians” (p. 70). Also, with support by reasonable argument, Paul is said to be released after the end of Acts 28. Sometimes historical questions are left begging with such statements as, “If we accept that the ‘we’ passages reflect the actual travel of Luke. . .” (p. 189). Also Witherington seems unaware of some recent works, such as Leonard L. Thompson’s important reevaluation of Domitian in *The Book of Revelation: Apocalypse and Empire* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990).

Most readers will be looking for more consistent and obvious interaction with primary and secondary data to help follow and assess the arguments or to explore issues further: many of the footnotes refer to the author’s own work. And there is no bibliography nor a modern author index. We await a NT history to replace books like George

Caird, *The Apostolic Age* (London: Duckworth, 1972) or F. F. Bruce, *New Testament History* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1980).

Graham H. Twelftree
Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA

Studying the Historical Jesus: A Guide to Sources and Methods. By Darrell L. Bock. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic; Leicester: Apollos, 2002, 230 pp., \$18.99 paper.

Darrell Bock, Research Professor in New Testament Studies at Dallas Theological Seminary, has established himself as the premier American evangelical Lukan scholar, with three commentaries on Luke's Gospel and a major one in the works on Acts. It is natural, therefore, for him to expand his focus to all of the Gospels. This is the first of two volumes which together will create an admirable pair of textbooks covering most everything a seminary-level, semester-long course on the four Gospels would want to introduce. Indeed, these volumes have emerged out of Bock's many years of teaching the material in the classroom. This is the smaller, introductory book, broken into two main parts: "Jesus in His Cultural Context" and "Methods for Studying the Gospels." The second, larger work, which should have appeared by the time this review is published, is *Jesus according to Scripture* (also with Baker Academic and Apollos), which introduces each of the four Gospels in more detail and then offers a commentary on a harmony of the Synoptics, followed by a commentary on John.

A substantial introductory chapter in Bock's first volume deals with the primary literature generating our knowledge of relevant backgrounds. In chronological order, Bock discusses Jewish sources predating or contemporary with Jesus (the OT, apocrypha, pseudepigrapha, Dead Sea Scrolls, Philo, and Josephus), the four canonical Gospels (with brief overviews of their key themes, outlines, and circumstances of composition), and sources that postdate Jesus (esp. the Midrashim, Mishnah, and Talmud).

Part 1 contains three quite different types of material not normally grouped together. The first chapter treats in detail the nonbiblical literary evidence for Jesus, conclusively disproving the recurring claims that we know nothing (or next to nothing) about Jesus from ancient non-Christian sources. The second chapter discusses the issues involved in reconstructing key dates for Jesus' life, also with greater care and detail than introductory textbooks usually provide. Chapters 3 and 4 offer more what one has come to expect in such introductory texts—a survey of the primary political developments of the intertestamental period through the end of Pilate's reign in Judea, followed by "sociocultural history," which somewhat creatively subsumes the discussion of religious developments and sects under a larger treatment of the culture of Jesus' world.

Part 2 more obviously hangs together. After an initial chapter on the three quests of the historical Jesus, Bock devotes successive chapters to historical, source, form, redaction, tradition, and narrative criticism. A unique feature of the first several of these is Bock's interaction with the tiny minority of evangelicals who dismiss these methods completely out of hand (well summarized in Thomas's and Farnell's *Jesus Crisis*), providing a courteous but convincing critique. Under tradition criticism, Bock deals exclusively with the "criteria of authenticity" of Gospels research, culminating with Wright's new double similarity and dissimilarity criterion. Narrative and genre criticism are the only branches of current literary criticism treated in the final chapter, but these are doubtless the two most important.

Overall, Bock's work is exceedingly well done. Time and again I found myself agreeing exactly with his takes on controversial issues and his choice of material to include

on less debated topics. Indeed, there will be little to choose from between his combined two-volume package and my *Jesus and the Gospels: An Introduction and Survey* (Nashville: Broadman & Holman; Leicester: IVP, 1997), except that those who want greater detail five years more up-to-date should choose Bock and those who favor brevity or who wish to have time to supplement with material from different perspectives should choose me! And, of course, the sequence of our treatments varies noticeably.

There are a few questions, however, that I would pose of Bock's book. Why is the common, conservative dating of Luke to ca. 62, based on the abrupt ending of Acts suggesting that Luke was writing while Paul was still awaiting the results of his appeal to the emperor, not mentioned? Why is a paragraph entitled "Non-Jewish Sources" included under the subheading "Jewish Sources That Postdate the Time of Jesus"? Why is the treatment of the testimony of Thallus and Lucian to Jesus labeled "Thallus and Peregrinus" (one an author; the other, a fictitious name for a parody of Jesus)? Why are minor, debatable references in the Talmud to Christ treated while nothing appears on the specific mention of Jesus by name along with five of his disciples in a portion of *b. Sanh.* 43a? (A footnote calls this reference too problematic, but it is scarcely as problematic as texts that use no names at all and may not even be referring to Jesus.)

Bock's choice of AD 33 as the slightly more likely date for Jesus' crucifixion than 30 should surprise no one familiar with the work of his mentor, Harold Hoehner. However, it is not clear he has felt the entire force of the case for 30 nor the degree of difficulty in conforming the chronology of Acts and Paul to 33, not to mention the problem of Luke calling Jesus "about thirty" (3:1) when, on Bock's dates, he would have been 37 to 39. I doubt whether "calendar" issues belong among the top six "themes . . . in thinking about Jewish faith" (p. 123). And Schleiermacher used the siglum (not "sigla") Q before either Weiss or Wernle (contra n. 24, p. 174). Nevertheless, these are minor quibbles compared to the enormous strengths of the work, which should be warmly and widely welcomed.

Craig L. Blomberg
Denver Seminary, Denver, CO

A Simplified Harmony of the Gospels. By George W. Knight. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2001, xxvi + 267 pp., \$14.99 paper.

The church recognizes four canonical Gospels. That fact, plus recent trends in Gospel research, has caused the concept of a single-line harmony to be much maligned in contemporary scholarship. Nonetheless, given that the Gospel authors themselves purport to represent history (a debated, but still defensible, position), one could conceive of the possibility of reconstructing the order of the reported historical events. This is an age-old endeavor in the history of the Church. Knight's *Harmony* continues in this tradition, though at times it fails to inform the reader of the pitfalls.

The *Simplified Harmony*, while aiming at a popular market, provides three distinctive features when compared to other available harmonies or synopses. (1) It is based on the Holman Christian Standard Bible. This translation seeks to be "as close to the words of the Hebrew and Greek texts as possible" (p. xxv). It affords a serviceable, if occasionally awkwardly phrased, foundation for this book. (2) This volume includes brief study Bible style notes and section introductions. Occasional sidebars in italics supply context or acknowledge choices made in producing the *Harmony* (cf. "Two Cleansings of the Temple?" on p. 37). These are quite helpful to the lay reader, but sometimes suffer from oversimplification (e.g. the Lucan genealogy is "traced through Mary" [pp. 13–14]; the Pharisees "hated everything about foreign culture" [p. 61]; Romans used crucifixion

“only for slaves and the lowest types of criminals” [p. 236]). (3) This is a *simplified* harmony. Rather than render parallel accounts of similar events in parallel columns (as do most contemporary harmonies and synopses), Knight has chosen to provide a single unbroken narrative. Hence this *Harmony* is similar to the Gospels section in the *Narrated Bible* (1984); to the “harmonies” by Cadman (1885), Dietz (1951), or Boettner (1977); and to some older, conservative “Life of Christ” volumes. Knight has improved on many of these predecessors by including some useful devices such as a parallel synopsis listing and an index. Further, Knight employs superscripts to indicate which Gospel is being cited; and on some occasions (though certainly not all) variant words from another Gospel are indicated within brackets.

Like all such single narrative accounts, Knight must make some decisions. Principally he follows the order of Mark, supplementing with Luke or John. This causes multiple displacement of the material in Matthew 5–12. A major exception to the Marcan order comes in a curious re-organization of the crucifixion narratives. Occasionally, one finds perplexing results, such as locating John the Baptist’s death (Mark 6:17–29) before the first half of the very same pericope (Mark 6:14–16), which makes nonsense out of the transitional word “for” at the beginning of Mark 6:17 (see pp. 100–101; also cf. p. 41).

There are certainly dangers to this kind of “harmony.” The Gospels do not merely contain a listing of events; they also interpret those events by locating them in a particular context. By seeking to place these events in a re-created historical order, one invariably strips them of their canonical interpretive context. This is especially problematic with transition words (such as “for” mentioned above), but it can also effect how one understands the whole pericope (contrast Knight’s blended beatitudes on pp. 64–65 with the Matthean and Lucan accounts by themselves). Historical reconstruction has benefits; however, the reader (especially the lay reader) should be made aware of the cost. Yet, both the author in his introduction and the publisher on the cover have failed to clarify these important limitations. Many will find it interesting and edifying to engage with Knight in this activity of harmonizing the Gospels. I would indeed recommend this book to them, though I would also caution them concerning the inevitable weaknesses.

David W. Chapman
Covenant Theological Seminary, St. Louis, MO

Paul and the New Perspective: Second Thoughts on the Origin of Paul’s Gospel. By Seyoon Kim. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002, 336 pp., \$25.00.

In his 1977 dissertation under F. F. Bruce, Seyoon Kim argued that the origin of Paul’s Gospel is to be found, not in Judaism or Hellenistic religions, but in the Christophany that Paul saw on the road to Damascus. In this Christophany, Paul not only received his commission as apostle to the Gentiles but came to recognize Jesus as the eternal Son of God, the *eikōn* of God (from which Paul derived both his Adam Christology and Wisdom Christology) and to understand salvation as justification through grace alone and faith alone, as reconciliation, as adoption, and as transformation into the new man and new creation.

Now Kim, professor of New Testament at Fuller Theological Seminary, has sought to update aspects of his dissertation in light of developments in Pauline studies over the intervening twenty-five years, particularly the New Perspective. The real guide to the book’s contents is the subtitle, *Second Thoughts on the Origin of Paul’s Gospel*. It is not a general survey or critique of the New Perspective, nor is it the new edition of

his dissertation that Kim had once planned to write. It is instead a defense of certain points from the dissertation and an expansion of others.

The first chapter, "Paul's Conversion/Call, James D. G. Dunn, and the New Perspective on Paul," is the book's longest. Against Dunn, Kim reasserts that Paul's doctrine of justification developed early and directly from Paul's encounter with Christ on the road to Damascus and that Paul's own statements offer evidence for the works-righteousness character of first-century Judaism. The detailed rebuttal of Dunn's criticisms of Kim's earlier work may fail to engage some and may unfortunately deter them from continuing to the more generally accessible parts of the book.

The second chapter will be of interest to a greater number of readers. In it, Kim argues that it is possible to find "Justification by Grace and through Faith in 1 Thessalonians." Kim's persuasive exegetical argument raises questions for those who hold that Paul developed his understanding of justification in connection with a late-dated Galatian controversy.

In "Isaiah 42 and Paul's Call," Kim argues that, in addition to other texts, Isaiah 42 shaped Paul's understanding of his apostolic call. Kim finds numerous allusions to Isaiah 42 in Gal 1:15–16, including the possibility that Paul's early mission to Arabia (Gal 1:17) was prompted by Isa 42:11. More significant is the evidence that Paul understood his apostolic call in relation to the endowment of the Spirit (Isa 42:1). This both sheds light on the central role played by the Spirit in Paul's ministry, as well as on the way in which Paul saw the relationship between his ministry and that of Christ, *the Anointed Servant of the Lord*.

Many readers may find "Paul, the Spirit, and the Law" to be the most useful. In it, Kim surveys recent challenges to the traditional understanding of Paul's teaching on the law. Finding these lacking, Kim briefly discusses some recent literature on first-century Judaism that has questioned the New Perspective's portrayal of first-century Judaism. From both Paul's understanding of the meaning of Christ's crucifixion and his experience of the Spirit in his conversion, Kim believes that Paul came to understand the antitheses flesh/Spirit and law/Spirit through reflection on such texts as Ezekiel 36–37 and Jer 31:31–34. Taking Dunn's challenge to examine Gal 3:10–14 as a test case, Kim finds that this text in fact supports the traditional understanding of Paul's teaching on the law and provides evidence for a works-righteousness understanding in first-century Judaism.

"Christ, the Image of God and the Last Adam," repeats the argument of Kim's dissertation, that from the Damascus road Christophany, Paul recognized Jesus as the *eikōn* of God. Here Kim develops this position with two new insights: utilizing the work of others he highlights the importance of the chariot throne theophany of Ezekiel 1 for Paul and also offers his own argument that Paul knew and used Jesus' "Son of Man" sayings in developing his Christology. Kim believes he can discern here a theological method in which Paul joined his experience, the traditions about Jesus, and the Hebrew Scriptures to develop his theological insights.

