

# Book Reviews

Mark TOULOUSE, ed. *Walter Scott: Nineteenth-Century Evangelical*. St. Louis: Chalice Press, 1999. 150 pp. \$19.99.

The authors of this book on Walter Scott have provided us a more complete story of this tenacious evangelist of the American religious movement which bears his imprint but not his name. Eight authors have explored the life of this passionate and sometimes flamboyant preacher, author, artist, and nationalist. A ninth participant, Fred Craddock, offers a sermon in honor of Scott's contributions to the Stone-Campbell Restoration Movement. Mark G. Toulouse and Peter M. Morgan set the stage, briefly presenting Scott as an artisan, skilled in music and poetry, whose thought and work mirrored the moods and events of the postrevolutionary era in the United States. He was eccentric but without a doubt, effective. Though steeped in the rationalism of his day, he did not lack passion for his message, and scores of Americans, sharing his dreams for Protestant Christianity, responded. Amy Collier Artman's chapter, "An Implicit Creed: Walter Scott and the Golden Oracle," highlights Scott's most repeated message: Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God. Scott was tireless in emphasizing this as the True Gospel and the only creed of Christianity. Scott believed that he had restored this fact to its proper place in Christianity. Like the other reformers, Scott was strongly anticreedal, but this Golden Oracle was singular and biblical. Unfortunately, in defending and explaining it, Scott was unable to avoid layers of propositions and supports. In the end, the whole discussion was a well-developed faith system which, in form, at least, rivaled any other creed of its time.

Similarly, James O. Duke's chapter, "Walter Scott, Theologian," shows that in spite of Scott's intense insistence to be free from the theological cross-currents of the religious world, including the term "theology," his prolific writings reveal the inability to escape methodological and traditional shaping of his religious context. Duke says Scott's views were a "very peculiar Scots-American blend" of religious thinking that may least aptly be called nontheological.

T. Dwight Bozeman shows that Scott's True Gospel operated to downplay the subjective and accent the objective aspects of faith. Love, fear, joy and other expressions of piety were in no way discounted, but they required restrictive focusing to avoid the pitfalls of the emotion-laden revivalism of the American frontier, which in his estimation reduced Christianity to a "mere vehicle of feelings."

Thomas H. Olbricht writes about Scott's method of biblical interpretation, showing among other things Scott's interest in biblical anthropology. Scott

focused much of his study and teaching on the narratives of both testaments, observing humanity's struggle with sin. The messiahship then, is the central issue of Scripture; Christ brought salvation in response to the need of humankind. In different ways, Olbricht and Bozeman explore Scott's enthusiasm for what he saw as the self-evident truths of Scripture.

David E. Harrell gives attention to the powerful political and nationalistic influences on Scott's thinking. Democratic fervor, the strong national belief that the United States would be the agent for millennial perfection, and the view that the Reformation would bring about unity of Christians, all fueled Scott's hopes and expectations. D. Newell Williams's chapter focuses on Scott's vision for bringing the apostolic church to life in his time. While Barton Stone and the Campbells placed their emphasis on reform of existing churches, Scott worked to convert people outside the churches.

This scholarly book will find its place in the classroom and in the hands of others interested in aspects of Scott's life and work that have until now gone little noticed. The reader will find early expressions of forces and issues still present in the Stone-Campbell Restoration Movement.

CHARME ROBERTS  
Project Assistant  
Center for Restoration Studies  
Abilene Christian University

**Randall M. MILLER, Harry S. STOUT, and Charles Reagan WILSON.** *Religion and the American Civil War.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998. 422 pp. \$24.95.

This collection of sixteen essays examines both the relation of religion to the Civil War and the influence of the Civil War on religion. The essays are organized according to the general categories of ideas, people and places. Included in the category of ideas are essays on different understandings of the relation of the Bible and the church to slavery, the role of religion in the dissolution of the American Union, and the character of American religion both during and after the War. Essays focusing on people explore the impact of the War on the religion of white women and the interplay of the emergence of Irish Catholics as an American ethnic community and the American Catholic church's use of the War to demonstrate its Americanism. The function of religion for the common soldier is also discussed. Included in the category of places is a study of changing views of religion in the Confederate capital of Richmond over the course of the War and a survey of religious consequences of the War in both sections of the nation. Rounding out the volume is an overview of religion and the Civil War, a comparison of the American Civil War

with the English Civil War of the 1640s and the Spanish Civil War of the 1930s, and an Afterword which identifies areas for further research.

The strengths and weaknesses of the volume are one and the same: No overall consensus emerges from the essays regarding the relation of religion to the War or the impact of the War on religion. Moreover, the conclusions of several of the essays are tentative. In addition, important topics such as the meaning of the War for African-Americans are sketched only in the broadest strokes. The reader looking for neat and final answers to questions such as the importance of religion in relation to other factors in the collapse of the Union or the influence of the War on the spirituality of different groups in American society will be disappointed. On the other hand, this collection—which disavows any claim to being comprehensive—clearly demonstrates the importance of the topic of religion and the Civil War for understanding both the Civil War and American religion and informs and invites further study.

There is no reference in this volume to views and actions of Stone-Campbell Christians or discussion of the impact of the War on the Stone-Campbell Movement. Nevertheless, readers familiar with the contrasting views of Alexander Campbell and Barton Stone regarding slavery and the American nation or acquainted with the postbellum history of the Movement will readily identify connections with the views and actions of Presbyterians, Baptists and Methodists discussed in the essays. Thus, the volume helps one acquainted with the history of the Stone-Campbell Movement to see the Movement in relation to the views and actions of other American Christians.

This volume will be of special interest to historians of the Civil War and American Christianity. It will be useful in the upper-level college and seminary classroom. It will also be of value to any church leader interested in the relation of religion and culture in American History.

D. NEWELL WILLIAMS

William G. Irwin Professor of Church History  
Christian Theological Seminary

**Robert E. WEBBER.** *Ancient-Future Faith: Rethinking Evangelicalism for a Postmodern World.* Grand Rapids: Baker, 1999. 202 pp. \$15.99.

Robert Webber, professor of theology and director of the Institute for Worship Studies at Wheaton College, in this brief yet ambitious text joins the continuing dialogue on the project of outfitting evangelical Christianity to best brave the waters of postmodernity. Webber's contribution (strongly reminiscent of Thomas Oden's) is summed up in his phrase, "the road to the future through the past." The basic thesis of the book is that after examining our present, "postmodern" situation and the major models of Christianity throughout the history of the

Church (classical/ancient, medieval, Reformation, modern/Enlightenment), one finds that the classical/ancient model is the most amenable to the present, post-modern situation. Webber describes postmodernity in terms of three shifts in the way many contemporary people think: a shift towards mystery, emphasizing the complexity and ambiguity of life; a shift towards community, emphasizing the interrelationship of all things; and a shift towards symbolic communication, emphasizing the visual and the participatory. Webber then shows that the classical model of Christianity—itsself focused on mystery, community and the symbolic—powerfully speaks to postmodern people.

After setting out the basic argument of the book in part one, each of the following five parts (Christ, Church, Worship, Spirituality, Mission) examines its subject matter by: (1) looking at the different major understandings or “paradigms” that came with the major periods of church history, (2) describing the problematic elements that the enlightenment model has left with us, (3) examining more closely the classical model of the topic under consideration, and (4) showing how the classical model is especially meaningful in the postmodern context. The last section of the book is a substantial “appendix” (being longer than several parts of the book and arguably dealing with the most weighty subject matter in the book) considering the nature of authority in the classical and postmodern settings.

The strengths of this book are myriad. The basic argument is simple in its presentation, sound in its logic, and powerful in its implications. Upon this strong core is constructed a holistic view of Christianity in a synthetic, systematic text on Christian theology and practice, contemporary thought and church history. Webber admirably seeks to revive the rich traditions of the Church as a valuable resource for Christians today while seeing the present condition of postmodernity as a profound opportunity for Christian witness and ministry. His use of the Christ-as-*Christus-Victor* motif as the systematic, unifying starting point for an ancient-future Christianity is both powerful and insightful. There are numerous helpful charts and tables (though they could sometimes use more explanation) and a great bibliography.

That much said, there are a few weaknesses to be found. First, there are several annoying errors in the numbering of the endnotes. Second, the summary and evaluation of postmodern philosophy in all of two pages—though ambitious and potentially helpful—deals with subject matter so complex and varied that the reader who has had some firsthand experience with postmodern philosophy may find that the simple slips into the simplistic, forfeiting accuracy. Third, from the direction of church history, some of the historical conclusions set forth are debatable; the ancient church is presented as a unified (idealized?) tradition while church history shows that doctrinal and practical consensus was by no means universal, and when consensus was achieved (say in Chalcedon), entire branches of Christendom often broke communion with one

another. Fourth and finally, Webber's regular use of George Lindbeck's cultural-linguistic view of doctrine displays what might be described as a mild schizophrenia. While Webber often speaks of the universal and trans-cultural significance of Christianity, Lindbeck's view of doctrine effectively cuts off any real claims to truth beyond the community of the church, thus putting forth little to defend Lindbeck's view from the charge of sociopragmatism. This uncritical use of Lindbeck's rather reductionistic view of doctrine is unfortunate but does not really weaken the basically strong thesis of the book.

While many of those in the Stone-Campbell Restoration Movement would ask, "Why not just return to Scripture?" Webber argues for the value of not only looking to the Bible as the central and proper text for the Church but also of looking to classical Christianity as a guide for the proper interpretation of this central text. Beyond this, it is hard not to perceive that there is much resonance between Webber's project and that of the Stone-Campbell Restoration Movement. Both advocate returning to the thought and practice of the early Christians as a guide for contemporary thought and practice (Webber even writes of reviving an emphasis on the significance of Christian baptism), and both see this return to this common source as a basis for the unification of the divided Church of Christ.

Stone-Campbell Restoration Movement scholars (read, Bible college professors) need to read and interact with this book. While probably not being the best textbook for most college or seminary classes due to its being so broadly interdisciplinary, it certainly provides a powerful paradigm that could significantly inform the structure and content of most theology and Christian ministry classes. Given the battery of unifying concepts and fresh practical insights it contains, it would also be of great value for those involved in the local ministry.

CHRIS SIMPSON  
Lincoln, Illinois

**Karel van der TOORN, Bob BECKING, Pieter W. van der HORST,**  
eds. *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*, 2d edition. Grand  
Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999. 998 pp. \$120.00.

This volume consists of more than 400 articles covering every deity mentioned in the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures, the apocrypha, and the pseudepigrapha. Furthermore, deities mentioned exclusively in ancient Near Eastern texts (including epigraphic Northwest Semitic) also receive full treatments. In addition to its treatment of deities, there are also articles on demons, angels, spirits, and semidivine heroes. For example, divine names such as "Yahweh," "El," "Elyon," "Baal," "Asherah," "Qaus," "Molech," "Marduk," "Ptah" are treated extensively; however, there are also superb articles treating minor

deities, such as Ashima (2 Kgs 17:30 and the Aramaic Teima Inscription). There are scintillating articles about angels such as “Gabriel,” “Michael,” “Raphael,” and demons such as “Asmodeus” (a major character in the book of Tobit). This volume is so thorough and exhaustive that there are also entries for entities such as the “Evil Spirit of God” and the “Esau,” things which, strictly speaking are not “deities,” “deified humans,” or “demons.” Of course, one might question the inclusion of such entries, but such is the nature of this encyclopedic tome. Moreover, the quality of all of the articles is so high that even those which are peripheral are most welcome. Each article is written by a leading specialist in the field.

The articles essentially follow a standard format: (1) etymology; (2) references in the primary literature; (3) historical background; (4) relevant secondary literature. Because of the high quality of the editing, there are very few typographical errors. The volume concludes with a thorough subject index (but no Scripture index).

CHRIS A. ROLLSTON  
Resident Research and Teaching Fellow  
Johns Hopkins University

**Henri BLOCHER.** *Original Sin: Illuminating the Riddle.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999. 158 pp. \$18.00.

Henri Blocher may not be well known to American readers or to readers of SCJ. He is the professor of systematic theology at the Faculté Libre de Théologie Évangélique in Vaux-sur-Seine, France. He has written two other scholarly and helpful books, both worth reading, that have been translated into English: *Evil and the Cross* and *In the Beginning: The Opening Chapters of Genesis*, both published by InterVarsity Press. The current volume is a part of the New Studies in Biblical Theology, edited by D.A. Carson.

In this present volume, Blocher seeks to tackle the ever tough subject of original sin. Just the mention of “original sin” brings out the competitive partisanship of any scholar, no matter on which side of the theological divide one is to be found. Blocher enters the fray seeking to bring, in a sense, the best of both theological worlds to bear on this issue in order to bring illumination to this sometimes confusing and confused riddle.

Blocher does this by dividing the book into five chapters, each chapter addressing some part of the issue that is raised in the discussion of this subject. Chapter one looks at the biblical material, specifically where the concept of original sin is taught in Scripture, and how it has been interpreted over time. Chapter two centers on the issue of original sin and the Adam event. Blocher wants to distinguish, as the church has traditionally done, between originated

original sin, that is, the “tendency to sinfulness with which we are born,” and the originating original sin, that is, “the transgression Adam perpetrated in the Garden and through which sin and death invaded our world.” He looks at how these two concepts have developed historically and tries to discern what the Eden story is actually telling us. The third chapter is a more specific look at the text of Romans 5, in order to try to understand the mind of Paul on the issue of original sin. Blocher compares and contrasts the two sides of this controversy and offers a new interpretation for our consideration. Chapter four is a look at the empirical evidence of the universal sinfulness of human beings, which is in turn offered as a means of supporting Blocher’s position of the inherited nature of original sin. In the final chapter Blocher wrestles with the unsatisfying traditional metaphors of the past that have become roadblocks to our understanding of this doctrine.

Blocher does an outstanding job of boiling down much of the historic discussion and debate on either side of this dispute. His survey of the biblical material is helpful and his presentation, specifically, of the thoughts of Augustine, Kierkegaard, Pascal, and a number of other noted scholars makes this work a valuable tool for understanding the issue. Perhaps a good number of the readers of SCJ will not agree with his exegesis of Romans 5 and thus some of the conclusions that he reaches, but in all fairness, he does bring some new and helpful light for understanding this important doctrine. He raises some interesting questions that both sides must answer. While he has a tendency to retreat to the use of “mystery” to explain the nature of original sin, he rightly points out that only belief in original sin, in some form, makes sense of the evil and wrongdoing that permeates the human scene. We do live “east of Eden.”

This volume would be beyond the use of most college students but would be a good text for seminary students and scholars. Most ministers would find this volume of little use, although it would be helpful reading for them. The bibliography is especially helpful if one wishes to do further study on this important topic, but for those who do not read French or German it may be of limited value.

TERRY FERGUSON  
Adjunct Professor of Theology  
Great Lakes Christian College

**Craig L. BLOMBERG.** *Neither Poverty nor Riches: A Biblical Theology of Material Possessions.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999. 300 pp. \$20.00.

The subtitle of *Neither Poverty nor Riches* well describes the book’s focus and format. Blomberg has examined the theme of material possessions across

the entire biblical corpus in order to articulate a coherent theology. This masterful work in biblical theology is worthy of serious study by believers concerned about their stewardship of God's resources.

The introductory material presents a sampling of statistics on worldwide distribution of wealth. Blomberg identifies three economic impasses: increased poverty, ongoing environmental problems and skyrocketing unemployment (18-19). His survey of spending trends within developed economies is succinct, yet sobering. In the late 1980s and early 1990s Americans spent about five times as much money on pets as on overseas Protestant ministries, to cite but one example (19). Blomberg then surveys Christian literature in response to these trends; his presentation is thorough, though not lengthy. His review shows a gap in the current literature:

. . . works which interact with any kind of hermeneutical sophistication with the Christian use of the Old Testament in the New Testament age, with the use of historical narrative for theology or with the application of occasional epistolary literature in a later time and culture. In addition, all of the major developments in biblical scholarship . . . dealing with the socio-economic standing and practices of the early Christians, have yet to be integrated into a theology of wealth and poverty. (28)

This book, then, is Blomberg's effort to fill the gap. There are two chapters on OT texts, followed by a survey of intertestamental literature, including the Dead Sea Scrolls. Four chapters devoted to the NT follow: the teachings of Jesus in the Synoptics, literature from earliest Christianity (James and Acts), the epistles of Paul, and the remaining New Testament material. The final chapter contains a recapitulation and summary of each major section, with suggestions for personal and corporate application. Blomberg identifies his audience as both "the introductory theological student and thoughtful layperson" (32).

*Neither Poverty nor Riches* successfully accomplishes its purpose. He uses the words of Agur to summarize biblical teachings on material possessions:

Two things I ask of you, O LORD;  
do not refuse me before I die:  
Keep falsehood and lies far from me;  
give me neither poverty nor riches,  
but give me only my daily bread.  
Otherwise, I may have too much and disown you  
and say, "Who is the LORD?"  
Or I may become poor and steal,  
and so dishonor the name of my God (Prov. 30:7-9, NIV).

There is ample food for thought in this fine work. For example, Blomberg suggests two possible interpretations of the familiar "sheep and goats" parable in Matt 25:31-46. One viewpoint identifies the "brothers" as spiritual kin and



the “least of these” as representing disciples who go about preaching. The point of the imagery, then, is that material help must be given to brothers who travel and proclaim the gospel. The second and more current view has Jesus referring to the dispossessed in general, rather than to itinerant evangelists in particular. Blomberg favors the first interpretation (126).

As Donald Carson notes in his preface, Blomberg does not “simplistically condemn wealth” nor does he “exonerate acquisitiveness” (9). Rather, he draws these conclusions (243-246): 1) Material possessions are a good gift from God meant for his people to enjoy. 2) Material possessions are simultaneously one of the primary means of turning human hearts away from God. 3) A necessary sign of a life in the process of being redeemed is that of transformation in the area of stewardship. 4) There are certain extremes of wealth and poverty which are in and of themselves intolerable. 5) The Bible’s teaching about material possessions is inextricably intertwined with more ‘spiritual’ matters.

Blomberg does not address problems of systemic evil that may facilitate and/or perpetuate extremes of poverty and wealth. Nor do his proposed solutions challenge macro structures. This is one way in which this book differs from Ronald Sider’s seminal work *Rich Christians in an Age of Hunger* (1977; fourth edition, 1997). Blomberg does offer occasional comments about systemic issues. See, for example, his comparison of reasons to boycott the Disney and Nike corporations (251-252). However, his first concern is that individual Christians understand their personal responsibility as stewards over the material possessions God has entrusted to them. Any corporate response of the Church then arises from the shared understanding of her members.

Of particular value is the extensive Bibliography (255-292). Sources from a variety of viewpoints—conservative evangelical to liberation theology—are included to create a veritable gold mine for further research. Another valuable aspect of the book is found in the summary and application chapter, where the author gives testimony of his own family’s practices with reference to material possessions (248-250). A minor complaint is the misprinting of chapter headings on each page of the introduction and first chapter; the chapter heading for chapter two appears in error on these pages.

This volume addresses a difficult question in a way that is scholarly without being esoteric. His writing style is clear and engaging; his conclusions are thought-provoking and challenging. Christians who are serious about restoring biblical perspectives and practices to the contemporary church should add this book to their reflections on stewardship.

TAMSEN MURRAY

Associate Professor of Biblical Studies  
Hope International University

**John FINNIS.** *Aquinas: Moral, Political, and Legal Theory.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1998. 385 pp. \$18.95.

Very few readers would be unacquainted with St. Thomas Aquinas as a theologian or philosopher. However, Finnis acquaints us with a different dimension of Aquinas's endeavors and interests. This is the first volume of a series entitled *Founders of Modern Political and Social Thought*. Finnis provides the reader with a topically arranged "sound critique" of Thomas Aquinas's philosophy (vii). The treatment of various subjects is based on the most recent Latin edition of over sixty works authored by Aquinas. It includes not only extensive citation and quotation of primary sources but supplies accompanying commentary and critical reflection by Finnis. The author's intention, beyond the obvious historical value of the text, is to demonstrate the relevance of Aquinas's perspective in spite of the centuries that have passed since he wrote.