The final three chapters have previously appeared elsewhere. In "2 Corinthians 5:11–21 and the Origin of Paul's Concept of Reconciliation" (*NovT* 39 [1997] 360–84), Kim argues that Paul developed his understanding of salvation as reconciliation from his own experience of reconciliation to God on the Damascus road. Here again Kim suggests a model for theologizing that interprets and substantiates the experience of Christ in light of the Scriptures and the traditions concerning the historical Jesus.

In his dissertation, Kim argued that Paul's understanding of the "mystery" of Romans 11 derived from reflection on key scriptural texts in the light of his commission as an apostle on the Damascus road. "The 'Mystery' of Romans 11:25–26 Once More" (*NTS* 43 [1997] 412–29) attempts to refute objections to this view and to strengthen the argument.

The final chapter, "The Jesus Tradition in Paul," is reprinted from the *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*. Here Kim develops at greater length the argument that there is evidence that Paul knew and used sayings of Jesus to develop and support his doctrine and paranesis.

Kim's argumentation may not persuade all readers. Much of it depends on identification of allusions, a subjective enterprise. It would strengthen Kim's presentation if he were to reflect explicitly on methodology by which one could determine the validity of proposed allusions (e.g. Koch, Stanley, Berkley). At points Kim seems to suggest that a number of possibilities may add up to a certainty, as when he begins his summary of the argument of chapter 3: "The above eleven observations and arguments may not all be equally convincing, yet they support one another, and their cumulative effect appears to be strong. So I conclude that . . ." (126).

This is primarily a book for Pauline scholars. Those already familiar with *The Origin of Paul's Gospel* will be interested in Kim's defense and further development of that work. While it is not necessary to have read *The Origin of Paul's Gospel* in order to benefit from this new volume (Kim helpfully rehearses relevant portions of the argument at key points), those seeking a more general work on Paul might benefit more from the first book. Despite the title, those looking for an introduction to the New Perspective, whether for their own reading or for classroom use, will want to look elsewhere.

James A. Meek

Covenant Theological Seminary, St. Louis, MO

Paul between Synagogue and State: Christians, Jews, and Civic Authorities in 1 Thessalonians, Romans and Philippians. By Michael Tellbe. ConBNT 34. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell International, 2001, xii + 340 pp., n.p.

Tellbe's intriguing title identifies the guiding perspective for his book: how the apostle Paul responded to the socio-political dilemma of three Christian communities in the mid-first century. The genesis of this project first emerged as a Th.M. thesis on the socio-political context of Philippians under Gordon D. Fee at Regent College (Vancouver, Canada). Later, under the doctoral supervision of Birger Olsson at Lund University (present editor of the ConBNT Monograph Series), his study expanded and deepened to include 1 Thessalonians and Romans. Tellbe's offering is a worthy contribution to an already august series of dissertations.

The introductory chapter maps out method and procedure. The author's investigation proceeds by asking a series of determinative questions (pp. 11–12) with a self-admitted "socio-historical bent." He follows a path similar to Craig De Vos (*Church and Community Conflicts: The Relationships of the Thessalonian, Corinthian, and Philippian Churches with their Wider Civic Communities* [Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999]), who draws largely on a social conflict theory of investigation. "Honor" and "shame" become pivotal concepts in Tellbe's analysis of the tripartite relation and interactions between Jew, Christian, and imperial cult within the believing communities of Thessalonica, Philippi, and Rome.

Chapter 2 sets the stage for a clear and inclusive outline of the legal status and privileges of first-century diaspora Jews under Roman rule. The chapter concludes with an attempt to lay the groundwork for a stated thesis that the "parting of the ways" between Christianity and Judaism was actively in process well before 70 CE. The preliminary groundwork for this attempt is based on his investigation of Acts.

Chapter 3 probes the interaction between Christians, Jews, and civic authorities in mid-century Thessalonica based on 1 Thessalonians and Acts, but not 2 Thessalonians. This is somewhat surprising in light of Tellbe's high regard for the integrity of the entire *corpus Paulinum* (see e.g. p. 13, n. 42) and his related arguments for the historicity of Acts (pp. 15–18). Nevertheless, what emerges in his study of 1 Thessalonians is the unmistakable and striking socio-political tone of this letter. In this regard, some of these insights may draw more from Helmut Koester's seminal article ("Imperial Ideology and Paul's Eschatology in 1 Thessalonians" in *Paul and Empire: Religion and Power in Roman Imperial Society* [ed. Richard A. Horsley; Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1997] 158–66) than a lone footnote reference to it might suggest (p. 124, n. 189).

The socio-political setting of Romans is addressed in chapter 4. The author traces the origins and development of the Christian community amidst the marked political upheavals leading to and following after the writing of this letter. Surprisingly, Tellbe argues *against* using Claudius's expulsion edict of 49 CE in his reconstruction of Roman Christianity. Fortunately, this in no way affects his convincing exegesis of the *ad hoc* nature of the politically-charged Rom 13:1–7 passage. Indeed, Tellbe sets in bold relief the often neglected, yet key boundary marker for Roman Jews, the temple tax, over against Roman Christians, whom Paul encourages to pay all Roman taxes, thereby implying and fostering an autonomous religio-political identity for Roman Christians *vis-a-vis* Roman Jews. The author's prodigious mastery of the secondary literature nevertheless overlooks Mark Reasoner's illuminating examination of the crucial "strong" and "weak" entities in Romans (*The Strong and the Weak: Romans 14.1–15.13 in Context* [SNTSMS 103; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999]). Presumably published too late for interaction, yet equally noteworthy, is Bruno Blumenfeld's extensive, sophisticated articulation of the political and Hellenistic Greek framework of Romans (*The Political Paul: Justice, Democracy and Kingship in a Hellenistic Framework* [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001]).

The Philippian setting comprises chapter 5. Tellbe identifies three intertwining and socio-politically imbued themes running throughout Paul's letter: suffering, disunity, and "joy in the Lord." Apart from the latter motif, this resonates strongly with Peter Oakes's recent monograph (*Philippians: From People to Letter* [SNTSMS 110; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001]). As with chapters 2–4, a concise and incisive summary concludes the chapter.

The final chapter draws together and summarizes Tellbe's previous observations and ends with a stimulating discussion of implications for further study. This book marks a genuine advance both generally and specifically: generally, by its measured and finely nuanced analysis of Jewish-Christian relations in the early church; specifically, by demonstrating the highly significant socio-political dimensions of Paul's thought. This volume will be read and continually consulted by Pauline scholars and graduate students for years to come.

Chris M. Smith
Bethany College, Scotts Valley, CA

The Irony of Galatians: Paul's Letter in First-Century Context. By Mark D. Nanos. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002, xiv + 376 pp., \$26.00.

As improbable as it may seem, in *The Irony of Galatians* Mark Nanos proposes an apparently novel background for Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. Approaching this tar-

get cautiously, Nanos presents his methodology clearly, assesses the alternatives fairly, and presents his own conclusions reasonably. The thesis is announced in the prologue: Paul's conflict is with a group Nanos labels the "influencers . . . members of the larger Jewish communities of Galatia entrusted with the responsibility of conducting Gentiles wishing more than guest status within the communities through the ritual process of proselyte conversion by which this is accomplished. . . . They probably understand themselves to be helping the addressees negotiate the uncertainty and marginalization resulting from their present identity as pagan guests, which is magnified by the present nontraditional expectations of the addressees within their subgroups" (p. 6).

This reconstruction of the context of Galatians begins with a careful examination of the character of the only primary source material (i.e. the epistle itself). Aware of the perils of circularity, Nanos focuses on the rhetorical character of the letter "rather than imposing some other larger construction" (p. 23). Based on examples of ancient rhetorical and epistolary conventions, Galatians is determined to be an example of a letter of ironic rebuke (pp. 60–61). Examining Paul's argument further, Nanos distinguishes between the situational content (written directly to the addressees), the narrative content (drawing on other events for supporting material), and the transitional seams. In his dissection of Galatians, Nanos places most emphasis on the situational discourse "to derive details of the exigence in Galatia that has provoked the letter, as Paul sees it anyway" (p. 62). The meticulous analysis defies summary, but is presented clearly and convincingly. Nanos takes seriously the Pauline emphasis on the dawning of the new age in Christ (p. 85); indeed, the disagreement between Paul and the synagogue on this point is at the heart of the crisis experienced directly by Paul's Christ-believing Gentile addressees and indirectly by the apostle himself.

According to Nanos, Paul's addressees discover themselves to be liminal individuals, marginalized with respect to their Gentile communities of origin and with respect to the community of those living in covenant with the God of Israel (p. 94). Whereas the influencers offer to resolve this marginalization by guiding the addressees through the final stages of proselyte conversion, Paul insists that the addressees are living already in covenant with God (a consequence of the dawning of the new age) and must not view themselves as liminals or as prospective proselytes (p. 96). The boundary between Jew and Gentile has not been obliterated, but the Gentiles have become "fellow heirs of Abraham while remaining members of the nations" (p. 99).

After a lengthy engagement with prevailing interpretations, Nanos provides a coherent argument supporting the details of his thesis and considering the implications of the proposal. Finally, a brief conclusion summarizes Nanos's findings (pp. 317–21). Throughout Nanos presents his argument clearly and reasonably, and he is to be commended for the quality of his work. His careful attention to the rhetorical character of Galatians and to the sociological issues involved in the Pauline mission are likewise praiseworthy.

Nanos has offered an interpretation of Galatians that solves some of the problems troubling NT scholars. Most significantly, an understanding of Paul and of Galatians is advanced that helps "interpreters escape the seemingly ineluctable conclusion that Paul denigrated Jewish identity and behavior" (p. 282). Nanos may have a personal interest in this problem, for in the prologue he confesses: "I am a product of many factors, not least the long shadow of the Holocaust, which claimed so many Jewish people, my people" (p. 4). Again, Nanos's work is significant and worthwhile, though here the resolution of one problem exposes another conundrum. To Paul is attributed the understanding that "Israel and the nations would together worship the One God, the Creator of all, together as one, although remaining Israel and the nations" (p. 100). Many evangelicals will find this two-covenant solution problematic.

Beyond this fundamental question other challenges can be mounted to elements of the reconstruction. Throughout his argument, Nanos suggests that the influencers may have been unfamiliar with (or even unaware of) Paul's message and mission. Is this suggestion plausible, particularly given Paul's experience with Galatian synagogues (Acts 13–14)? Perhaps Nanos would claim a North Galatian destination resolves this problem (Nanos is explicitly silent on the geographical destination; pp. 21–22, n. 7), but given Paul's routine of beginning with the Jewish population at the commencement of his work in a city, a change of venue would not seem to eliminate this question.

Occam's razor suggests another challenge to the probability of Nanos's thesis. Postulating an otherwise unknown crisis, the liminality and status ambiguity of "Gentile Christ-believers," is a credible though undocumented (at least within the NT) dilemma. Meanwhile a prominent crisis, the circumcision issue in earliest Christianity and the related matter of table fellowship between Jewish and Gentile Christians (documented as near as Syrian Antioch), is rejected as the central issue in the Galatian conflict. Why should a known conflict be dismissed in favor of a hypothetical conflict? The new hypothesis is credible, and is consistent with the sociological context in which the addressees found themselves, but Nanos offers no primary source materials to demonstrate the status ambiguity upon which his argument depends. Contrary evidence is present in the Acts account of Paul's trial before Gallio. The proconsul's dismissal of the case as an internal Jewish matter suggests that one side of the hypothetical ambiguity is questionable; at least some (prominent) Gentiles perceived Christ-believers as members of a Jewish sect.

Despite these questions, *The Irony of Galatians* is a valuable contribution to Pauline scholarship. In this work Nanos promises to stimulate significant, insightful discussion of the relationship between the old covenant and the new, and of Paul's views regarding the dawn of the new age. Nanos has also presented a serious critique of the various prior Galatian reconstructions, a worthy effort in itself. Advocates of alternative hypotheses will not be compelled to accept this new theory, but they should address the points presented here.

Richard W. Johnson
Charleston Southern University, Charleston, SC

Revelation. By Simon J. Kistemaker. The New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2001, x + 635 pp. \$39.99.