Finnis treats Aquinas's contribution to Western culture along three interactive lines of thought: human nature, society, and government/civil law. Therefore, the text has a distinctively legal focus. Finnis is Professor of Law and Legal Philosophy at the University of Oxford. On occasion he provides charts of comparative or illustrative data not only to clarify Aquinas's position, but to advance the interpretation provided by the author. The text is extremely well documented and provides an extensive set of indices, including subject and citation, which allows the reader a thorough reference to the subjects treated. It also provides the reader a thorough treatment of Aquinas's views in regard to civil law.

Although it is an excellent treatment of this subject, one must wonder if it is also an issue for the readers of SCJ. How applicable is it to the general or even scholastic concerns of SCJ readership? The text appears to be most appropriate for the study of law, business, or political science, and perhaps philosophy. However, the author intentionally provides little attention to Aquinas's theological contributions. Not until the last chapter does Finnis deal directly with Aquinas's theological framework. Even chapter ten addresses the theological framework only *as it applies* to legal and governmental issues addressed in earlier chapter. Nevertheless this chapter does provide the reader with an excellent paradigm for the integration of theology into society. "Everyone knows that for Aquinas the answers to all these questions [previously listed throughout the text] includes, and is shaped by, certain positives which he regards as truths about God" (295).

Section headings detail God's interaction, both directly and indirectly through the church, with individuals, society, and law/government. For example, "God's Providence, Law, and Choice," and "Revelation and Public Reasons: Church and States." The most applicable aspect of the book, then, for the readers of SCJ is the chapter which the author describes as a minimal concern of the text. Hence, while the book itself is an outstanding achievement

and the vanguard of a new series, it is limited in regard to its usefulness to the constituency of SCJ.

JAMES RILEY ESTEP, JR.  
Academic Dean  
Great Lakes Christian College

**David N. LIVINGSTONE, D.G. HART, and Mark A. NOLL, eds.**  
*Evangelicals and Science in Historical Perspective. Religion in America Series.* New York: Oxford University, 1999. 351 pp. \$45.00.

This collection of some fifteen essays provides a much-needed scholarly treatment of the history of evangelicals and their engagement with the scientific enterprise. Combining both history of ideas and social history approaches to the topic, this tome brings together key authors in the relatively young field.

One of the strongest essays in the book is the opening chapter, “The History of Science and Religion: Some Evangelical Dimensions,” by John Hedley Brooke. He frames the methodological and definitional issues, provides a test case in the figure of nineteenth-century Scottish geologist Hugh Miller, and suggests avenues for groundbreaking research in the field.

“Science, Theology, and Society: from Cotton Mather to William Jennings Bryan” by Mark A. Noll elucidates how evangelicals often viewed science in terms of its impact upon society rather than according to its own methods and procedures. Noll points out the abundance of recent literature on American evangelicals and science from a social-historical perspective. He also stresses the relative lack of attention to the actual *practice* of science by evangelicals such as James Dwight Dana, Asa Gray, and G.F. Wright. Noll’s essay represents a call for more scholarship on the intrinsic approach to science of such figures to counterbalance the current emphasis on evangelicals who belabor the social consequences of science.

Another essay illustrating the importance of attention to cultural setting is “Situating Evangelical Responses to Evolution,” by David N. Livingstone. His analysis challenges scholars to abandon simplistic reference to generalized “isms” which ignore the particularity of circumstances in which scientific and religious issues have been debated. He compares the reaction to Darwinian evolution in 1874 by Presbyterian clerics and academics in three intellectual communities: Edinburgh, Belfast, and Princeton. By adopting such a tight focus, Livingstone is able cogently to show the impact of local social factors upon developments in the history of ideas.

“Creating Creationism: Meanings and Uses Since the Age of Agassiz” features Ronald L. Numbers, the leading academic historian of the modern creationist movement. Numbers provides a succinct survey of the use of the terms

“creationist” and “creationism” on the American scene from the nineteenth century to the present. He highlights the major figures and groups involved in the internal debate among evangelicals over evolution, giving the busy scholar a means of quickly identifying the various ways evangelicals have appropriated (or misappropriated) science into their understandings of the doctrine of creation.

Students in the U.K. will appreciate “Science and Evangelical Theology in Britain from Wesley to Orr” by David W. Bebbington, and “Science, Natural Theology, and Evangelicalism in Early Nineteenth-Century Scotland: Thomas Chalmers and the *Evidence* Controversy” by Jonathan R. Topham. The book’s efforts at geographical and topical diversity also include Canada in “Toward a Christian Social Science in Canada, 1890-1930,” by Michael Gauvreau and Nancy Christie.

I found Part IV, *Specific Encounters* to be the weakest portion of the book. All five chapters center on some dimension of the creation-evolution dispute, from the “scriptural geology” movement in America in the 1830s, to the popularity among evangelicals of the spurious legend of Darwin’s deathbed conversion, to the apologetic thrust behind the many quixotic failed expeditions to recover Noah’s ark. While doubtless from a social-historical perspective the creation-evolution dispute is important, it is also heavily trodden territory. I found myself longing for at least one essay on evangelical engagement with sciences such as physics or chemistry. Indeed, the book’s introduction mentions in a footnote a work like Geoffrey Cantor’s *Michael Faraday: Sandemanian and Scientist* (1991), but little of the book’s contents would suggest that evangelicals have been involved in scientific issues other than those touching on geology or evolution.

Another weakness is the failure of some authors to distinguish between fundamentalist and evangelical approaches to science and Scripture. The most glaring instance of this is James Moore’s criticism of American evangelical scholars as inconsistent for taking many biblical stories at face value while adopting a skeptical stance toward stories like the legend of Darwin’s conversion. Moore conflates the credence given by William Bell Riley and Jimmy Swaggart to the Darwin legend with (unnamed, undocumented) evangelicals who support the eyewitness testimony of the apostles to the resurrection of Christ (227-228). He boldly states that “Hermeneutic naïvete will remain endemic among evangelicals so long as the Bible is not interpreted as Benjamin Jowett in 1860 famously insisted it should be, ‘like any other book’” But this is not a particularly modernist insight, as it was voiced some 24 years earlier by an American evangelical named Alexander Campbell: “To understand the meaning of what is commanded, promised, taught, etc., the same philological principles, deduced from the nature of language, or the same laws of interpretation which are applied to the language of other books, are to be applied to

the language of the Bible” (*The Christian System*, 1836, repr. The Gospel Advocate Company, 1956, p. 4). Moore also seems unaware of the nuanced arguments for the historicity of the resurrection and other biblical events in the recent works of American evangelicals Craig Blomberg and William Lane Craig.

Notwithstanding such occasional weaknesses, I recommend *Evangelicals and Science in Historical Perspective* as a well-documented, scholarly treatment of many of the themes and issues surrounding evangelical interaction with the scientific enterprise throughout modern history.

DENNIS L. DURST  
Saint Louis University

**H.D. BEEBY.** *Canon and Mission.* Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1999. 117 pp. \$11.00.

This book proposes to bring together the entire canon of Scripture and practical questions related to the whole mission of the church. It appears in a series on “Christian Mission and Modern Culture.” Its author, a former missionary to China and Taiwan and minister of the United Reformed Church, refers to himself as both a liberal and a “sympathetic outsider” to Protestant conservatism.

The author has two audiences in mind: (1) those who do not regard the Bible as the authoritative word of God and whose view of mission is grounded partly in extrabiblical ideologies, and (2) those who say they have a high view of Scripture but do not think “canonically” and whose view of mission has been narrowed by this failure to think within the framework of the whole of Scripture.

Beeby insists that only a canonical Scripture is an adequate basis for mission (since he regards the canon as the norm for Christian mission). He is concerned, therefore, with the “recovery of Scripture”—the normative value of the Bible as “scripture”—which he considers to be virtually lost to contemporary European culture, since the presuppositions by which it evaluates the Bible preclude its acceptance of the Bible as normative.

Scripture, he maintains, is the account of the *missio dei*. It arises out of mission and is intended for mission. To interpret canonically, to enter the mystery of the unity of Scripture, is to be pointed in the direction of mission. The canonical hermeneutic is ultimately inseparable from mission.

In bringing mission to the canon, Beeby identifies controversies in contemporary mission and suggests that its currently atomized state is due largely to fragmented interpretations of Scripture. He urges that mission be understood canonically, that it be grounded in the entire canon rather than in a

canon within the canon. He then examines (1) the question of finding a canonical way of doing mission to culture and (2) the implications of the Exodus for mission. In the latter he attempts to reconcile the themes of liberation and freedom in the Exodus with those of patience and resignation in Jeremiah 29. He concludes that all such questions must seek their ultimate resolution in a unified canon rather than in political ideologies or in fragmented interpretations of the canon.

Beeby's concern that mission be understood in the light of the entire canon is reflected in the title of his fourth chapter, "From Moses and All the Prophets," in which he provides an extended proposal for a canonical approach to interfaith dialogue from a "postcredal" perspective. Here he draws an analogy between Israel and the church and their relationship to the various faiths of the nations, suggesting that "dialogue between the chosen and the nations lies at the heart of the economy of salvation."

He concludes with "notes for an introduction to the prolegomenon" of a missionary hermeneutic, suggesting that mission is the key and the clue to appreciating in new ways the totality of Scripture.

Although the book assumes a familiarity with liberal/conservative perspectives in mission, it is well written and suited for scholars and students of mission and theology. Beeby's treatment of the Exodus, the social and political dimensions of mission, and interfaith dialogue are particularly insightful and will not likely offend the sensitivities of conservatives nor be rejected outright by others.

The author's failure to provide a clear definition of key terms may cause some initial difficulty in recognizing the fundamental thesis of the book. However, this failure might be attributed to a conscious effort by the author to avoid certain controversial issues which would detract from his thesis.

BOB LEWIS

Solid Rock Missions

**Hozell C. FRANCIS.** *Church Planting in the African-American Context.* Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1999. 128 pp. \$14.99.

This text meets a great need in a specific ethnic community. Even though the American context tends toward the "melting pot," each ingredient in the pot consists of a particular character. The African-American context presents itself with its own set of issues that need to be addressed in the consideration of a church plant. This text starts with great consideration to this end.

The author needs to be commended for exposing the differences that exist in the sons and daughters of European origin and the sons and daughters of African origin. Much training and literature act as if this difference does not

exist. The candid disclosure helps to bring about an honest, up-front, more authentic beginning for exploration.

The personal experience of this African-American practitioner gives credibility to what he shares. Not only does Francis enter into an intellectual pursuit with information, but also he speaks to the outcomes in his own church-planting life. His training is being enhanced even as he communicates concerning this great need.

The author displays a great amount of maturity as he analyzes the social, racial, religious, and cultural environment of the African-American community. His years of involvement in what he now writes about speaks out clearly to others who might feel a call to be a church planter.

The emphasis on contextual relevancy for the African-American church planter points to the seriousness of Francis. Unless the church planter takes “pains” to know the target groups’ social structures, problem-solving mechanisms, community history, leadership expectations, informal leadership approaches, and educational levels, successful church planting does not occur. I agree with the author that intimate involvement with the target group must take place for significance to transpire in a church plant.

As the author guides the reader through the process leading to a church plant, he serves up doses of church reality. These actual church splits speak clearly to what happens in the church community. The author’s challenge to look seriously at the call of the church planter as a determining factor makes great sense. He has done intense observation to help his conclusions. A committed, highly skilled and trained contemporary church planter can face the insurmountable odds of an urban community.

The directive for the church planter to first serve as an apprentice in a church plant speaks well to me. As one receives mentoring on an actual church plant, many questions can be asked and explored. The need for much reading, many classes, and seminars really fits my experience to bring about skill and competence in any field of ministry. The author’s push for training in context suits the need of both the church and the church planter.

As the author takes the reader through the adventure to discover the differences between the dominant church culture and the African-American culture, one can appreciate the freedom necessary to have churches that meet the needs of the different ethnic groups. Even as the Great Commission calls, commands and demands worldwide outreach and discipleship, the outreach and discipleship leaders must recognize to whom outreach and discipleship are being directed.

For one who has an interest in church planting in the African-American context, I recommend this text. The author shares the means and methods to have a successful church plant. His way views the sociological, the theological and the practical. He provides a helpful overview for the church planter to

explore developing a comprehensive long-term ministry, forming a core group, doing extensive training and taking seriously the context.

ROBERT E. WOOLFOLK  
Agape Christian Church  
Denver, CO  
Urban Training Center Director  
Denver Seminary

**Scott GIBSON, ed. *Making a Difference in Preaching: Haddon Robinson on Biblical Preaching*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1999. 160 pp. \$16.99.**

“As a teenager, Haddon W. Robinson wrote the following in his diary about the preacher, Harry Ironside, ‘He preached for an hour and it seemed like twenty minutes; others preach for twenty minutes and it seems like an hour. I wonder what the difference is?’ Haddon Robinson has spent the rest of his life trying to answer this question” (11).

What is the difference? How can a preacher make a difference?

A string with too much tension will break. A string with no tension cannot be played. When the musician creates just the right amount of tension she can make marvelous music. In like fashion, Scott Gibson has chosen from the writings of Haddon Robinson tensions which will help the preacher make a difference.

Wisely, Robinson knows that many concepts are not either/or but both/and. The difficulty lies in creating the right kind of tension to make a difference. The book is divided into three major sections: the Preacher, the Preacher and Preaching, the Preacher and People. In each section there is tension.

Is the preacher to be a theologian or an evangelist? Too often these are an oil-and-water mix. Robinson concludes it well: “The church needs scholarly evangelists and evangelistic scholars—men and women who love God not only with heart and soul but with mind as well”(27).

Concerning authority, times have changed. In the 1800s the preacher was one of the most educated persons in the community. The position of pastor gave one authority. Not so today. In fact, most people in the world live in gray situations, while preachers are viewed as giving clear-cut answers. Without recognizing the complexities of life, we can lose authority. We need to “admit the tension and point it out. All truth exists in tension—God’s love exists in tension with His Holiness”(34).

The chapter entitled “A Profile of the American Clergyman” created another kind of tension. Although the statistics are given for the reader to assess and assimilate, a listing of some observations in the conclusion would be



more helpful. However, the tension of how ministers view themselves and how a newspaper reader might view them is an important observation.

Gibson finishes Robinson's thoughts on the preacher by talking about pain: personal, family and professional. As Robinson gives his painful story concerning an unjustified lawsuit while President of Denver Seminary, the reader feels the tension of preaching during such circumstances. Does one misuse the pulpit for self-therapy or a sniper's perch? How does one maintain integrity with his/her family at such times? Again, Robinson offers wisdom ". . . I was like every other person, a sinful human being with impure motives much of the time, in need of God's grace all the time"(52).

The other two sections are very important, but I chose to focus more on the Preacher section because what we are determines so much what we do. Let us briefly look at:

Much of the section on the Preacher and Preaching can be found in Robinson's fine work on *Biblical Preaching*. Here a synopsis of expository preaching is presented. "She must exegete both the Scriptures and her congregation . . . Doctrines must be preached practically and duties doctrinally"(67).

Homiletics and hermeneutics are often in tension. Misused passages such as: Matt. 18:19,20, "Where two or three are gathered"; Col. 3:19, "Let the peace of Christ rule in your hearts," are clarified and amended.

How to balance content and application is discussed. Interestingly, Robinson states an application need not be specifically given. The hearer has some responsibility and the intelligence to apply God's Word to his/her life. The preacher is "to leave behind 'we' in favor of 'you'"(94).

Tension again resides when the local preacher is compared and contrasted to the "communication kings" of the media in the section on the Preacher and His People. Graciously Robinson gives concrete reasons for the local's advantage and how to work in tandem with the communication kings.

Targeting audiences and illustrating are difficult. It is helpful to know, "the surprising thing is that the more directed and personal a message, the more universal it becomes"(121).

The final two chapters deal with the most sensitive nerve in the body, the one that leads to the pocketbook. These are great essays to help the leery preacher deal with the tension of preaching about money.

I like Haddon Robinson. I like his writings and I like his preaching. He is authentic and real. He gives great theory and helpful, concrete application. Scott Gibson has chosen well. The right tension has been given. The music can be played. Preaching the concepts in this book will "help other preachers make the difference"(156).

JOE GRANA  
Chair of Church Ministries  
Hope International University

**John Mark HICKS.** *Yet Will I Trust Him: Understanding God in a Suffering World.* Joplin, MO: College Press, 1999. 337 pp. \$19.99.

It is an age-old question that is destined to never fade away, neither from our theological reflections nor our personal experiences. “Why do bad things happen to good people?” Perhaps the question refuses to die because it has never been fully answered. It is true that Scripture gives us a divine insight into the problem of suffering in this world, but what God has chosen to reveal to us is only a small piece of a grander scheme. We cannot comprehend the full workings of God’s providence within creation, nor can we fathom the mysterious interaction between his goodness and our misery. Our attempts to create a rationale for suffering are by comparison quite meager, and leave us longing for further answers from God. Even so, a “theodicy” that is biblically based and reasonably sound can hearten our soul in times of trouble.

It is in this context that this book offers a very personal, yet theologically sound rationale for the suffering that pervades our lives. In many ways the material he presents is familiar, but his expression is often new and fresh, and a welcome reminder of the truths we need to remember. Hicks lays out a good exposition of the key biblical texts one would expect when dealing with the issue of suffering: the book of Job, the Psalms of lament, and the references to the sufferings of Christ. He also demonstrates the ability to draw from these passages general principles related to his theme.

A key emphasis in this book is the “permissive will of God” as a fundamental reason behind the presence of suffering within God’s providence. The hardships of this life occur because God allows them to be. He may permit our human and spiritual enemies to assault us, but God himself will never act against us with malice. He may allow the forces of nature to harm us, and the frailties of human flesh to weaken and kill us, but God always has a plan for our ultimate good (Rom 8:28). The Devil may use such dire circumstances to tempt us to give up our godly pursuits, but God’s intent is simply to test our commitment to him and thereby lead us further in our spiritual growth.

The permissive will explanation for suffering always raises some tricky issues, and Hicks deals with them well. If God is permitting evil to happen, does this necessarily imply that he must also wait to see what will actually occur and how we will respond? Hicks says, “No,” because God is omniscient, and thus is never “caught by surprise” with what we do. If God is willing to permit harm to come our way in order to test our faith, does that also mean that he is willing to allow us to fail the test? “Yes,” Hicks explains, as he speaks of “God’s risk” in permitting that which could either build us or destroy us, depending upon how we choose to respond.

In all of this Hicks presents a solid explanation and defense of the idea of God’s permissive will and its relation to human suffering. It would have also been helpful if he had included a good development of what could be called

the “causative will of God,” in which God does not simply permit, but actually causes harm to befall individuals and nations (as with divine plagues, and ultimately with hell).

Perhaps the most intriguing aspect of Hicks’s book is the personal touch he has intertwined with his biblical study. He tells of his own struggles in dealing with the death of his first wife after only three years of marriage and of his current testing in raising a son with a terminal condition. These and other real life situations he relates throughout the chapters help to make this book more than just an academic exercise, but rather, a reflection upon human suffering that is existentially heartfelt as well as biblically sound.

JOHNNY PRESSLEY

Professor of Theology

Cincinnati Bible College and Seminary

**André RESNER.** *Preacher and Cross: Person and Message in Theology and Rhetoric.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999. 205 pp. \$18.00.

This is a book about the character of the preacher. It describes the importance of good character in conveying Christian messages to people. However, it is not lightweight devotional reading for the preacher seeking shortcuts to effective communication or a life of prayer. It is Resner’s revised doctoral dissertation in homiletics at Princeton Theological Seminary. Resner is now on the faculty at Abilene Christian University.

The background Resner lays out in chapters one and two includes a survey of the issue of *éthos* in classical Greek and Roman rhetoric and an historical overview of the relationship of Christian theology and rhetoric.

The heart of Resner’s argument is a serious topical exegesis of 1 Corinthians 1–4 with a focus on Paul’s reversal of the classic rhetoricians’ understanding of *éthos*. He shows how Paul uses the “cross-event-proclaimed” as the point of orientation for salvation, for Christian living, for Christian epistemology, and for the evaluation of the work and life of the Christian preacher. He shows then how appropriate it is for Paul to use *peristasis* catalogues (lists of sufferings) and his supposed deficiencies as marks of credibility instead of shame. As Resner (131) summarizes it:

The cruciform *logos* calls for a cruciform *éthos*, just as it forms a cruciform *ekklésia* which now reasons with a cruciform consciousness (“the mind of Christ,” 1 Cor 2:16). Such a reframed view of *éthos* ironically turns sociological criticisms against Paul into theological arguments for his legitimacy.