In his book *Under the Unpredictable Plant*, Eugene Peterson observes that "certain times pull particular books of the Bible into prominence" (p. 144). Provocatively Peterson contends that Revelation is the book for our times, not for the reasons we often link with it but for the portrait of the pastoral vocation it provides to the church amidst tribulation and trivialization. If Peterson's claim is right (or even worth contemplating), then we need to pay special attention to new commentaries on the NT Apocalypse, and one of the most recent is that of Simon J. Kistemaker, emeritus professor of New Testament at Reformed Theological Seminary, Orlando.

This volume marks the completion of the New Testament Commentary series, initiated by William Hendricksen and completed by Kistemaker. Intended for pastors and serious Bible students, this volume contains a substantial discussion of standard introductory issues, a translation and exposition of the Greek text of Revelation, a selected bibliography, and indices of citations from authors, Scripture, and other ancient writ-

ings. Overall, this work is distinguished by clarity and judiciousness. I will focus in this review on two pivotal issues, the commentary's treatment of author and date and its hermeneutic.

On Revelation's author and date, Kistemaker considers the pertinent external and internal evidence and concludes that John, the son of Zebedee and the apostle, wrote the book in the mid-90s. His rebuttal to the widespread endorsement of a "non-apostolic" John as author is, in my opinion, sound. As Kistemaker puts it in his admirably temperate way, "nearly solid external evidence and helpful internal evidence" support apostolic authorship (p. 26). The book's dating is a dicier issue than its authorship. Kistemaker again takes up both external and internal evidence, giving greater weight to data that tend to favor a late date. From my perspective, Kistemaker is the most compelling when he dates the book by referring to the condition of the seven churches (Revelation 2-3) and their experience of imperial and Jewish opposition. His comparison of the portrayal of these phenomena in Revelation with that found in the rest of the NT is particularly helpful. When, however, he takes up the internal evidence relating to the temple and city in Revelation 11, the beast in Revelation 13, and the seven kings in Revelation 17, he is less satisfying. One does not have to have a preterist interpretation of the book to sense that the challenges raised by these items are not fully met by Kistemaker (and in this he is not alone).

The last point brings us to Kistemaker's discussion of two other key issues of introduction, namely, the preterist, historicist, idealist, and futurist approaches to the book and the relevance of the prevailing millennial positions for the book's interpretation. On these matters, Kistemaker does a fine job exposing the limits of each approach but shows a puzzling lack of reflection on the benefit of combining insights from the various approaches. In fairness this reflection emerges sometimes more, sometimes less, in the commentary proper, where Kistemaker's indebtedness to both idealism and futurism is on display. In his discussion of the millennial positions that bear on the book's interpretation, Kistemaker clearly identifies himself with the so-called amillennial camp. His discussion provides a helpful consideration of the contribution that Rev 20:4-6 makes to the millennial debate, but it garners surprisingly little help from important considerations such as the history of doctrine and interpretation. Other useful items round out the introduction, most noteworthy of which is a synopsis of the book's theology.

Moving to the commentary proper and its overall hermeneutic, readers will find much to appreciate in Kistemaker's remarks. He excels at tracing the argument of the book, at highlighting interpretive problems, relevant data, and possible solutions, and at providing the most pertinent support for his own conclusion. These traits will make the commentary valuable to its intended audience as a companion to other, more ambitious and creative volumes such as Beale's recent work in the NIGTC series. Justifiably, however, specialists will still wish that Kistemaker had incorporated more of the important insights from comparative and typological studies. This is not to say that we should expect Kistemaker to duplicate the work of others. It is only to say that we expect commentaries like Kistemaker's, which are intended for non-specialists, to distill the major contributions of the specialists. In many good ways, Kistemaker has done this. There are some noticeable holes, however. Three come to mind.

(1) Kistemaker could have done more to bring to light the use of irony in the book of Revelation, particularly as it relates to the victory of the Lamb and the saints. Readers will have to find these insights in Beale's commentary and in selected studies of Johannine literature.

(2) Kistemaker underplays John's preemption of epic images and themes from cognate cultures. Both OT and NT scholars, across the theological spectrum, appreciate that this ideology is fundamental to biblical prophecy and historiography (see e.g. T. Longman III and D. G. Reid, *God is a Warrior*). With reference to Revelation, the contention

would be that John uses these themes as his predecessors in biblical authorship did. That is, John uses them to disclose the epic dynamics latent in his readers' experience and, through that disclosure, awakens their analogical imagination so that they are sustained in the hope of the eschatological re-manifestation of those same dynamics at their Lord's return. Again, the observation here is not that Kistemaker ignores this ideology altogether; it is, rather, that he underutilizes it as a hermeneutical tool (e.g. in his exegesis of Revelation 12–14 and 20–22).

(3) Kistemaker's commentary is sensitive to OT citation and allusion in Revelation, but this sensitivity needs the enrichment of studies in literary intertextuality and typology. Historically, conservative commentary has largely neglected typology, fearing the loss of the historicity of the biblical narrative to allegory. Deliverance from this fear is found, however, in recognizing that typology is firmly grounded in the lexical concordance and chronological similarity of biblical texts (i.e. in literary intertextuality). Bauckham explored this phenomenon to significant effect in his book *The Climax of Prophecy: Studies on the Book of Revelation*, and it holds much greater promise than Kistemaker has recognized. To date, the most thorough application of literary intertextuality and typological hermeneutic to the interpretation of Revelation is Warren A. Gage's groundbreaking study, *St. John's Vision of the Heavenly City* (Ph.D. diss., University of Dallas, 2001). Gage identifies a pervasive lexical concordance between Revelation and, of all things, the Gospel of John, which in turn exposes an astounding array of consecutive and chiasmic correspondences between the books. Not only does this concordance establish common authorship; it also compels the necessity of a lectionary reading of the two books as companion volumes (much like Luke and Acts), the one hermeneutical to the other. Thus, we see the interconnectedness of the two pivotal issues highlighted in this review, the commentary's treatment of author and date and its hermeneutic.

In sum, Kistemaker's commentary will serve pastors and serious Bible students as a clear and judicious, if predictable, guide to the interpretation of Revelation. Because of its limitations, however, users will want to keep more ambitious commentaries and specialized studies close at hand.

R. Fowler White

Knox Theological Seminary, Fort Lauderdale, FL

What is New Testament Theology? By Dan O. Via. GBS. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002, v + 148 pp., \$15.00 paper.

This book is a follow-up study to one done in the same series by Hendrikus Boers in 1979 under the same title. Via, Emeritus Professor of NT at Duke University Divinity School, proposes in this volume "to consider the diverse ways in which various New Testament scholars in recent decades have sought to bring the incipient theological potential in the New Testament to disciplined, structured expression" (p. 1). A good part of this book, then, is a review and contextualization of the discipline of NT theology in the last two decades of the twentieth century. In the end it turns out to be a critique of NT theology as a postmodern enterprise. Footing is established by a two-page rehearsal of Boers's book beginning with J. P. Gabler. The connecting point between the old and new books is Rudolf Bultmann, certainly the pivotal figure for the discipline (as for most NT disciplines) in the period under consideration. Bultmann found present, existential theological value in an ancient Christian document. Via's question is how this can be done today.

Chapters 2 and 3 deal with the important issues of structure (i.e. presentation) and subject (i.e. textual or extra-textual) in a concise and helpful way. These are important topics, but they are not the heart of Via's survey. The essential issue for NT theology, according to Via, is that of method (chaps. 4–8). Is the reflective theological task strictly historical (descriptive), strictly hermeneutical (in some sense prescriptive), or sometimes both? Chapters 4–6 are very helpful in surveying the similarities and differences among scholars. Those who advocate a strictly historical method (Wrede, Stendahl, Räisänen, Mack, Schmithals, Strecker, Jeremias, Caird, Balla, Barr, Dodd, Käsemann, Marxsen, Dunn) form a large majority of scholars since the time of William Wrede. Those who advocate a strictly hermeneutical method are more recent and less in number (Brueggemann, Adam, Hauerwas, Crossan). Via rejects both a strictly historical objectivistic modern approach and a strictly hermeneutical subjectivistic postmodern approach, opting instead for a method that combines these two approaches (Bultmann, Robinson, Donahue, Scroggs, Funk, and Wright, to whom he devotes considerable attention).

Chapter 7 offers a threefold critique of postmodern methods of doing NT theology. (1) The historical approach is necessary because the documents under study refer to events or situations that happened or are supposed to have happened but are not accessible to perception. Via highlights a number of postmodern scholars (Montrose, White, Kellner, Eagleton) to demonstrate that postmodernism does not invalidate historical quests. In answer to the question as to why a subjectivistic hermeneutic has often militated against historical criticism, Via, following Wright, thinks that it results from a pietistic approach to the Bible rather than from postmodernism. The quest for an immediate referent has negated historical particularity. But, in fact, historical criticism calls Christianity back to its historical roots and thus preserves it from both modern and postmodern rejection. (2) Postmodern views of God and/or the transcendent are often anti-Christian and antibiblical. Modernism, on the other hand, at least holds to the chronological sequence of events in the real world and to the possibility of newness and change in keeping with the Bible. (3) Postmodernism is actually a figment of scholarly imagination and, as such, is incoherent. In other words, Via wants to reject the notion that we are in a postmodern age.

In the end there are four factors for which any method of NT theology must account: the historical context, the content of the text, the structure of the text, and the creative and constitutive role of the reader. "[A]ny theological interpretation that actualizes all four of the interpretive factors is on the right track" (p. 128). Of course these four factors each engender their own debates, which Via mentions but does not explicate. It is Via's hope that the NT guild will keep alive all of the possibilities that arise out of these debates.

As a summary of the last two decades of NT theology, this book is excellent in both its breadth and its organization and analysis. It goes beyond earlier discussions such as Hasel's and Räisänen's. Via has correctly identified and camped upon the essential issue of method. As such the book answers the question of its title for the present world. In terms of conclusions, Via offers an important corrective to a trend toward hermeneutics to the exclusion of history. Although one might disagree with Bultmann's (and now Wright's) conclusions, his instinct to pursue an existential interpretation within a historical framework has the potential to lead to the theology of the NT. One can appreciate Via's desire to be open to a multitude of possibilities, but one must also be careful not to give up the pursuit of a singular truth that one might call *the* theology of the NT.

David H. Johnson
Providence Theological Seminary, Otterburne, MB

A Visit to Vanity Fair: Moral Essays on the Present Age. By Alan Jacobs. Grand Rapids: Brazos Press, 2001, 173 pp., \$18.99.

Reviving the moral essay, Alan Jacobs has tapped into a genre of writing that may be best suited for moral discourse in an age of shortened attention spans and heightened inquisitiveness. Jacobs effectively uses the exploratory character of the moral essay to engage in cultural criticism, which in turn produces thought-invoking reflection. With his commitment to charity and honesty, Jacobs is able to disagree with the conclusions of the opponents of the Harry Potter series while validating their concerns about the series. He is also free to make a moral judgment against those who watch with pleasure and fascination the death and mutilation of God's creatures. For Jacobs, charity and honesty mandate humility regarding one's conclusions but also demand that one speaks forcibly among us when necessary.

With the goal to present a compelling vision of the moral law, Jacobs proceeds to deal with various topics scattered about the moral landscape. The secret of the strength of Jacobs' approach is found in his ability to ask questions that continue to haunt the reader far after the book has been closed. In his essay "A Bible Fit for Children," he asks the reader how it is possible to preserve in our children an "ignorant bliss" while exposing them to the stories contained in the OT and NT. He follows up this leading question by asking if it is possible that children pluck the forbidden fruit of knowledge from the tree of Holy Writ. All the while, he is challenging the reader's presupposition of the innocence of children: "a growing belief in the innocence of children leads to a growing determination to shield them from the stories that might corrupt or wound that innocence." This introduces the fundamental dilemma of how to depict the crucifixion of Jesus to the "innocent."

In each new chapter, Jacobs continues to challenge the reader's moral awareness. In the essay, "Harry Potter's Magic," Jacobs asks those concerned about the portrayal of the imaginary magical technology in Potter's world if they are as equally concerned with the effects of modern technology on the sensibilities and worldviews of our children. (Neil Postman addresses the second concern in his thoughtful book, *Amusing Ourselves to Death*.)

In his essay "Lewis at 100," Jacobs thoughtfully writes, "that the achievements of the truly great are best honored not by the one who praises their work but by the one who follows their example." Just as Lewis strove to encounter and interpret his world, we, both collectively and individually, should strive to do the same in our world today. For this to take place, one must be asking the right questions and developing a healthy environment for conversation and dialogue to ensue. Another of Jacobs' strengths is found in his ability to use modern culture and common experience as a thought incubator from which great questions emerge. But Jacobs is concerned about more than just an ensuing dialogue, highlighted in his closing thoughts on the life and work of Donald Davie: "Conversation is never an end in itself; it matters insofar as it dispels darkness or encourages virtue" (p. 137).

A potential weakness of this book or any book written employing illustrations from popular culture is the relative short shelf life of the personalities and topics emerging from popular culture. This in turn directly affects the shelf life of a book dealing with these trendy aspects in popular culture. Another significant danger in the age of shortened attention spans is a lack of affinity for or interest in the subject matter. By his own concession, Jacobs' essays lean either in the direction of cultural criticism or personal reflection. The more personal of Jacobs' essays may come dangerously close to experientially isolating the potential audience. Certain essays in this volume may be of little interest to an individual not schooled in literature or the 60s and 70s music scene.

Jacobs seeks to present a compelling vision of the moral law without arguing for it. He employs personalities and scenarios from culture, which may or may not be common to most of our individual experiences, to present this compelling vision; however, the fragmentary nature of the various essays in Jacobs' book may make it more difficult to grasp this vision of the moral law. Pieces of a puzzle do not make a clear picture, although they are necessary to the existence of a picture. Only if one takes the time to assemble the pieces of the puzzle does a clear picture emerge. The budding or weathered truth-seeker may be best served by reading Jacobs' work alongside C. S. Lewis' work in *Mere Christianity* and *The Abolition of Man*. Lewis' work on the moral law may prove to be a necessary companion to Jacobs' work to succeed in presenting a compelling vision of the moral law.

Jacobs is right in recognizing there is a shift underway from a foundationalist to a postfoundationalist worldview. However, he may be too quick in suggesting that it is a mistake to argue as C. S. Lewis for the existence of the Tao or moral law. The moral law by its very nature is existentially gripping and may not be too abstract for the emerging postfoundationalist population. Even the great metaphysical skeptic, Immanuel Kant, could not free himself from the mystery of the moral nature of humanity. It may be better to view the work of Jacobs and Lewis as complimentary of one another in a postfoundationalist era. Both are working towards the same end while approaching it from slightly different means. Both foci, the more experiential and the more abstract, are necessary but not sufficient in creating a vision of the moral law.

Jacobs' work could prove to be useful in the hands of individuals either beginning or well underway in the exploration of morality and culture. Although this is an academic work, the terminology is less technical than most books written on this subject matter. Jacobs' maneuvers his way through potentially difficult material while making his work accessible to those outside academia.

Tyler B. Johnston
Denver Seminary, Denver, CO

Theological Literacy for the Twenty-First Century. Edited by Rodney L. Petersen, with Nancy M. Rourke. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002, xxiv + 421 pp., \$30.00 paper.

In his 1908 book, *Orthodoxy*, G. K. Chesterton described the church's dealings with theology as a "great and daring experiment of irregular equilibrium." Chesterton suggested that if one theological idea becomes less powerful, then some other theological idea may become too powerful; and one small blunder in theology may lead to huge blunders in human happiness. Some still interested in theological issues have hunkered down in their various foxholes of theological perspectives, bringing their traditions dangerously close to a loss of what Chesterton has termed irregular equilibrium. Some continue to take part in the great experiment through genuine conversation both inside and outside of their respective traditions.

Rodney Petersen, the contributing editor of *Theological Literacy for the Twenty-First Century*, sees this book as an invitation to a conversation, a conversation about what it means to be theologically literate. He suggests that this theological conversation not only promotes theological literacy but also defines theological literacy in the twenty-first century. According to Petersen, the commitment of the individual authors to conversation—both promoting and defining theological literacy—provides coherence to the collective (p. 380). As a result, a reader of this collection of theological essays may or

may not find the following five chapter divisions particularly helpful when working his or her way through it: (1) theology: what is the real thing?; (2) theology and institutional expression; (3) hermeneutics: how we understand and interpret the Bible; (4) the rhetoric of theology; and (5) theological literacy in seminary and university.

The book begins by asking what theological literacy is. Petersen defines theological literacy in two ways: “learning to give a reason for the hope that is in us” and “learning to think theologically, which implies a more self-conscious effort at theological reasoning” (p. 2). Both involve discerning and discussing what is the real thing in life. David Tracy sees becoming educated in general as the freedom to enter the conversation of the living and the dead, what he terms the “community of inquiry” (p. 13). This community of inquiry is nothing other than a long conversation of the living and the dead. He suggests: “Every great religious tradition lives by welcoming a genuine critical community of inquiry” (p. 14). The development of the life of the mind requires conversational partners; thus, theological education requires a community of inquiry.

But in entering the conversation, complexities emerge and must be faced. Robert Cummings Neville, in his chapter “On the Complexity of Theological Literacy,” points out four complexities that make achieving theological literacy difficult: theological identity, theological expression, theological truth, and theological engagement. These complexities require much knowledge of the world outside of one’s tradition and outside of religious topics, including knowledge of psychology, our habitation, other cultures, other religions, and science. Literacy is about equipping individuals not only with the necessary tools for inquiry but developing within individuals a desire to continue to inquire and learn throughout their life: “Literacy is a tool for learning, not a merit badge for having learned” (p. 54). Inherent within this statement is a posture of humility that out of necessity should remain true throughout one’s life. The complexities often associated with theological literacy should not be viewed as insurmountable or lead the educator or educated to a place of despair.

In his book, *Gospel in a Pluralistic Society*, Lesslie Newbigin puts this into perspective by suggesting that one can never know all that is necessary when communicating the gospel. Those who think they understand the human situation and know how to present the gospel in a given context are forgetting that their knowledge of the culture and especially of the individual lives of the hearers is limited. He suggests, “The Gospel has a sovereignty of its own and is never an instrument in the hands of the evangelist.”

Alkiviadis C. Calivas’s offering is a refreshing chapter to visit while making one’s way through this collection of essays. Calivas grounds theology in the revelation of the triune God through the creation of the world and the incarnation of his Son. God reveals himself to creation. As Karl Barth suggests in *Evangelical Theology*, “God is the only hope for theology.” Calivas resists the urge to stay “other-worldly” when suggesting that God works through the finite condition of human existence. God has chosen to reveal himself through divine revelation, transmitted through human language; however, this in no way limits God to this form of revelation. Theology is more than an “accumulation of data and the formulation of propositions” (p. 29). The aim of all theology should be to confer union with God and to bring about the transfiguration of the individual or community, who or which comes in contact with the divine (p. 29). Authentic theology is dynamic and creative; static theology is dead theology: “Static theology is unrelated to the needs and concerns of the church in a given time and place” (p. 28). Calivas concludes his chapter suggesting that the division of Christians is the vexing problem of the church, especially when he sees the church as gifted with infallibility regarding the truth (pp. 30–31). But what does this gift of infallibility mean in light of 33,800 Christian denominations worldwide whose members all think they are right (*Newsweek* [April 16, 2001] 49).

Andrew Walls, in his chapter entitled "Christian Scholarship and the Demographic Transformation of the Church," views the hope for Christian scholarship as arising out of Christian mission and its cross-cultural expression. He defines evangelistic theology as "scholarship in mission, made necessary by mission" (p. 167). This process began when the gospel crossed the cultural frontier between Israel and the Hellenistic world. New theological questions emerged and new theological discoveries were made that potentially never would or could have been made in a completely Jewish Christian setting. As Christian mission to the Hellenistic world expanded, Christian theology expanded. Where Christian mission has been, scholarship in the best sense of the word has emerged.

Walls's statement about Western theology being primarily Enlightenment theology may be contestable, but his point that Christianity is moving to the southern continents is not. With this move comes a fresh new opportunity for Christian mission and Christian scholarship, but this freshness is contingent upon the quality of interaction between the Christian and the ancient cultures of the southern continents. As Christianity begins the twenty-first century, it remains to be seen whether these conversations will produce new and beneficial insights for the universal church, or create distortion, confusion, and potential widespread hypocrisy.

In the face of globalization, religious pluralism is an opportunity and a challenge, according to Francis X. Clooney, S.J. A very practical reason for interreligious dialogue is the fact that there are many issues in which world religions share a common interest, such as natural, social, and ethical concerns; but a great challenge emerges for the Christian community in the face of religious pluralism. Words used to present Christianity—words such as *faith*, *revelation*, *Scripture*, *God*, *wisdom*, and *love*—are used on a regular basis devoid of any Christian meaning. This creates a problem for those communicating the gospel in a pluralistic setting: The hearer may misinterpret the speaker's intended message. This highlights not only the importance but also the necessity of understanding and becoming literate regarding other religions. Clooney states rather emphatically that in order to communicate effectively, mastering the basic information of other religions is unavoidable. In this cultural diversity of religions, Clooney believes it is the job of priests, teachers, and preachers "to help Christians learn from other religions in a way that is properly Christian . . . without mythologizing or belittling others" (p. 245). Craig Blomberg, a member of the evangelical community, and Stephen Robinson, a member of the Church of Latter-Day Saints, have demonstrated the mutual benefit of such an endeavor in their book, *How Wide the Divide*. Blomberg and Robinson have also demonstrated that this free exchange of ideas does not have to lead to a relativizing of beliefs. Clooney concludes: "Interreligious literacy requires a community, and does its share to help create one" (p. 256).

One may find some of the chapters in this volume lacking a sense of the transcendent because the theological perspectives of the authors are defined by the concepts inherent within the qualifier preceding the word theology, e.g. *evangelical* theology, *liberal* theology, *liberation* theology, *feminist* theology, or *black* theology. To illustrate, in Canada there is a T-shirt that reads "I am Canadian." The focal point is on the word *Canadian*. But also in Canada, one will hear the terms *French Canadian* and *Canadian* signifying the rest of English-speaking Canada; the focal awareness is placed on that which divides rather than that which unites. If a subsidiary awareness in theological studies unintentionally becomes the focal awareness, a focal loss on the Revealer of theology may lead at best to some new form of dry theology or at worst to some new idolatry.

The real strength of the book is found in the various authors' commitment to conversation even in the face of theological differences that would normally prohibit such collaboration. Potential theological and philosophical discrepancies do emerge from the

various chapters due to the authors' commitments to their theological and philosophical traditions. This book is not for those lacking theological tenacity or those beginning their endeavors into the world of theological literacy; it deals primarily with subsidiary concerns of theological inquiry. Evangelicals looking for a good textbook on theological literacy must be forewarned that the diverse traditions of the various authors place chapters of this book outside the boundaries of evangelicalism.

Tyler B. Johnston
Denver Seminary, Denver, CO

Moral Darwinism: How We Became Hedonists. By Benjamin Wiker. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2002, 321 pp., \$20.00 paper.

At its core the modern scientific endeavor is a philosophical and theological venture. It is for this reason that "every distinct view of the universe, every theory about nature, necessarily entails a view of morality; every distinct view of morality, every theory about human nature, necessarily entails a cosmology to support it. . . . There is no way to escape the interrelationship of science and ethics, and no one should be relieved of the responsibility that this interrelationship entails" (pp. 22–23). Working from this thesis, Ben Wiker's *Moral Darwinism* is a plausible account of the philosophical, scientific, and moral lineage that runs from Epicurus to Darwin. It asserts that the apparent "scientific revolution" ushered in by Darwin was very likely a reconstitution and adoption of philosophical and moral assumptions asserted by Epicurus more than two millennia ago and carries with it, as it did for Epicurus, specific ethical implications that drastically influence modern moral thought.

Wiker argues that the Epicurean ideas behind Darwinian evolutionary theory are: (1) there is no God, and (2) all of reality is reducible to material components. The motivation behind these claims, argues Wiker, was their therapeutic value. That is, Epicurus's desire was to provide a philosophical/ethical theory of life undisturbed by ruminations about divine punishment or worries regarding the afterlife. Thus, Wiker argues, Epicurus "purposely and systematically *excluded* the divine from nature, not only in regard to creation and design of nature, but also in regard to divine control of, and intervention in, nature" (p. 20).

Likewise, Darwinian evolutionary theory assumes: (1) a closed universe, and (2) a universe totally reducible to material components. Similarly, by adopting the Epicurean view of the universe, modern Darwinian world views also "inherit the moral universe that was necessarily part of his materialist universe, even if it only accepted only the materialist premises of that universe" (p. 23). As a result, with God out of the picture, one can view moral issues like abortion, euthanasia, and sexuality in a totally different light. The underlying philosophical assumptions virtually eliminate the need for concern over objective moral standards regarding such issues. "Since, for Darwin, our nature is the result of random natural selection, human nature has been formed in great part by chance. Darwinism becomes moral Darwinism precisely in advocating that we take evolution into our own hands and remold our nature according to our own will" (p. 221).