Resner then shows how Christians can distinguish theology and rhetoric to find help in both for preaching. But his primary point is that theology (the

Christian message of the cross) deconstructs the normal rhetorical understanding of *éthos*. He makes his point by differentiating between rhetoric *kata sarka* (according to flesh, i.e., from a merely human standpoint) and rhetoric *kata stauron* (according to the cross, i.e., from the standpoint of the Christian gospel).

This is an extremely helpful distinction. The cross shows both the extent to which God has gone to reconcile human beings to himself and the kind of influence (power perfected in weakness) God exerts to effect that reconciliation with people. The cross should, then, control the use a preacher makes of personal references, especially in sermons.

At this point Resner deals with a weakness in David Buttrick's insistence that personal references are out of place in a sermon. Buttrick overlooks the fact that a preacher is building *éthos* with or without personal references. In fact, the absence of personal illustrations can be counterproductive. The important factor in this regard is that the personal reference should highlight not the preacher's strength or wisdom but rather God's presence and power. The preacher does this best by referring to his or her weakness or foolishness and ultimate experience of the gospel. In Resner's words (184):

The critical dogmatic test for all uses of self-disclosure in preaching is the message of the gospel itself. For ultimately, the goal in using *éthos* appeals in preaching is to serve the *kata stauron* orientation that the gospel in its proclamation effects. *Kata sarka* uses of *éthos* serve Christ and God's continuing mysterious and redemptive activity in the world by showing concretely the ways in which God is still active (184).

I see two problems with this book. In all fairness, David Buttrick's name should have been mentioned much earlier than it was. He certainly could have been recognized in chapter two as a leading light in modern homiletics who, although disagreeing with Barth on many fundamentals, has a love-hate relationship with classical rhetoric. Instead, his name appears on page 80 only in reference to Robin Meyers.

The second problem is stylistic. Some sections of the book are hard reading. It was, one must understand, originally a dissertation; but I fear that the dissertation style will intimidate some potential readers who could profit from it.

This book should prove helpful for all who teach preaching or ministerial formation. It sets the preacher's character exactly where it should be—not in some human holiness, but in the suffering servant Lord and the symbol of his suffering. That sets the expectations of preacher and congregation where they belong, not in some personal prize but in the grace of suffering.

It should also be on required reading lists for seminary students. Half a century after Barth's resounding (dare we say, "rhetorical?") rejection of

rhetoric, Christian ministers now have a starting point for a Christian rhetoric. For that we owe Resner our thanks.

BRUCE SHIELDS

Professor of Preaching and Biblical Hermeneutics  
Emmanuel School of Religion

**Bernhard W. ANDERSON.** *Contours of Old Testament Theology.*  
Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999. 358 pp. \$27.00.

Anderson's map of the "contours of OT theology" begins with a brief introduction to the history of biblical theology as a scholarly enterprise and a discussion of some of the fundamental aspects of the biblical testimony to Yahweh as "the holy one of Israel." Anderson then turns to an examination of the key themes in each of three OT covenants—the Abrahamic, Mosaic, and Davidic. Each covenant has its distinctive topics, "the mountain of God" for the Mosaic covenant or "the cosmic rule of Yahweh in Zion" for the Davidic covenant. Yet some topics recur for each covenant, like prophecy as conceived in the traditions associated with each covenant. Readers will immediately notice that Anderson's discussion of these covenants proceeds in roughly canonical and chronological order. The post-exilic period, however, stands rather outside Anderson's covenant periodizations. He therefore treats wisdom literature and apocalyptic separately. The outline of the work helps Anderson balance a forthright accounting for the diversity of the OT with an emphasis on the common themes that unite the literature. It also enables him at least to touch on virtually all major aspects of OT theology.

What the volume boasts in breadth, however, it lacks in depth. Readers long familiar with works in OT theology will find little here that is new or even particularly engaging. The greatest value of the work would seem to be in introducing students to the goals, procedures, and concerns of OT theology. Anderson himself implies as much by including, as an appendix, a "précis" for a course on biblical theology of the Old Testament. The book's thirty-six chapters rarely exceed ten pages in length and most should be easily manageable for undergraduates. The brevity of the chapters invites more detailed discussion of the matters under consideration, which might frustrate readers long familiar with biblical theology but could prove pedagogically useful in an introductory course.

Anderson's presentation is marred, however, by a few unusual moves. Some of these are simply organizational. For example, Abraham himself is prominent in only one of seven chapters treated under the heading of the Abrahamic covenant. The other chapters under this heading treat the Noachic covenant and Priestly theology (God's "tabernacling presence," sacrifice, holi-

ness). Similarly, Anderson's treatment of the Mosaic covenant is informed primarily by Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic history. The organization of the material makes sense, but the labeling of the material (Priestly theology as part of the Abrahamic rather than the Mosaic covenant) can be confusing.

Of more significance is the fact that some of Anderson's fundamental premises about God seem to be constructed more from nonbiblical sources than from biblical ones (a move not necessarily out of bounds for theology but rather odd for an *Old Testament* theology). Prominent here is the degree to which Anderson appeals to the studies of Rudolf Otto and Mircea Eliade while explaining the Old Testament's witness to God as "the holy one of Israel." Without prejudice to the independent value of such works, it may fairly be said that Otto's "idea of the holy" does not really match the Levitical idea of holiness. "Be the *mysterium tremendum*, for I am the *mysterium tremendum*" can hardly be the meaning of Lev 11:44, for example. Here and elsewhere, Anderson's treatment sometimes leaves one wishing for a more detailed exegetical presentation of basic concepts.

Despite its weaknesses, the volume promises to serve as a useful introduction to OT theology. It should be approached, however, as an invitation to further investigation rather than as a digest of results. If Anderson's book draws readers into further consideration of the topics he addresses in it, he will have done a great service.

CHRIS HEARD

Assistant Professor of Bible  
Milligan College

**Bill T. ARNOLD and Bryan E. BEYER.** *Encountering the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1999. 512 pp. \$49.99

The Roman poet, Horace, once wrote, "I strive to be brief, and I become obscure." In *Encountering the Old Testament*, Arnold and Beyer have attained the brevity desired by Horace without falling prey to obscurity. They have highlighted the content of the OT and the major issues in its study in a format that is quite readable.

This work, which is a part of the Encountering Biblical Studies series, is designed to serve as an undergraduate textbook for introductory courses in the Old Testament. It is written in a textbook format with appropriate learning objectives preceding each chapter and with relevant study questions at the conclusion of each section. The authors have supplemented the text narrative with chapter bibliographies, sidebar discussions of contemporary issues, color illustrations and maps, a CD-ROM multimedia learning packet for student usage, and a Resource Manual to assist instructors. The authors have also made a con-

certed effort to maintain a content level that is suitable to a college text. As such, the text provides a more in-depth treatment of the OT than is provided by popular handbooks while not approaching the technical level of standard introductions.

On the whole, this format yields quite satisfactory results. The background, content and message of the books are surveyed from the perspective of faith in Christ without any theological axes being ground. Anyone approaching the OT from an evangelical point of view could use this text without significant concerns of theological bias. While the text is definitely a Christian survey, the authors acquaint the reader with the larger world of OT scholarship, introducing critical issues in a manner which will acquaint students with issues they will deal with in further study. Devotional applications are regularly incorporated into the account at regular intervals. While, at times, these spiritual observations give the appearance of being forced into the narrative, they reaffirm that OT study is not merely an academic discipline.

These qualities of the text led to its adoption as the textbook for BOT101 – Old Testament Survey at Saint Louis Christian College for the Fall 1999 semester. Students were given regular assignments from the text upon which they were to report using the study questions at the conclusion of each chapter. In the process of course evaluation, students were asked to evaluate the textbook. They were asked to indicate their level of agreement to statements that indicated the achievement of the textbook's stated objectives according to the following scale: 1 – Strongly Disagree; 2 – Definitely Disagree; 3 – Mildly Disagree; 4 – Mildly Agree; 5 – Definitely Agree; 6 – Strongly Agree.

Out of 47 students, 43 enrolled in the course completed the survey. The results are as follows: Q1) The textbook helped me understand the factual content of the OT (4.83); Q2) The textbook helped me understand the historical, geographical, and cultural background of the OT (4.96); Q3) The textbook helped me understand the principles by which the OT is to be studied (4.46); Q4) The textbook acquainted me with critical issues of OT study (4.65); Q5) The textbook helped to confirm my Christian faith. (4.15); Q6) The textbook encouraged my love for the Scriptures (4.11); Q7) The textbook encouraged my love for God (4.28); Q8) The textbook was written at a reading level appropriate to this course (5.09); Q9) Maps and illustrations were helpful in understanding the text (4.73); Q10) Sidebar discussions of contemporary issues illustrated the relevance of the OT to modern life (4.38); Q11) I regularly used the textbook's CD-Rom supplement (2.40); Q12) The textbook's CD-Rom supplement proved valuable to my study (2.60); Q13) I would recommend that this textbook be used for future OT Survey classes (5.04).

As these figures indicate, students definitely agreed that the text was written at a level appropriate to a college course and that the text should enjoy continued usage in BOT101. The effectiveness of the book in communicating fac-

tual information regarding the background and content of the OT was also definitely recognized (Q1-2). Achievement of affective goals was less definitely recognized (Q5-7). Students did not view the CD-ROM multimedia program as being of value to their study (Q11-12). This is probably due more to the failure of the instructor to adequately incorporate exercises involving the multimedia materials into assignments and classroom procedure than to the quality of the materials.

Students were also asked to provide written comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the book. The helpfulness of maps and illustrations was mentioned repeatedly as a strength while the absence of a glossary and difficulties in obtaining precise definitions of technical terms were most often mentioned as weaknesses.

One student aptly summarized the general consensus in regard to the book when she wrote, “it was very interesting and caught my attention without going over my head.” This assessment and others like it indicate that *Encountering the Old Testament* should make a valuable contribution to Christian higher education as an introductory textbook for years to come.

MICHAEL PABARCUS  
Professor of Old Testament  
Saint Louis Christian College

**Frank Moore CROSS.** *From Epic to Canon: History and Literature in Ancient Israel.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998. 262 pp. \$45.00.

Good scholarship is born when clear thought finds its mate in clear writing. Clear thought emerges from the application of sensible theory to a wide range of evidence, properly sorted and coordinated. In the study of the OT, perhaps no one has been a better and more stimulating scholar in the past half century than Frank Moore Cross, emeritus professor at Harvard, editor of the Dead Sea Scrolls and author of salient books and articles, as well as director of over one hundred dissertations. Like his mentor William F. Albright, Cross is one of the few who commands the whole range of the biblical field, from the second millennium BCE to the Roman period. He has embodied the model of the scholar, who is, as Shakespeare puts it in *Henry VIII* (Act 4, Scene 2) “Exceeding wise, fair-spoken, and persuading. To those men who sought him sweet as summer.”

The present work, a collection of twelve essays covering the sweep of the OT period, wears its massive erudition lightly. Two of the essays are entirely new: Chapter 1 discusses “Kinship and Covenant in Ancient Israel,” arguing for the older consensus, now under attack, that found in Genesis-Judges



authentic information about a premonarchic period in Israel in which kinship networks, clans and tribes, shaped religious and “political” life in the absence of a monarchy. This reworking of an older position deserves attention in the present scholarly environment in which minimalist historians describe all this material as “fiction” created in the Second Temple period. Properly, in my view, Cross is not seduced by the problems that confound some readers of these texts into a simplistic dismissal of the evidence.

Chapter 11, “The Stabilization of the Canon of the Hebrew Bible,” is also new. It examines the gradual fixation of the rabbinic canon around the turn of the eras, drawing on Josephus, the editorial history of *Chronicles/Ezra-Nehemiah/1-2 Esdras*, and Qumranic material to obtain a comprehensive view of the problem, if not its solution.

The remaining chapters are revisions, often extensive, of previously published essays in journals and *Festschriften*. While some of the pieces are as much as twenty-five years old, the collection of them in one place offers the reader a valuable resource. Chapters 2 and 3 (along with Chapter 1) discuss premonarchic Israel, concentrating respectively on “Traditional Narrative and the Reconstruction of Early Israelite Institutions,” and “Reuben, the Firstborn of Jacob.” In both cases, Cross shows how ancient poetry, though often using mythological imagery, casts light on ancient societies.

Chapters 4-5 discuss priestly lore in an ancient Near Eastern context, focusing on the so-called “olden gods” (otiose deities) and the complicated relationship between the Tabernacle and Solomon’s Temple. Chapters 6-7, though overlapping in some ways (a drawback of the collected essays genre), offer one of the best available discussions of the conventions of Hebrew poetry. Cross argues for a shift from the forms of early poetry, rooted in oral composition, to those of late poetry, which was written from the start. Against James Kugel and others, he wishes to salvage some notion of parallelism. He also restates his long-held views of meter and scansion. Scholars will debate his theses for some time.

Chapters 8-9, meanwhile, move to the postexilic period, proposing “A Reconstruction of the Judaeen Restoration” and discussing the relationship between “Samaria and Jerusalem in the Era of the Restoration.” Chapters 10-11 move to the end of the biblical period, concentrating upon the shaping of the canon of the Hebrew Bible.

The order of these chapters, one should note, follows the chronological order of the subjects they discuss. Each essay also serves willy-nilly as a model of what Chapter 12, though overtly a discussion of pottery and epigraphy, calls the typological method. As Cross puts it, “The fundamental assumption of all the typological sciences is that artifacts [including texts!] of a given category or class change in the course of time” (235). This assumption consists of two points: the observer (here, historian) may organize data into classes that more

or less accurately reflect reality; and the realia that the historian reconstructs changed over time. The historian, that is, studies human creation (including the writing of texts) both synchronically and diachronically. Chapter twelve's description of method, to which I can do scant justice here, should be required reading for anyone interested in understanding the Bible in its original settings. This book, and not just its final chapter, exhibits the work of a master typologist who collects voluminous philological, archaeological, even sociological evidence, and organizes it in a sensible and persuasive way, demonstrating how Israel's ideas and practices (and, therefore, its literature) changed over time.

To conclude, then, *From Epic to Canon* ushers the reader into the inner sanctum of key discussions in Old Testament studies. Though clearly written and argued throughout, it may prove daunting for those without at least some background in the field. But for those who want to know what interests biblical scholars and why, there is no better place to go than here. For scholars, this book provides a model that is “wise, fair-spoken, and persuading.” It deserves a wide audience.

MARK W. HAMILTON  
Harvard University

**Tremper LONGMAN III.** *Reading the Bible with Heart and Mind.*  
Colorado Springs, CO: NavPress, 1997. 240 pages. \$14.00.

Over the past decade, Tremper Longman III has written extensively on the literary dynamics of OT texts. He puts his expertise to use in a volume intended to teach how to read the Bible correctly, not just for intellectual knowledge but for spiritual transformation. This book is a sort of hermeneutics primer for the general reader with special emphasis on reading strategies for the various genres of biblical literature.

The first part, “The Bible’s Transforming Power,” portrays the Bible as a seed leading to growth and a mirror of our souls. Longman uses the biblical term “soul” to refer not to some inner spiritual or psychic entity but to the whole person. We are complex beings defined neither “by” our physical existence nor apart from it. The Bible meets the needs of such complex creatures. It tells us of God’s dealing with the world through story and poetry rather than philosophical treatise or systematic theology; therefore, it can capture our imaginations. To read the Bible as stories and poems does not necessarily imply its events are historically untrue. By appealing to our imaginations while being grounded in history, the Bible brings us into a clear and direct encounter with God’s voice.

In the second part, “The Receptive Heart,” Longman addresses correct and incorrect approaches to the Bible. He gives classic warnings against eiseget-

ical approaches (“treasure chest of golden truths,” “compilation of riddles and secrets”) but also powerfully critiques the model of the reader as the detached, totally-objective interpreter who comes to the text as an object rather than as the vehicle of a relationship between two people (God and reader). He insists that complete objectivity is impossible and, perhaps, undesirable. “Everything that makes us who we are as individual human beings influences us as we read the Bible” (52). However, our individual backgrounds do not determine the meaning of the Bible, they only impact how we read it. We all read the Bible with lenses we have acquired from our personal experience, and we need to acknowledge that some lenses distort more than help us to see the text. We must wear those interpretive glasses loosely and give others the benefit of the doubt and a fair hearing when their interpretations differ from ours.

The scientist is an inadequate model for the Bible interpreter because neither the scientist nor the Bible reader can be totally detached from his subject matter. Longman, instead, uses Prov 2:1-6 to offer as the proper model the image of artists, passionate people who study the world with the whole being. We must approach the Bible as God’s Word, as an accurate guide for living that speaks truly on whatever matters it touches, and with Christlike humility. To protect us from distorting the Bible’s meaning while preserving our passion, we must read the whole Bible rather than focusing on favorite parts, understand the historical contexts of the books, and interpret in community. To these practices, we must also add the disciplines of prayer, contemplation, and the saturation of our personal experience.

The third part, “The Understanding Mind,” provides a concise and helpful discussion of biblical trustworthiness, composition, canon, transmission, and translation. Longman then turns to present seven classical principles for interpreting the Bible. He argues effectively that it is proper and necessary to look for the author’s intended meaning in an age of relativism.

The fourth part, “The Literary Cornucopia,” surveys reading strategies for the genres of biblical literature (history, law, gospel, apocalyptic). Each of the eight identified genres receives two chapters. Generally, the first gives a general description of the genre while the second discusses the literature’s contemporary appropriation and Christian use. This distinction, however, is not consistent. The chapters on law, the gospels, and apocalyptic are quite strong. Both those on the prophets and the epistles contain highlights but also weaknesses. Longman seems to confuse the prophetic word’s fulfillment with its message. This confusion often leads to a failure to see contemporary relevance. His epistles chapter presents good reading strategies but barely acknowledges the existence of non-Pauline epistles.

There are some things I wished Longman had done. He would have strengthened his treatment of the genres had he consistently listed principles for reading the genres at the end of each section. He did for some but not for

all. I also believe readers would profit from more space devoted to the proper application and devotional use of the genres. On balance, however, *Reading the Bible with Heart and Mind* provides an excellent introduction to Bible reading for general readers, small groups, and introductory hermeneutics students.

MARK HAHLEN

Professor of Old Testament  
Dallas Christian College

**John D. CURRID.** *Doing Archaeology in the Land of the Bible: A Basic Guide.* Grand Rapids: Baker, 1999. 128 pp. \$14.99.

Currid has produced an easy-to-read and useful book, which, as his title affirms, describes “doing archaeology in the land of the Bible.” The subtitle, however, “A Basic Guide,” accurately implies the book’s target audience, which is people who are just beginning their excavation work. The book may be divided into three unequal sections. The first, consisting of two chapters, opens with a brief definition and description of archaeology and then moves into a survey of the history of Palestinian archaeology, which he conveniently presents in periods of development. The second section (seven chapters) focuses more specifically on the archaeological process. These chapters discuss tells, archaeological survey work, site identification, excavation procedures, a survey of the role of ceramics in archaeological work, features of architecture including construction techniques and architectural styles that characterized various periods, and a chapter on excavating and conserving small finds other than ceramics. The third section, consisting of only the last chapter, is an extremely brief application of the archaeological process to the recent excavations at Bethsaida under the direction of Rami Arav.

Several pages of color photographs grace the volume. The photographs are labeled in such a way as to relate to the material in the text, but the pages are clustered together in the book with no cross-references to the photographs from the relevant chapters. In my volume, the photographs were fuzzy as if they were out of focus, but it appears that the problem occurred in the color separation process of printing and production. Occasional charts and line drawings appear at appropriate places to illustrate the narrative. For the novice, though, several terms and concepts remain unillustrated. Simple line drawings and plans would have resolved this deficiency. Among these are drawings of “bent entrance,” “four-room house,” and “tripartite pillared building.”

Each chapter has a respectable bibliography to direct the more serious student to other sources. Content notes are minimal and appear at the end of the volume just before the index.

A handy feature of the book is the sidebars that are sprinkled through the

text. These provide definitions of common archaeological terms and facilitate locating the material rather quickly. Regretfully, however, some of the terms appear with little or no elaboration of their definitions in the text. Many of the terms need more developed discussions (meaning, locus). The author has provided a useful guide to archaeological technique. I would recommend it as a valuable introduction to classes on archaeology and the Bible and especially for people as they might prepare for their first archaeological field work.