Unfortunately, those who have claimed the scientific high ground for the last 150 years have tended to take the data of scientific investigation and use it as a proof-text in support of materialistic philosophical assumptions while avoiding the attending philosophical questions altogether. For this reason what modern culture calls "science" or "Darwinian evolutionary theory" may in reality be more aptly described as "philo-

sophical materialism.” It is at root an ideology that attempts to explain the nature of reality, but is only one of several options available in the marketplace of ideas and arguably not the best.

Seizing this point Wiker argues that because materialist assumptions are just that—assumptions—they actually function as a type of faith. He then argues that this “faith” is diametrically opposed to Christianity “because it was originally designed by Epicurus to destroy belief in a creator God, the soul, the afterlife, purposefulness in nature and a permanent, natural foundation for morality independent of human opinion. The worldview that it leaves in its wake is a unified theoretical and moral account of the universe and humanity’s place in it; and this revolutionized worldview is irreconcilable both theoretically and morally with any non-materialist view, but especially with Christianity” (p. 297).

Thus, without a doubt the greatest strength of the book—and there are many—is the connection Wiker makes throughout between one’s underlying world view assumptions and the ramifications such beliefs have in the realm of morality. On this point the ninth chapter is particularly enlightening. His discussions of individuals like Margaret Sanger and Alfred Kinsey present stark examples of the practical ramifications of his thesis. One need be warned, however, that this discussion (particularly that of Kinsey) is not for those weak of stomach.

While there is much to be praised in this work, it is not without faults. Wiker tends to be a bit too categorical in his critiques of figures such as Newton and Galileo in chapters 6 and 7. While he does suggest that the intent of these men was to bring Christian understanding to what was taking place in the physical world around them, his characterizations tend to lay maniacal motives at the feet of each figure he discusses. This results in the feeling that there is a demon motivating every scientist or scientific advancement. Certainly there is nothing wrong with seeing God in what is revealed about nature or exploring the scientific realm in a manner that is honoring to God and further reveals his glory. Wiker certainly believes this to be true, but he underplays this thought during his critique. In addition, Wiker’s assumptions about the influence and motives of these men begs the question of how noble-minded men of faith gazing at the stars and discovering new realities should have explained them any differently than they did. This is in part the point of his last chapter and perhaps will be a focus in future works. The book is set up nicely for just such a sequel.

In the final analysis Wiker has touched on a vital point every Christian must realize and embrace. The front-line battles of the modern moral culture war (such issues as abortion, euthanasia, and sexuality) are ultimately metaphysical struggles linked to one’s view of the nature of the universe. Ultimately, the positions of opposing sides in these debates are irreconcilable because their foundations rest on irreconcilable world views. Materialism denies God’s existence; Christianity depends upon it. While raw scientific data can and should be pursued and applied in the most coherent model possible, any hope for winning the culture war battles depends not on the proper application of data from the created order (although such integrity would help) but on the conversion of hearts from what is ultimately a hopeless world view to the One who is the hope of our salvation.

By exposing the ideological assumptions underlying the modern scientific endeavor, Wiker provides a foundation from which one can not only understand why the modern moral culture wars are such heated battles but also why evangelism is ultimately the most effective form of moral debate. Basic world view assumptions about the nature of reality drive moral commitments. For this reason alone the book is a must read.

Mark Daniel Liederbach
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Wake Forest, NC

The Westminster Handbook to Reformed Theology. By Donald K. McKim, ed. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001, 241 pp., \$24.95.

This book serves primarily as a reference tool designed for clergy and students with scholarly and compact articles on a variety of topics related to Reformed thought. Each piece is accompanied by a brief bibliography. A number of entries are of particular interest.

The article on scholasticism is important to the early development of Reformed theology after the Reformation. It is a bit surprising that McKim did not have Richard Muller, the foremost expert in the field, write this article, especially since Professor Muller is a contributor to this book. Elsewhere, 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 of scholasticism primarily as a method allows for the possibility of disagreement in terms of the content of theology among the major confessional groups.

Arvin Vos, the author of the entry on scholasticism, argues that Reformed scholasticism came into prominence with the theology of Theodore Beza, who “modified Calvin’s position in significant ways” on the subjects of predestination, Scripture, and limited atonement. I would argue for essential agreement between Calvin and Beza on this score. Although Calvin did not develop the concept of limited atonement in the *Institutes*, he did make clear statements in support of that doctrine in his commentaries. Vos also argues that the Aristotelian influence on Vermigli, Zanchi, and Beza (all of whom made the divine decrees a more central aspect of their thought) resulted in a more prominent place for the doctrine of predestination. This perspective is a modification of the traditional argument that predestination was the central dogma for Reformed scholasticism, an argument that Muller has consistently refuted. Vos correctly notes, however, that Calvin was only one of many contemporaries (including Zwingli, Bucer, and Vermigli) who together founded what became known as Reformed theology.

Another interesting entry is Derk Visser’s article on law. He points out that the third use of the law is a prominent feature in Reformed theology. For Calvin, this means that the moral law serves as a guide for proper behavior. Visser argues that on this score Calvin was not arguing against Luther, who had a strong view of the applicability of the Ten Commandments for the Christian. Yet, Luther did not make the formal argument on the third use of the law and generally viewed the law in negative terms, i.e., as being associated with sin and death. Calvin, by contrast, saw the law as his ally to help express God’s will. For Calvin, the law was an element of the divine covenant and a source of continuity between the OT and the NT.

Dewey Wallace’s essay on federal theology is of considerable interest. Federalism was the dominant form of Reformed thought in the seventeenth century. Wallace highlights Heinrich Bullinger’s contribution on the topic of covenant as a central theme running throughout Scripture. For Bullinger, there was only one covenant in the Bible, the covenant of grace, which was anticipated before Christ and remembered afterwards. Each period had its own sacraments. The argument in favor of infant baptism is its relationship to the OT sacrament of circumcision. Later Reformed theologians highlighted a covenant of works made with Adam as our federal head. In such a scheme, we have an obligation to fulfill our side of the bargain. For believers who live under the covenant of grace, works are still important “as a pattern for a devout life possible through sanctifying grace.” Wallace, therefore, notes a change from a single covenant to a double covenant. A recent book by Peter Lillback, entitled *The Binding of God: Calvin’s Role in the Development of Covenant Theology*, shows a higher level of continuity between Calvin, Bullinger, and the federal theologians on the topic of the covenant.

In the article on predestination, Wallace outlines Calvin's stance on double predestination and shows how Calvin drew heavily from the theology of Augustine. Wallace agrees with Vos that, in the post-Reformation period, Calvin's successors such as Beza enlarged the scope of the discussion of predestination and, according to Wallace, Beza made it a "more central part of his theology."

The articles draw from a virtual "who's who" of scholars of Reformed theology. On the whole, the articles are well written and insightful, providing an excellent introduction to the cardinal doctrines of the Reformed faith. McKim is to be commended for his continued contributions to our understanding of Reformed theology and history.

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

Visual Faith: Art, Theology, and Worship in Dialogue. Engaging Culture series. By William A. Dyrness. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2001, 188 pp., \$21.99 paper.

We live in a visual age, so it is crucial that Christians find effective ways to communicate their faith through visual media. William A. Dyrness, Professor of Theology and Culture at Fuller Theological Seminary, issues a clarion call for contemporary Christians to be engaged with the visual arts in this first volume in a series entitled *Engaging Culture*, edited by Dyrness and Robert K. Johnston.

In the first two chapters of *Visual Faith* and in a later chapter on modern art, Dyrness traces the history of the somewhat uneasy relationship between Christianity and the arts. He provides an excellent analysis of the religious significance of many works of art, and offers a helpful description of the relationship between key Christian theologians and the arts. Dyrness is not attempting to write an art history, so his overview of ancient art is understandably not as rich as such works as Robin Margaret Jensen's *Understanding Early Christian Art*. However, Dyrness's chapter that surveys the contemporary art scene presents a particularly insightful and perceptive explanation of the meaning and significance of modern art. This discussion alone is worth the price of the book.

Dyrness does make two historical claims that appear to be overstated. First, he probably exaggerates the evangelical disaffection with the arts when he accuses Protestantism of "giving up on the visual arts" (p. 12). While the early Reformation leaders obviously reacted strongly against the misuse of art objects in the Roman Catholic Church and reasserted the priority of the written and spoken word of God, they did find other visual ways of expressing Christian truth. Dyrness himself later lists numerous examples of post-Reformation Protestants who have made valuable artistic contributions. Although Dyrness notes that secular visual arts have expanded beyond the formal boundaries of institutional "high" art, he does not take into account the widely disseminated "low" art of Christian artists such as Warner Sallman, thus making the purported gap between evangelicals and the arts seem greater than may be the case. Second, Dyrness insists that nineteenth century American art (as evidenced in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts collection) "contains little reference to the Christian faith" (p. 11), "does not even illustrate a particular Christian belief" (p. 11), and contains "little or no particular theological content" (p. 59). In fact, the Boston museum collection has numerous paintings with explicitly Christian theological themes, from Thomas Cole's classic painting *Expulsion from the Garden of Eden* to dozens of works by John La Farge in various media (paintings, stained glass, wood engraving, etc.) on a variety of biblical persons and themes. Other nineteenth and twentieth-century works in the museum feature biblical characters and events including Moses, Elijah, Belshazzar's feast, Jesus,

Mary, Lazarus, and an angel releasing Simon Peter from prison, not to mention those depicting angels, churches, and scenes from church history. Furthermore, Dyrness's claim does not adequately take into account the profoundly Christian symbolism in nineteenth-century American art, particularly through expressions of the Hudson River School (over one hundred of which are at the Boston Museum of Fine Arts), in which religious symbolism played a significant role (especially through the use of light, the cross, and church scenes), or the *trompe l'oeil* school of Harnett and Peto (which raises questions about the nature of reality and the significance of life, not unlike those of Rene Magritte in contemporary art).

Dyrness develops a rich biblical and theological foundation for the arts in two thoughtful and well-written chapters. He first surveys the biblical language about beauty and the use of images in Scripture in the course of developing a biblical aesthetic. He then outlines a theology of the arts that is both trinitarian and incarnational. Dyrness rightly grounds his theological aesthetic in the doctrine of creation. He offers the questionable thesis, however, that virtually all art can bear at least an indirect witness to Christ because of creation and common grace, whether the art of other world religions or of an unbeliever such as Picasso (pp. 85, 96). Dyrness offers no clear set of Christian values by which one might evaluate a work of art produced by an unbeliever. While believers may see something of the tragedy of the fall in much contemporary art, they may not be able to see God in or through these works. In general, Dyrness is able to locate more common grace in works of modern art than many evangelical Christians will be able to recognize in them.

The final four chapters explore the challenges and opportunities available to Christians who get involved with the arts. Dyrness calls upon the church to achieve a new vision for the arts, to incorporate the arts in a renewal of worship, and to restore the great tradition of Christian art. These are worthy aims if they can be achieved without theological compromise. There is no doubt that many (and perhaps most) younger and median-aged Americans are visual learners, and the church that does not take this crucial factor into account will lose a tremendous venue for communicating Christian truth. Furthermore, there are clear biblical precedents for utilizing the visual arts to help facilitate worship.

Dyrness provides a compelling apology for evangelicals to incorporate visual arts into Christian faith and worship. Furthermore, he provides a strong biblical and theological rationale for a church to be more engaged with the visual arts, and identifies possible points of dialogue and rapprochement between Christian faith and the arts. It would have been helpful, however, had he provided a specific proposal of suggested steps that evangelical churches should take in order to close the gap with the visual arts. For example, Dyrness mentions the case of a church that gratefully accepted a painting donated to the church by a member who was a Christian artist, but the church was unsure about how to utilize this artwork in the service of the church. The painting was prominently displayed in the church for a period of time, and then taken down, much to the disappointment of the artist. Dyrness never provides any specific answers to how this church could have solved this dilemma and utilized the painting more effectively. Some specific plan of action or proposed list of initiatives for a church to utilize the visual arts more effectively would have been a useful addition.

Nonetheless, Dyrness provides a compelling case for evangelicals to interact more seriously with the visual arts. Ministers and other Christians interested in more effective engagement with contemporary culture will find this book to be an interesting read and a valuable resource.

Steve W. Lemke
New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, New Orleans, LA

The Supreme Harmony of All: The Trinitarian Theology of Jonathan Edwards. By Amy Plantinga Pauw. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002, 192 pp., \$22.00.

In this study Amy Plantinga Pauw traces Jonathan Edwards's trinitarian theology as a guiding motif in his overall thought. The result elevates an important aspect of Edwards's thought and underscores the historical grounding of recent interest in trinitarian theology.