DALE W. MANOR

Associate Professor of Archaeology and Bible  
Harding University

**Fred STRICKERT, *Bethsaida: Home of the Apostles*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998. 187 pp. \$19.95.**

Strickert has produced in this volume a helpful compendium of some of the previous publications on the ongoing excavation of Bethsaida. This “less technical study” (ix) skillfully surveys the history of Bethsaida, the material remains found thus far, and the literary sources (mostly Josephus, the New Testament, and the Talmud) that inform us about the city. Along the way the author finds opportunity in excursions to give his conclusions concerning other archaeological controversies such as the “House of St. Peter” in Capernaum and Tabgha as the site of the feeding of the five thousand. He also informs us about related material finds such as the Ginnosar Boat.

The strength of this book is the author’s attempt to use the inscriptions, coins and other objects, like the figurine supposedly of Livia, to interpret the Second Testament. Strickert sees the feeding-of-the-five-thousand miracle (which took place in his opinion at Bethsaida) as Jesus’ response to the Livia cult and its belief in her as the guarantor of fruitfulness (123). Likewise, Jesus’ statement in John 12:24 is a rebuttal of the deification of Livia after her death and a statement of “the superiority of Jesus as the benefactor for the Christian community” (148). Suggestions such as these make this a stimulating read and one which helps the reader understand better the political ramifications of Jesus ministry.

Yet, a few cautions need to be offered about the book. The author sometimes seems to overplay his hand. It is understandable that he would like to affix as much importance as possible to the site of Bethsaida, but his argument that it was the center for the collection of Jesus’ sayings is quite tenuous (155-156). The exchange between Jesus and Philip in John 14:8,10 and the passage the author cites from the Nag Hammadi text, *Pistis Sophia*, do not seem to me to be compelling evidence that Philip at Bethsaida was a major collector of Jesus’ sayings.

Nor was I convinced that Bethsaida or the nearby Beteiha plain was the “Bethany beyond the Jordan” (111) where John the Baptist did some baptizing (John 1:28). In spite of the fact that there would have been much water in the plain, I think we need more evidence to conclude that the two names refer to the same place. The author’s other suggestion, Batanea, in the eastern part of Philip’s territory, also has little to commend it except for the similarity in name. Either of these two identifications would make Bethsaida the crossroads for John the Baptist’s activity.

Finally, I was surprised that the author so easily identified the so-called Bethsaida cross as a Christian symbol and that he accepts that the incense shovel was a part of the Livia cult when that has not been effectively demonstrated.

Nonetheless, this summary is useful in many respects and highly recommended for nonspecialists and students of the Second Testament.

DAVID A. FIENSY

Professor in Biblical Studies  
Kentucky Christian College

**Paul W. BARNETT.** *Jesus and the Logic of History.* New Studies in Biblical Theology. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997. 188 pp. \$18.00.

This book is a revision of Barnett’s 1996 Moore Theological College Annual Lectures. Aiming at the “third quest” for the historical Jesus, and especially the Jesus Seminar, Barnett proposes that the “logic of history” demands a Jesus who is definable and about whom a practical consensus can be reached (11). Reconstructions of Jesus in current research are “future-less” figures who cannot account for the impact upon the early church (34), but the “Christ of faith” is both continuous and congruous with the “Jesus of history” (91).

Barnett correctly asserts that “historical reconstructions of Jesus must attribute to *him* . . . the percussive impact which establishes . . . early Christianity, its worship, and ‘the faith’ [the apostles] preached” (102). Barnett goes further: not only is such a “causal continuity” historically legitimate, any lesser interpretation would be historically implausible (102).

Barnett borrows a working definition of history: history has to do with events, not states. History deals with phenomena, and seeks to explain them (18). This definition is directly opposed to one focused on history as inextricably bound up with the point of view of the interpreter, the historian. According to this view, history is an unending dialogue between the historian and his “facts,” an unending dialogue between past and present (22).

Barnett proceeds to outline his approach: all sources must be surveyed, especially “incidental” sources, since these presumably have no historical ax to grind. Sources are categorized by proximity (those closest to the events should

be given the most weight), type of source, original intended audience and purpose, and perceived bias. Distant sources (the Gospel of Thomas) are problematic (26).

Barnett surveys the handful of extracanonical witnesses to Jesus, and then analyzes Paul's letters for "incidental" information about Jesus. His conclusion is that the Jesus found in these sources is consistent with the pictures found in the Gospels. Barnett rightly faults the Jesus Seminar for undervaluing Paul's letters as sources for early Christian views of the historical Jesus.

In terms of his basic positions and his general approach, Barnett's work is to be commended. Conservatives will agree with most of Barnett's conclusions, but then these are already standard tenets of their faith. Unfortunately, at a deeper level Barnett's book disappoints. Despite series editor D.A. Carson's promise that Barnett "interacts thoughtfully and tellingly with the literature of the 'third questers'" (9), the reader searches in vain for any substantive interaction. In fact, Barnett lumps together all "historical Jesus" studies, making no distinction between radical views and legitimate interests. Even the work of evangelical scholar B. Witherington is panned as "eclectic and subjective," and his positive contribution to the discussion is trivialized (104, n. 57).

Barnett's book reads like the popular lectures it is based upon, not the scholarly revision it claims to be. His discussions of methods and procedures are superficial, and the entire book is "fuzzy" in the very areas it claims to address. There is no serious effort to discuss philosophies of history; Barnett settles for sound-bite quotes to reinforce his own opinions. While Barnett dismisses as too subjective the "social science" which figures prominently in current Jesus research, he demonstrates no awareness of the debate among practitioners of social science-based exegesis over different approaches and methods, nor does he acknowledge the evangelical scholarship which finds value in such studies (A. Malherbe). The irony of Barnett's objections is that they reveal his own subjectivity, even as he (wrongly) assumes the objectivity of his own methods and interpretations.

Barnett uncritically invokes the 19th-century views of Martin Kähler, maintaining that the impact of Jesus upon the early church was such that the "Christ of Faith" and the "Historical Jesus" are continuous and congruous. While this is a "given" of popular conservative Christian faith, Barnett nowhere acknowledges the problems posed by Kähler's position, which almost all scholars—including evangelicals—have long since recognized.

It appears that Barnett wishes to deny legitimacy to any aspect of historical Jesus research. While many conservatives would agree, at least at a practical level, the matter is not that simple. After all, Barnett ostensibly engages his opponents in this very discussion. But this is where Barnett's book is most conspicuously wanting. His definition of history, and especially his practice of history, are too casual. Why is 1 Peter's allusion to the "sufferings of Christ" his-

torical (not primarily theological), when the real point is Christ's death and resurrection? Why can Barnett assume the historicity of Gospels for his study of John the Baptist? Barnett needs to wrestle with his opponents' view of history and show why his own philosophy and practice of history have not been tainted by his biases.

Barnett oversimplifies the problems, underestimates his opponents, and overinterprets his sources as he overstates his own case. He boils the NT down into two genres: letters and "biographies" (Gospels). Sidestepping the scholarly debate over the genre of the Gospels, Barnett pronounces them to be *bioi* ("lives," i.e., biographies), and even *bioi Iesou*, as if this were an official designation. This serves his purposes for a while, but when it comes down to it, he must append an entire chapter to demonstrate why the Gospels are not *bioi* in a conventional sense.

Barnett's analysis of Paul's "incidental" comments about the historical Jesus strikes me as naive. While it is important and helpful to see what role tradition played in Paul's christology, Barnett makes no distinction between Paul's "incidental" statements and pre-Pauline confessions. Either way, it is naive to assume that Paul is a disinterested party and that such statements are historically "innocent" or theologically neutral.

Barnett's work is weakened by uncritical acceptance of traditional assumptions. Luke's prologue refers to oral sources and perhaps "short" written accounts [anything more undercuts Barnett's assumption of an early date for Luke]; without discussion, Hebrews is pronounced to be pre-70; Silvanus was Peter's amanuensis, yet 1 Peter is assumed to be totally independent of Pauline influence. In addition, Barnett assumes traditional authorship for the Gospels: Matthew, a literate customs official, took notes on Jesus' teaching while they traveled around Galilee, and authored a sayings-source in Hebrew. While most conservatives are comfortable with these positions, Barnett's stated agenda—a discussion of history and historicity—precludes the mere assumption of historicity.

Other problems include his overinterpretation of non-Christian sources. It is unlikely that high-ranking officials in Rome were aware of and worried about the Jesus-movement in Palestine; it is doubtful that the Romans, or even Josephus, understood what Barnett assumes by *christos* or *christianoï*. Barnett also engages in some questionable exegesis: "born of a woman" in Gal 4:4 is merely a Jewish idiom for "human," not Paul's doctrine of the virgin birth. On another note, it is unclear how Barnett reconciles the Gospels as products of a culture of rabbinic tradition *and* as thoroughly hellenistic biographies of the genre *bios*.

Barnett's work is a good restatement of traditional positions; it is not an adequate refutation of opposing views. In the end, Barnett fails to appreciate the implications of the fact that all canonical sources make theological claims



about historical events. He makes the same category error as the “Questers” he rebuts when he artificially separates theology and history. While conservatives share his assumptions and therefore his conclusions, I doubt “outsiders” will find Barnett’s work compelling; I suspect that this book will be perceived as just another “naive biblicist” tract. This is regrettable, since he really does have something to say, and because it could have been prevented by a more careful and rigorous approach. The hardest part is that once again evangelicals have come up short in the free-market economy of ideas. Until conservatives do a better job, we will not gain the hearing we seek.

THOMAS SCOTT CAULLEY  
Professor of New Testament  
Manhattan Christian College

**James R. BECK.** *Jesus and Personality Theory: Exploring the Five-Factor Model.* Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1999. 276 pp. \$15.99.

Beck, a clinical psychologist and professor of counseling at Denver Seminary, has put together an interdisciplinary document that stretches, challenges, and ultimately satisfies. The title does not especially help the reader know what to expect. Certainly there is no effort to infer from the teachings of Jesus a theory of personality. Nor does the book have the kerygma encountering personality theories. Beck only gently defends his acceptance of the “Five-Factor Model,” and then explores extensively the ways in which Christ’s actions and teachings demonstrate or interface with the various factors.