Pauw begins by acknowledging her indebtedness to Janice Knight whose *Orthodoxies in Massachusetts* (1994) traced a sharp but little-noticed split among seventeenth-century Cambridge Puritans. This division, the "Antinomian Controversy" (1636–38), pitted the moralistic doctrines of one emerging tradition—linked particularly to William Perkins and William Ames—against a more affective theology promoted by Richard Sibbes, John Preston, and John Cotton. Knight's study included a brief epilogue that noted distinctive similarities between the views of the affective puritans and Edwards's beliefs. Knight's epilogue is Pauw's starting point.

Pauw argues that Edwards's main link to the affective puritans is their shared commitment to a theology of God's communal unity as portrayed in Christ's prayer of John 17. There, as elsewhere in the New Testament, God's immanent (intratrinitarian) love is revealed as his motive in creation and salvation. It is only in God's threeness, rather than in his unity or simplicity, that the biblical use of social metaphors of mutual affection can be grounded. Edwards, like the earlier puritans, believed that only in applying such social metaphors can God's selfless humility, expressed in the divine plan of the death, burial, and resurrection of the Son, be understood. Furthermore, it is just such a portrayal of God that captures the fallen human heart once the promise of God's sacrificial love is revealed to the hearts of the elect by the Spirit. So, while Edwards tips an ambivalent hat to the doctrine of simplicity—never denying it—he prefers to engage God's social nature as a "triplicity."

Pauw's comparisons of Edwards and the moralistic Puritans reveal two competing trajectories: the typical Puritan pattern, Pauw points out, is to elevate divine simplicity even when engaging the doctrine of the Trinity. With such a metaphysic God ultimately exists as a solitary perfection, and divine love expresses a non-relational self-devotion. Sibbes and Edwards, by contrast, held that God's social ontology accounts for creation as the fruit of God's "communicative, spreading goodness." Furthermore, Pauw argues that Edwards's relational ontology reverses the traditional Scholastic and Reformed axiology that presumed complexity to be a creaturely limitation. Rather, it is in God's immanent harmony that his beauty consists—a beauty rooted in harmonious complexity. Similarly, Edwards's covenant theology is reshaped to explain God's relations with humanity—his economic work—in a manner consistent with, but distinct from, God's existence as the immanent Trinity. To accomplish this Edwards uses a relational ontology to explain God's union with his saints. The covenant of redemption—an intratrinitarian covenant made in eternity—is held to be in full harmony with the covenant of grace, thus paving the way for salvation to be granted to the elect in a unilateral "free" testament.

Pauw provides an especially insightful facet to the study by asking in the penultimate chapter how Edwards applied his trinitarianism as a pastor. The critical question is: given Edwards's belief that the Spirit is the immediate source of divine love breathed into a believer's soul, how did Edwards expect that love to be evidenced in ordinary life? The answer was that it is not to be measured by private religious experiences or by displayed holiness, but in a new ardor for worship created by a new heart. This set the context for Edwards's decision to restrict access to the Eucharist to those who reflected such ardor. His parishioners, however, reacted to the restriction as presumptuous and their unhappiness paved the way for Edwards's departure from the Northampton

ministry. The disagreement between Edwards and his church also revealed the disruptive side of his doctrine when it was not fully shared—or experienced—by others.

Pauw concludes the rather firm line of her thesis with a surprisingly hesitant summary. She acknowledges that Edwards's eclectic creativity and his lack of concern for systematic coherence leaves any single approach vulnerable to criticism. Even her own study, she explains, is a complex interplay of distinct but related analogies—the psychological and social—that help reveal the Trinity. When this complexity is formed into a final picture it remains something of “a cobbled trinitarianism” that could be overlooked or misread by later scholars. The body of her thesis, however, portrays Edwards's view of God in terms that invite a bolder conclusion.

What, then, of Pauw's effort? Her work is to be strongly commended, inviting the attention of Edwards specialists, trinitarian theologians, and students of Reformed theology in general. Edwards's discussions of God's relational motive for creation and salvation, in particular, are seen more clearly through a trinitarian optic. That viewpoint also challenges a tendency still present in some Reformed circles to see God too much in terms of his solitary oneness. Furthermore, her portrayal supplies a broad ontological foundation for Edwards's belief that religious affections are the keystone of human salvation—showing how God's immanent and economic relations unfold to his creatures in a harmonious fabric of affective, redeemed relations that comprise salvation.

Finally, a historian's disappointment must be noted. Edwards's engagement with the affective Puritans is not well documented in the study, despite the presumption of that connection throughout the work. For instance, while Pauw's narrative often places Sibbes's views in tandem with Edwards's similar views on a given topic—thus creating an impression of direct influence—her footnotes fail to demonstrate Edwards's specific awareness of Sibbes at such points. So, while Edwards had certainly read Sibbes and others of Sibbes's affective companions, questions about the strength of this linkage remain unanswered. However, this issue aside, Pauw's contribution is heartily welcomed as an insightful step forward in the ongoing exploration of the Protestant trinitarian-affective tradition, a tradition that clearly included Edwards.

R. N. Frost

Multnomah Biblical Seminary, Portland, OR

Unapologetic Apologetics: Meeting the Challenges of Theological Studies. By William A. Dembski and Jay Wesley Richards, editors. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2001, vii + 280 pp., \$14.00 paper.

Unapologetic Apologetics is a collection of articles written by Princeton theological students who seek to provide rational support for an orthodox Christian world view. These scholars, through their participation in The Charles Hodge Society and The Religious and Theological Students Fellowship, work to maintain an orthodox witness at seminaries that have not only left their theological legacy but have even become hostile to their Christian heritage. The authors design this book to do three things: reawaken Christians to engage in research that is sorely needed for responsible apologetics, warn readers against the errors of a non-Christian world view, and encourage Christians to engage opposing ideas, even if it means suffering academic martyrdom.

The articles cover specific issues confronting students in today's non-evangelical seminary environment. Authors assume that readers have a casual familiarity with Scripture and general Christian theology. While the book defends orthodox Christian-

ity, it does not cover the breadth of world views the way, for example, Geisler's *Christian Apologetics* does. The book's focus on contemporary issues means it takes only a cursory look at the principles of apologetics or debate theory. However, astute readers will glean principles of debate theory from a careful observation of the way the authors construct their arguments. The authors do not spend much time defending Christian teaching by marshalling evidence; this is due perhaps to their broadly Reformed perspective. Rather, the authors work to show the incoherence and/or question-begging bias of opposing positions without the rancor or dismissiveness that sometimes occasions other approaches to apologetics. The authors' *via media* position on the issue of presuppositionalist and evidentialist styles of apologetics should prove invaluable for those seeking an alternative.

If the reader tends to ignore introductions, I would suggest that this one not be skipped owing to its reasoned call for Christian students to study and engage liberal theological education. Editors Dembski and Richards, who penned the introduction, speak from the authority that only experience can provide when they encourage others to follow their example. They are careful to advise readers to count the potential social and academic costs of standing for the truth of Christian orthodoxy. The authors are to be commended for discussing apologetics in the context of discipleship and not purely from an academic perspective.

The editors have organized the fifteen articles into five categories: foundations, Scripture, Christology, theology, and science. Readers should understand that this book does not get involved—and I think properly so—in Christian sectarian disputes. It is clearly centered on defending orthodox Christianity against the non-Christian world views of materialism and relativism. The following discussion is based on my own grouping of the articles.

"The Task of Apologetics" and the "Afterword" responsibly address the "what" and "why" of apologetics. The first article correctly fleshes out the practical implications of Jude 1:3, namely, that apologetics is not an option for believers. It is a reasoned attempt to convince Christians infected with relativism that their belief has implications and consequences with regard to other world views. By contrast, the "Afterword" presents a heartfelt appeal to seminary students to join in the task of Christian apologetics.

The editors include two historical articles that shed light on the ideological struggle between liberal and orthodox views of Christianity through the lens of Princeton Seminary. Readers from other seminaries may find the debates at Princeton to be instructive in helping to understand how their own seminary changed or resisted change.

Four articles center around exposing and critiquing the assumptions of naturalism and contextualism that provide the basis of so many contemporary non-Christian world views. These articles are essential reading for any burgeoning apologist, because they apply to views of science and to the existence of objective truth. By assaulting radical contextualism, Dembski makes room for (at least) limited objectivity and by implication the existence of absolute truth. Dembski continues his good work by discussing the role of design theory as it relates to naturalistic evolution. For those who appreciate *Darwin on Trial*, Dembski's two articles are essential reading.

Five articles wrestle with liberal critiques of the cogency of a traditional understanding of Christian teaching, focusing on alleged errors in Scripture, the incoherence of the incarnation and Christ, universalism, and the Y chromosome. The article using Pascal's wager as a method to decide whether or not the Bible should be understood as teaching universalism is especially enjoyable. In each case, a methodological strategy is modeled as to how apologists should handle these issues.

Three articles confront the feminist critique of Christianity. Given the way feminism has exerted a significant impact on seminaries, these articles are must reading

for any contemporary Christian theology student. They exhibit care and compassion while avoiding the easy solution of simply rejecting the feminist concern over “male” God language, offering instead a positive case for the value of traditional God language.

I would strongly recommend this book to professors as a secondary text to introduce their first-year students to readings in applied apologetics. The intellectual rigor coupled with a pastoral tone is a worthy example for future pastors and theologians to follow. These students should feel some satisfaction in seeing how their studies and beliefs are both reasonable and practical. There are some caveats, however: Because Latin phrases and ideological terms are not always explained, the book is not particularly user-friendly for beginning students. For example, instructors should provide background on the presuppositionalist versus evidentialist debate before having students read the “History of Apologetics at Princeton” essay. Also, various articles make unsupported claims. To my mind, the failure to offer support for these assertions by means of thorough documentation severely hinders the book’s potential use as a scholarly resource.

I would also recommend the book to Christians considering attending non-evangelical seminaries. At a minimum, the articles give readers several essential tactics in addressing some of the most common contemporary critiques of historic Christianity. This book does not cover all the issues they will face; topics such as Christians and politics, social and sexual issues, and environmental concerns are not addressed. Hopefully, the editors will create a second volume addressing concerns not touched on in this work. They should be commended for providing an apologetics book that properly balances the desire for truth with the need for grace. I can only hope that more Christians model the apologetics presented in this book.

Stephen Vantassel

Trinity College of the Bible and Seminary, Newburgh, IN

The Medieval Theologians: An Introduction to Theology in the Medieval Period. By G. R. Evans, ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 2001, xx + 383 pp., \$41.95 paper.

The Medieval Theologians, edited by G. R. Evans, fills the need for an up-to-date, comprehensive, and readable introduction to religious life and thought in the Middle Ages.

Part I, “The End of the Ancient World,” begins with John Rist’s brief but successful attempt to tackle some of the “ambiguities” of St. Augustine’s thought. Rist argues that St. Augustine has been subject to misinterpretation and therefore misunderstanding. In a noble effort to uncover the “real” Augustine, Rist surveys such topics as God’s nature, baptism and the Church, sin and virtue, faith and reason, love, grace and knowledge, and philosophy and the Bible. Rist humbly concludes that numerous avenues of inquiry into Augustine assist in the daunting task of trying to understand this important medieval figure. Charles Kannengiesser, in chapter two, addresses the “towering” figures of Boethius, Cassiodorus, and Gregory the Great. Kannengiesser succinctly identifies the qualities of each individual (Boethius, philosophy and logic; Cassiodorus, man of letters; Gregory the Great, able pastor and politician) and their uncanny ability to transmit their respective qualities to a world in transition. Finally, Andrew Louth highlights the definitive character of Chalcedonian Christology and filters this through the life and thought of key “postpatristic Byzantine theologians.” Louth equitably treats Eastern (Greek) Fathers such as Origen, Dionysios and Romanos, Maximos the Confessor, St. John Damascene, Photios, Symeon the New Theologian, Psellos, and Gregory

Palamas, as well as monastic liturgy, spirituality, and icons. Louth accurately captures the essence of the Orthodox faithful.

Part II, "The Carolingians," begins with a short chapter on Bede by Benedicta Ward. She compellingly shows how Bede internalized and utilized the traditions of the early Fathers and masterfully transmitted them to the English people. Willemien Otten briefly and brilliantly examines the major theological controversies particular to the Carolingian milieu (adoptionism, iconoclasm, eucharistic meaning, and predestination), but stresses that Carolingian theology is not the "sum of its controversies." Rather, in Otten's estimation, the Carolingians embraced a theological past (e.g. appeal to the Fathers) to chart a decidedly theological future.

Part III, entitled "A Medieval 'Renaissance?'" comprises the largest section of this volume. G. R. Evans opens with discussion of several key theological controversies of the eleventh century (Berengar of Tours on "symbolic" communion; Peter Damien on the power of God; and Roscelin of Compiègne on the Trinity) brought about by strides in medieval scholarship and political controversy. Also, in the following chapter Evans chronicles the life of Anselm of Canterbury and the lasting influence of his theological and spiritual works. Lauge O. Nielsen next offers a glimpse of the "dissimilarities" between Peter Abelard and Gilbert of Poitiers. For instance, Abelard is well known for his escapades with Heloise and his theological writings are examples of formidable logic, while only rough biographical elements exist about Gilbert and his verifiable extant writings consist only of commentaries. Despite ontological differences and variations in literary presentation, Nielsen perceptively observes that Abelard and Gilbert are in concert with regard to the linguistics of religious language. Emero Stiegman covers medieval monasticism through discussion of key Cistercians and Victorines. Stiegman analyzes the striking mystical theology propounded by Bernard of Clairvaux and uncovers the detailed and erudite meditations of William of St. Thierry on trinitarian theology. Hugh of St. Victor is applauded for his "literal" mystical theology while his student, Richard of St. Victor, is praised for psychological acuity which, according to Stiegman, enhanced Richard's theology of contemplation. Jenny Swanson presents a concise history of the *Glossa Ordinaria*, and although textual criticism casts numerous shadows over its annotations of the Latin Bible, the *Glossa* remained a key "textbook" in academic theological circles from the Middle Ages to the eighteenth century. Marcia L. Colish, in the final chapter of Section III, shows that despite a distinct Victorine influence, Peter Lombard was a formative voice in scholastic theology.

Part IV, "The High Medieval Debate," offers a sample of important theologians and issues during the high Middle Ages. Michael Robson, in his essay on Saint Bonaventure, highlights key points of Bonaventure's theology (e.g. divine revelation of Scripture; authority of councils and Fathers) and offers brief summaries of *Breviloquium*, *De praeparatione ad missam*, and the *Collationes de septem donis Spiritus sancti*. Fergus Kerr offers a short and lucid biography of Thomas Aquinas, traces the development of his theology, and concludes with a detailed synopsis of the *Summa Theologica*. Oliver Davies presents the main features of medieval mysticism and summarizes the writings of Bonaventure and Julian of Norwich, among others, and suggests female mystics and "maverick men" like Meister Eckhart can offer fresh wisdom and insight into contemporary mystical spirituality. Takashi Shogimen's chapter on medieval academic turmoil includes discussion of the poverty controversy involving William of Ockham, the schism of 1054, and the Council of Constance. Finally, Alexander Broadie shows how Duns Scotus and William Ockham argued for a "univocity of being" against St. Thomas's Aristotelian "analogy of being."

Part V, "Dissent," covers various marginalized groups and people of the medieval era including the Waldenses (Euan Cameron) and John Wyclife (Stephen Lahey). This

chapter also includes essays on "Ecclesiology and Politics" (Matthew S. Kempshall) and "Dissent" (Gerhard Rottenwohrer).

Medieval Theologians closes with a riveting chapter in which G. R. Evans summarizes the thought of Robert Kilwardby and Gabriel Biel on salvation and suggests a connection with Martin Luther's notion of "saving faith." Paul Rorem rounds out this volume with probing comments on the profound legacy of St. Augustine through the Middle Ages, the Reformation, and even into our own day.

Dubbed as a "companion volume" to David Ford's (ed.) *The Modern Theologians, Medieval Theologians* is an equally compelling collection of essays on Christian theology. It serves as a grand introduction to the fine minds and the theological/political currents that shaped this fascinating period of Christian history.

Phillip Luke Sinitiere
University of Houston, Houston, TX

The Making of American Liberal Theology: Imagining Progressive Religion, 1805–1900.
By Gary Dorrien. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 2001, xxv + 494 pp., \$39.95 paper.

In the first of three volumes set to chronicle the liberal Protestant tradition in America, Gary Dorrien's *The Making of American Liberal Theology* artfully demonstrates that nineteenth-century Protestant liberals occupied a "middle way" between ardent conservatism and dry rationalism. Such ministers, theologians, and thinkers were shaped by Darwinist thought, German theology, and an increasingly progressive social order. Dorrien carefully points out that despite the eventual influence of German liberal theology, American theological liberals are best described as "honest Victorians." According to these liberals, best typified by Horace Bushnell, theology was not to be overly rationalistic or academic nor was it to be nauseatingly dogmatic; rather, theology was to be a transformative social force.

Dorrien defines liberal theology as "the idea that Christian theology can be genuinely Christian without being based upon external authority" (p. xiii). The first distinctly American group to embrace this view was the Unitarians, the subject of the opening chapter. Ministers like Charles Chauncy, Jonathan Mayhew, and Theodore Parker clearly embody this type of Christian, but William Ellery Channing captures best the Unitarian spirit. Dorrien indicates that the definitive moment for early American Unitarian Christianity came in 1819 at the ordination of Baltimore minister Jared Sparks, for this is when Channing defined a movement. After he upheld the Unitarian principle of Scripture as "God's revelation," Channing highlighted the importance of using reason to discern this revelation. The Unitarians's aim was, in Channing's words, to "spiritualize the mind" so that contemplation of God's moral perfection might produce righteous actions. Also within this framework, Channing questioned the reasonableness of the Trinity and forcefully discarded the folly of Calvinism. Gaining staunch popularity after his Baltimore sermon, Channing made a foray into literary criticism and objectified the "moral" impulse in Unitarian Christianity by remaining socially progressive throughout his lifetime.

The second chapter introduces the transcendentalist wing of liberal American Christianity. Dorrien effectively observes that the Transcendentalists valued spiritual experience over any creedal formula and thereby rejected outdated Lockean empiricism. This allows him to describe the Transcendentalists as "intuitionists" and "romantics." Dorrien convincingly presents Theodore Parker as the perennial Transcendentalist

whose liberal Christian impulse was stirred by Ralph Waldo Emerson's "Divinity School Address" at Harvard in 1838. A number of Parker's sermons and lectures, such as "The Transient and Permanent in Christianity" (1841) and "A Discourse of Matters Pertaining to Religion" (1841-42) transformed his anti-historical theology into decidedly historical action, evidenced by Parker's sympathy toward temperance, women's rights, and abolitionism. Dorrien clearly shows that Parker's perceived "radicalism" of the 1840s paved the way for an inclusive Unitarianism that supported theology and social action and called for Christianity to make ample use of the "dawning" scientific age created by Charles Darwin's *Origin of Species*.

Dorrien then presents the life and thought of Horace Bushnell and demonstrates masterfully that Bushnell represents the *sine qua non* of liberal theology in nineteenth-century America for his penchant to "theorize about the metaphorical nature of religious language" (p. 111). Eventually discarding stuffy Calvinistic theology, Bushnell focused on "words" as conveyers of spiritual truth, and his *God in Christ: Three Discourses* proclaimed a decidedly liberal theology of language. Other works such as *Christ in Theology*, *Christian Nurture*, *The Vicarious Sacrifice*, and *Nature and the Supernatural* established Bushnell's ability to present the validity of uncovering the intricacies of religious language, what Dorrien cleverly calls "imagination wording forth." For Bushnell, theology is best described as "poetry of the divine and human spirits," indeed a "third way" of subjective Christian spirituality.

The life and thought of Henry Ward Beecher and Elizabeth Cady Stanton comprise the fourth chapter of Dorrien's narrative. The tumultuous but transformative decades before, during, and after the Civil War provided Beecher a prime opportunity to shape a growing mainline Protestant presence by preaching a moralistic Christianity, otherwise known as the "science of right living." Despite the shape and scope of Beecher's preaching, he was implicated in an adultery scandal but later absolved by his congregation, even though, as Dorrien reminds us, the exact events of the controversy are difficult to reconstruct. Dorrien then points out that Beecher played a formative role in bringing Darwinism to American Protestants precisely because he was a pastor. Beecher opposed conservative rejections of Darwinism (namely, Charles Hodge's *What is Darwinism?*) as well as atheism masquerading as Darwinism. A "theology of evolutionary process," what Dorrien sees with Beecher as a "third way," was necessary for Christianity to make peace with the world. After a biographical sketch of Elizabeth Cady Stanton and the birth of the feminist movement, Dorrien spends considerable time discussing the formation of *The Woman's Bible*. Cady Stanton was deeply concerned with the misogynistic thrust of the Bible and thus sought to rewrite women into the biblical narrative. While her accomplishments sparked heated reaction, controversy, and rejection in her own day, Dorrien validly connects Cady Stanton, a "feminist [Theodore] Paker in religion," with the ascendancy of feminist religion.

The fifth chapter surveys the lives of three key liberal Protestant ministers, Washington Gladden, Newman Smyth, and Theodore Munger; chronicles the contentious evolution of Andover Seminary (later subsumed with Harvard Divinity School); and details the rise of the social gospel movement. Running like a golden cord specifically throughout this chapter is a very able explication of the "New Theology" movement that gained considerable popularity in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Dorrien perceptively argues that Newman Smyth's *The Religious Feeling* was the first major attempt in America to synthesize Friedrich Schleiermacher's theology and the evolutionary theory of Charles Darwin. Smyth maintained that religion and science occupy separate spheres but can inform one another. Smyth's *Old Faiths in New Light* also called for a Christianity that welcomed modern thought. The controversial part of *Old Faiths*, however, was Smyth's affirmation of a state of "future probation," eschewing traditional Protestant conceptions of heaven and hell. This proclamation was to cost

Smyth a prominent academic appointment at Andover (which he did not seek), but, ironically, as Dorrien strikingly shows, confirmed the seminary's "progressive orthodoxy." Theodore Munger, another apostle of American liberal theology, helped to popularize the New Theology through *The Freedom of Faith*. This landmark work embraced time-honored Christian distinctives of scriptural authority and revelation but articulated them in modern terms. Munger also sought to accommodate Christian theology to Darwinist theory because he believed the latter helped to reveal the process and progress of the Christian faith. Dorrien keenly observes that even Queen Victoria praised Munger's literary efforts, thus confirming New Theology's Victorian impulse to "suggest" a new system rather than articulate a firm system "dogmatically." Washington Gladden occupied the pulpit both as a minister and social critic whose preaching and writing provided considerable strength for the social gospel movement because he believed that personal conversion went hand in hand with the Christianization of society. Like Smyth and Munger, Gladden welcomed the theological explication of Darwinian theory. Dorrien cogently shows that in a critical historical moment for American Christianity, John Fiske's exposition of Darwinism decidedly shaped the New Theology movement (as well as Manifest Destiny). Social and economic "progress," accomplished through Christian ethical principles, evidenced the advancement of the kingdom of God on earth.

The sixth chapter tells the story of the ascendancy of liberal theology in a number of notable conservative Protestant institutions. Charles A. Briggs, a leading Presbyterian of the nineteenth century, was the subject of one of the most notorious heresy trials in modern memory. His devotion was to historic Reformed theology, and he called for modern (German) biblical scholarship to bear upon current questions of faith and practice. This "progressive theology" was outlined in his famous *Whither? A Theological Question for the Times* and more decisively in his first address as Edward Robinson Chair of Biblical Theology at Union Seminary, *The Authority of Holy Scripture*. Dorrien solidly concludes that Briggs's heresy trial and Union Seminary's subsequent move to the left are instructive features of the institutional foothold that liberal Protestant theology gained in the twentieth century. The second half of chapter six considers the contributions of Methodist Borden Parker Browne to liberal Protestant theology. Chair of the philosophy department at Boston University for many years, Browne issued an influential "personalist" philosophy, holding that "personality" is "all that is real" and that God is the end of all human inquiry. Browne insisted that the work of a theologian rests upon the pillars of philosophy and, as such, it is incumbent upon the serious thinker to have a philosophy of religion; to do so, according to Browne, is to brush off narrow-minded conservatism and to assail materialist atheists. In a telling moment for Methodist Christianity and liberal Protestantism, Browne was charged with heresy but later exonerated. Subsequently, Browne was quick to point out that serious criticism is necessary for progress in Christianity.

The seventh and final chapter concludes "act one" in the drama of liberal Protestantism in America. As Dorrien envisions, liberal theology has gained momentum and strength not only in the hearts and minds of many faithful in America, but in key institutions as well. The gravitation toward liberal theology was easiest in the "creedless" Congregational denomination, Dorrien concludes, but more difficult and taxing (though eventually successful) among other confessional Protestant bodies. The overarching Victorian element in the growth of liberal Protestantism in America became a concrete reality, observes Dorrien, with social gospelism. The unifying element between theological liberals was the premium placed on social action as an outgrowth of religious conversion. Dorrien singles out Charles A. Briggs and Newman Smyth as hopeful ecumenists; both saw the modernization of Catholic faith and practice as the critical step toward a unification of the faith (excluding Eastern Orthodoxy) despite key

pontifical encyclicals roundly condemning modernism. Given the recent crisis among Catholic clergy in America, this type of liberal “imagining” becomes far more poignant and interesting. Keen readers hope Dorrien readily addresses these developments in forthcoming volumes.

Dorrien’s biographical approach to the formation of an American liberal Protestant tradition is innovative, winsome, and quite successful. He ably captures the life, thought, and overall essence of the key figures in the first “imaginings” of the liberal Protestant tradition in America. This volume is the ripe fruit of exhaustive research and keen analysis and is indeed a magisterial contribution to the grand narrative of historical theology in America.

Phillip Luke Sinitiere
University of Houston, Houston, TX

Across the Spectrum: Understanding Issues in Evangelical Theology. By Gregory A. Boyd and Paul R. Eddy. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002, 287 pp., \$18.99 paper.

Perhaps no figure in contemporary evangelical theology is more controversial than Gregory Boyd, the prolific and passionate advocate of a “reformist” evangelicalism that embraces—among other things—open theism, evangelical feminism, and a reformulation of the doctrine of eternal punishment. In this volume, Boyd, pastor of Woodland Hills Church in St. Paul, Minnesota, teams up with Bethel College theologian Paul Eddy to lay out the various positions of debate in evangelical theology. Boyd and Eddy argue that this volume takes a “liberal arts” view of theology, in which the instructor seeks less to advocate a position to his students than to “broaden students’ minds by helping them empathetically understand a variety of perspectives while training them to think critically for themselves” (p. 6).

In so doing, Boyd and Eddy take up issues of longstanding debate within evangelical theology, such as the Calvinist/Arminian divide over predestination, the age of the earth, baptism, the millennial views, and the continuation or cessation of charismatic gifts. They also analyze more fundamental disagreements such as whether God foreknows the future, whether Scripture errs, and whether explicit faith in Christ is necessary for salvation. The methodology of the volume is consistent, as the authors present the various viewpoints on each topic, followed by possible objections to the view presented and relevant responses to the objections. In the presentation of each viewpoint, Boyd and Eddy seek to argue like an advocate of the position in order to reduce the temptation to caricature any position. Because the authors see so many questions at dispute in evangelical theology, one book is not enough to hold them all. They include an Internet address at which the reader may find an appendix addressing issues ranging from infant salvation to the timing of the rapture to the question of whether wives should submit to their husbands.

This book succeeds at many of its goals. The volume serves as both a concise and a comprehensive treatment of the doctrinal issues at stake. The authors display a keen understanding of the nuances within varying positions on a stunning array of theological points of debate. For instance, Boyd and Eddy explore at length the philosophical and doctrinal implications of the nature of the divine image. They also include the often overlooked—or too quickly dismissed as an outdated “gap theory”—“restoration” model of creation, which they rightly see as worthy of evangelical reconsideration.

The book also is yet more confirmation that there are few theologians in the contemporary context who are more skilled than Boyd at engaging and captivating

communication of ideas—often to the chagrin of many of us who find some of his positions subversive to the church. The book therefore avoids a systemic flaw of many of the current “four views” books on theological disputes—namely, the problem of a skilled writer on one side of the question debating a less equipped opponent. The authors’ “debating” their own arguments neutralizes the possibility of such a frustration.

Though most readers will be familiar with the theological vantage point of Boyd and Eddy on many of these issues, conservative evangelicals will not find themselves cringing at the way their views are portrayed here. The authors do indeed “empathetically” present competing viewpoints—to the point that one almost wonders how Boyd can hold some of his “reformist” positions after presenting such a straightforward defense of classical Christian orthodoxy.

Nevertheless, the primary flaw of this volume is its very premise. The authors are unable to present an objective and “empathetic” view of the panorama of evangelical theological options, precisely because they must choose what are indeed evangelical theological options. This discussion over evangelical identity and doctrinal boundaries is, in fact, at the heart of many of the issues Boyd and Eddy present in the book. The authors note in the introduction that they seek only to discuss evangelical options, and thus do not include debates over issues such as transubstantiation, earth worship, or universalism. The authors then, however, offer discussions of supposedly “intramural” disputes over issues on which evangelical theology has been united until the very recent past—issues such as the verbal inspiration of Scripture, the foreknowledge of God, and the penal substitutionary atonement of Christ.

Loosed from the confessional moorings of evangelical orthodoxy, Boyd and Eddy can judge what is within the tent of evangelical authenticity simply by discerning what parachurch evangelical publishers are currently willing to publish. This is an *ad hoc* creedalism that simply cannot sustain evangelical reflection on the issues before us—largely because it is no longer possible to distinguish between primary, secondary, and tertiary doctrinal matters, a distinction that even Boyd and Eddy maintain is necessary. In so doing, they treat issues that have been considered foundational to the meaning of the gospel itself—such as the atonement and the necessity of faith in Christ—in the same way that they treat genuinely intramural evangelical discussions on trichotomy versus dichotomy or immersion versus sprinkling.

In short, this book can serve as a helpful primer for professors as they seek to gauge whether they are fairly presenting alternative viewpoints in a classroom setting. It is probably not as helpful for theological students seeking to sort through the maze of current evangelical doctrinal debates. It is most helpful, however, for those who wish to see just how fractured and confused contemporary evangelical theology actually is. A book like this needs to be written as a resource for evangelicals seeking to understand the questions that divide them. Prior to this, however, must come a discussion about what is “evangelical” about evangelical theology, and just how wide the “spectrum” actually can be before “evangelicalism” no longer describes anything at all.

Russell D. Moore

The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, KY

Satan and the Problem of Evil: Constructing a Trinitarian Warfare Theodicy. By Gregory A. Boyd. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2001, 468 pp., \$24.99 paper.

Greg Boyd is senior pastor of Woodland Hills Church in St. Paul, Minnesota, and president of Christus Victor Ministries. He taught theology at Bethel College, St. Paul, from 1986 to 2002 and is known for his books *Letters from a Skeptic* (Chariot Victor,

1994), *God at War* (IVP, 1996), and the open theism primer, *The God of the Possible* (Baker, 2000).

Despite these very well-known publications, in order to understand why Boyd wrote *Satan and the Problem of Evil* and what he is trying to accomplish, one must consider a book that has possibly had the greatest influence on his career—his first. *Trinity and Process: A Critical Evaluation and Reconstruction of Hartshorne's Di-Polar Theism Towards a Trinitarian Metaphysics* (Peter Lang, 1992) is the monograph version of Boyd's 1988 Princeton Seminary doctoral dissertation. Here we encounter Boyd's formative thought and grasp the philosophical/theological vision that has since focused much of his research and writing program. In his preface, Boyd explains both his philosophical and theological orientation: "This work is, in essence, an attempt to work out a trinitarian-process metaphysic. . . . It is our conviction that the fundamental vision of the process worldview, especially as espoused by Charles Hartshorne, is correct. But it is our conviction as well that the scriptural and traditional understanding of God as triune and antecedently actual within Godself is true, and is, in fact, a foundational doctrine of the Christian faith. But, we contend, these two views, when understood within a proper framework, do not conflict" (p. i). Simply put, Boyd is constructing a "best of both worlds" approach, drawing from process and orthodox trinitarian thought. The methodology and the nature of the resulting view are both reminiscent of Barth's bold venture of choosing parts of classical liberalism and Reformed evangelicalism for his revolutionary theological *via media*, a synthesis that was still much more like liberalism than Reformation thinking.

The quotation above, and the playing out of this view in *Trinity and Process*, indicates that Greg Boyd has not been, as most evangelicals assume, an evangelical whose championing of open theism has prompted him to adjust away from evangelical views toward process thought in more recent years. Rather, at least since his dissertation research, he has been convinced that process thought (at least the kind promoted by Hartshorne) is, in the main, correct and only needs to be adjusted in a few areas toward evangelicalism.

We now return to the question of how Boyd's stated view in *Trinity and Process* largely explains why he wrote *Satan and the Problem of Evil* and what he is trying to accomplish. Two answers present themselves: because of the ways in which Boyd's views are like process thought and priorities; and because of the ways in which they are still like orthodox Trinitarian thought. To give two examples: (1) *Satan and the Problem of Evil* is a theodicy. Process thinkers are significantly preoccupied with giving an answer to the problem of evil, and Boyd follows suit. (2) Both *Satan and the Problem of Evil* and open theism begin with love as the "be-all-and-end-all" characteristic of God's character because that is exactly where process begins and how it prioritizes God's characteristics.

On the other hand, there are three elements in the title of Boyd's book that set his view apart from being simply reprocessed process thought: Though both are mentioned sparingly in the book, "Satan" and "warfare," reflect Boyd's belief in personal evil and rebellion against God, aspects of his openness theodicy that he has (rightly) adjusted from process thought's inflexible naturalism. Furthermore, "trinitarian" is also in contrast to process views of God, none of which comes closer to biblical trinitarianism than the semantics game of an economic trinity.

At the end of the day, however, in spite of whatever evangelical-sounding notes Boyd strikes along the way, his view and this book are still considerably closer theologically to process thought than evangelicalism. The remainder of this review will briefly track the resulting shape, strengths, and weaknesses of Boyd's proposed trinitarian-process theodicy, closing with a perspective for those considering reading *Satan and the Problem of Evil*.

In overview, the book divides into two main parts: Part one (chs. 1–6) lays out six trinitarian warfare theses that comprise the framework of Boyd's theodicy. These are: (1) love must be freely chosen; (2) love entails risk (à la Sanders's *The God Who Risks*); (3) love and freedom entail that we are responsible for one another; (4) the power to influence for the worse is proportionate to the power to influence for the better; (5) within limits, freedom must be irrevocable; and (6) this limitation is not infinite, for our capacity to choose freely is not endless. Boyd asserts that these six theses add up to a compelling explanation for the knotty problem of how evil exists in a world created by a good God.

In Part two (chs. 7–12), Boyd applies his construct to critical issues for any theodicy such as prayer, natural evil, and hell (to which he dedicates two chapters, focusing largely on his adjusted Barthian concept of hell being *Das Nichtige*, "the nothingness"). The remaining material is made up of five appendixes, a long glossary, a very useful bibliography, and two indexes.

This is an unusually difficult book to which to assign strengths and weaknesses; such evaluation depends almost entirely on one's entry viewpoint. On the one hand, if readers share Boyd's semi-process/openness presuppositions, his ambitious theodicy will come off as strong (i.e. rational) and of great significance. Again, if readers are in his camp or do not notice his unproven assumptions of God's self-limiting ultra-immanence and man's minimized sinfulness, they likely will end up exactly where he is trying to take them. In a word, if the eccentric premises of open theism make sense to readers, the construction of Boyd's logic probably will as well.

On the other hand, if readers don't accept Boyd's foundational stance, the superstructure built on it, while flashy, is ultimately a virtual house of cards. That is especially true of the material on hell. Furthermore, his essay on chance in the fourth appendix is vaguely entitled "Theology." It is, like the book's body, *philosophical theology*, now reflecting on chance. It is theology-like only in that God is mentioned a few times, Job is referred to, and there are biblical proof-texts in one footnote.

In conclusion, as evidenced by the clear and popular style of *The God of the Possible* and the fact that his pulpit ministry has added to the growth of Woodland Hills Church, Greg Boyd is a master communicator. That style, however, is seldom in evidence in *Satan and the Problem of Evil*, primarily because of its heavy philosophical tone. Though highly provocative in content, it still will prove difficult reading for all but the philosophically-oriented or those fascinated with finding out how well open theism fares in trying to best pure process thinkers at building a better mousetrap (i.e. theodicy). However, in a classic philosopher vs. non-philosopher disconnect, the majority will either resign in frustration before finishing or put the book aside in dissatisfaction at having to take on 450-plus pages of material, when Boyd's message could reasonably have been presented in half that amount.

Oddly enough, Boyd could have readily built upon the momentum of *The God of the Possible* and likely drawn a sizeable number of adherents (instead of a relative handful of the philosophically infatuated) to the openness fold by offering a readable theodicy. However, he aggressively attempts to write a *magnum opus* process-like theodicy. Apparently, to Boyd, the convincing of an occasional philosopher (whether evangelical or process, since his "neither fish nor fowl" view implies an apologetic to both) is worth the sacrifice of shooting over the head of, or even baffling, the mass of non-specialists.

A. Boyd Luter and Emily K. Hunter
The Criswell College, Dallas, TX