The Five-Factor Model, a relatively recent contribution to personality theory discussion, is gaining increasing but by no means universal, acceptance. It presumes to assess personality by evaluating these five dimensions of personhood: Openness to experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism. The model has distinct attractiveness for the Christian in that it assumes significant personal responsibility for choices that mold personality—this in contrast to classical psychoanalytic perspectives which cast major responsibility at the feet of early life experience. (This immediately alleviates any reader anxiety that this book will be an Erik Erikson-style psychoanalysis of a historical figure.) The critique of this model would raise the concern that faces any personality theory: The *imago dei* cannot be numerically measured, nor overly simplified. Yet it is apparent that certain factors are measurable: the tendencies to behave, think, relate, react, and feel in ways that become somewhat predictable for each person.

In examining Jesus through the screen of this model, Beck does not have to bother with experiential factors that may have molded the Messiah’s personality. The focus is upon what *is*, without having to ask *why*? This is a much

“cleaner” approach, since it is difficult for us to get a good picture of how environment and experience would mold the unique incarnation of God. The author thus moves apace from simply examining Jesus’ personality to looking at the broader and more applicable issue of *Christlikeness*. His thesis is that: “Christlikeness does not consist of personality similarity to Jesus but behavioral similarity to Jesus” (36). With respectful examination of a wide range of biblical texts, Beck proceeds to demonstrate how the example of Christ (and occasionally others such as Paul and Moses) gives us a model for responding to life’s circumstances in distinctly Christian fashion, regardless of whatever personality tendencies may have already developed.

The section on Extraversion illustrates Beck’s approach. This personality factor is fairly well-understood at the popular level and has been reliably measured by a variety of psychometric instruments. Neither extraversion nor introversion is deemed inherently good, but one’s place on the continuum between the extremes will influence how one impulsively responds. Beck rates Jesus as just average on the extraversion factor, with subfacets on either side of the median, but his central values on interpersonal dynamics led him to model love for others and trustworthiness in relationship. Therefore, Christlikeness in the area of extraversion is not determined by one’s warmth, gregariousness, assertiveness, activity, excitement seeking, and positive emotions but by the quality of intentional loving action and consistency in trustworthy words and deeds. Beck’s chapters on these last two categories are almost sermonical in character, running the gamut from the exegetical to the devotional, presenting the case of the reasoned propriety of making the same value choices that Christ made. His use of Scripture shows high regard for the inspired Word, but he avoids the kind of technical analysis that would be distancing to those lacking theological education. In another chapter he even runs the risk of too much self-disclosure by presenting a case history out of his own adolescence.

My experience of *Jesus and Personality Theory* went from skepticism to appreciation. The book will not greatly enhance the literature of personality theories, but it will contribute in several areas. The reader who wants to see a Christian psychology at work in examining personality will be enriched. The student of behavior who is open to instruction from the Son of God will be divinely taught. The preacher who desires to enhance pastoral style both personally and in the pulpit will find a strong model. The counselor who seeks to maintain the appropriate balance between biblical perspectives and psychological insights will find a healthy interface. I came away from the book with an improved understanding of both Christ and myself.

PAUL E. BOATMAN

Professor of Pastoral Care & Counseling  
Lincoln Christian Seminary

**Paul COPAN, ed. *Will the Real Jesus Please Stand Up?* Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1998. 186 pp. \$14.99.**

This book is a lively and, at times, entertaining debate between a leading evangelical apologist, William Lane Craig, who is a research fellow at Talbot School of Theology and John Dominic Crossan, an original member and former co-chair of the Jesus Seminar. The debate was moderated by William F. Buckley, Jr., a nationally syndicated columnist and editor of the *National Review* magazine. The debate came about when Dick Staub, a radio-show host in the Chicago area invited Crossan to debate Craig at the Moody Memorial Church.

Two evangelicals and two participants in the Jesus Seminar were asked to respond to the debate and to address in particular three issues: (1) the extent that the Jesus of history and the Christ of faith can be distinguished; (2) any role that divine supernatural intervention had in the resurrection; and (3) whether Crossan's or Craig's position best fitted the facts. Robert Miller and Marcus Borg represented the Jesus Seminar perspective and evangelicals Craig Blomberg and Ben Witherington the other.

In his opening address Craig defended two main contentions: (1) the real Jesus rose from the dead in confirmation of his radical personal claims to divinity; and (2) if #1 is false, Christianity is a fairy tale which no rational person should believe. He then gives four facts agreed upon, he said, by most scholars today: (1) Jesus was buried by Joseph of Arimathea in his personal tomb; (2) the tomb was found empty by a group of women followers; (3) various individuals and groups experienced appearances of Jesus after being made alive; and (4) the original disciples believed that Jesus rose from the dead despite their having every reason not to. In contrast, Craig quotes from published works of Crossan that Crossan denied all four points and argued instead: (1) Jesus' corpse was thrown in the common graveyard reserved for criminals and was probably eaten by dogs; (2) the visit of the women to the tomb was a fabrication made up by Mark; (3) the disciples never experienced any postmortem appearances of Jesus; and (4) the disciples never believed in the literal resurrection of Jesus.

Crossan in his address does not directly answer the challenge of Craig. Instead, he argues that when the Synoptic Gospels are laid out in parallel columns there are many contradictions and inconsistencies between them—enough to doubt their historical accuracy. In addition, he argues that the Gospel accounts are metaphorical in nature and were never intended to be taken literally.

After a rebuttal by each participant, an hour of dialogue follows led by William Buckley. In this exchange, Buckley is clearly on the side of Craig and at times needles Crossan. While interesting, the discussion tends to get off track, especially as Buckley diverts to issues not germane to the point being

made. One essential point, however, made by Crossan is that he does not deny the resurrection, as charged by Craig, but rather has a different definition of it. While Craig holds to a literal resurrection, Crossan contends for a subjective experience by followers. That is, believers today keep alive the memory of Jesus and what he stood for but in no way did he physically rise from the dead.

I learned a great deal from reading this book. It is fairly rare that liberals will meet face to face with conservative scholars, and Crossan is to be complimented for breaking with the norm. Craig was more structured and logical in his arguments and was very convincing (at least to me) but obviously not to Crossan. Crossan seemed bent on holding to naturalistic presuppositions despite the biblical data. It was also very frustrating to see him dodge and avoid Craig's major points. In some ways, both men missed each other but this may be the nature of the debate genre. One thing was clear, however, Crossan is antisupernatural, despite his contention that all of nature is infused with God, thus God does not have to intervene (is this pantheism or perhaps panentheism?).

This is a valuable book for those in the Stone-Campbell Restoration movement because it not only provides compelling evidence to buttress belief in the resurrection but also opens a window into how scholars who deny the historical resurrection of Jesus think. Preachers, teachers and informed Bible students should welcome it. Although somewhat technical at times, the book is very readable and clear; it was given before a general audience and this forced the participants to be less formal and technical than some discussions of the "Jesus of history and the Christ of faith" controversy. Today I recommended it to a friend whose son grew up in the Stone-Campbell Restoration movement but has now denied Christianity after going off to a state university. It may not convert the son, but it will help the father to understand where his son is coming from.

PAUL POLLARD  
Professor of New Testament  
Harding University

Carey C. NEWMAN, ed. *Jesus & the Restoration of Israel: A Critical Assessment of N.T. Wright's Jesus and the Victory of God*. Downer's Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1999. \$22.99.

Because of the importance of *Jesus and the Victory of God* (reviewed in SCJ 1.1), the magnitude of the project of which it forms the second part (Christian Origins and the Question of God), and also Wright's argument for the public nature of discourse within his own method, this volume of essays analyzing the persuasiveness of Wright's understanding of the historical Jesus is especially

appropriate. Apart from brief opening and closing statements from the editor, ten scholars contribute essays to this volume. Additionally there are two responses: one from Marcus Borg and one from Wright himself.

The essayists mainly focused on Wright's conclusions. Three concerns dominated. First, Wright's eschatology and his understanding of apocalyptic were questioned. This is no surprise, as the strong influence on Wright by his mentor, George Caird, has been noted before. In his response, Wright suggests that an unwillingness to let go of traditional understandings of apocalyptic language lies at the heart of this disagreement. It is possible, however, that Wright needs to rethink the degree to which he rejects such understandings. Is it possible that there is rapprochement to be found between the two views? Secondly, several authors criticize Wright's assertion that Israel in the first century considered itself to be in exile. However, it is possible that here Wright has brought attention to an important concept, the implications of which have not been carefully enough considered until now. Thirdly, some essayists expressed concern that Wright's understanding of the importance of Jesus' death for Israel might diminish the importance of Jesus' death as atonement. On this point, it should be noted that Wright, in *JVG*, was primarily dealing with Jesus' own understanding of his aims within his ministry. Therefore, full judgment of Wright's conclusion here should be reserved until later volumes.

This points to one of the weaknesses inherent in this volume. As Alister McGrath points out, this is only an "interim report" (178). Wright has very carefully drawn out his larger project and has carefully delineated the questions he is asking. He is only a third of the way to his final conclusions. This led some of the authors of this volume to argue outside of the parameters which Wright has set. In fact, some resorted to a rather strange tactic of constructing a sort of "Historical Wright" of the future. By speculating on hints in the present volume and from other of Wright's writings, they argue against what Wright *might* be likely to say in forthcoming volumes. It might be thought that 670 pages of text would have provided the authors with quite enough to discuss without resorting to this. Though perhaps this is only further evidence of the strength of Wright's approach so far. It must be quite difficult to respond to a detailed and overarching hypothesis in the space of a short essay. However, if the authors had been as careful to define their questions and had been as disciplined to remain within them, the essays in this volume could have been more productive than they are.

It was helpful that three of the papers did deal with Wright's method. Wright's approach has the promise of providing a solid epistemological foundation for NT studies but has often been ignored in favor of discussing Wright's conclusions. The strength of Wright's proposal comes from his consistent application of this approach and is worthy of further examination. The response of Marcus Borg, a historical and theological liberal, was useful for

putting the other essays in context. Wright's own response is the most enjoyable to read, the clearest, and the most thought-provoking. Wright responds with grace but also stinging accuracy.

While this book is too narrowly focused to be of use in the college classroom, it could be used quite successfully as a supplementary text in a seminary course which was using *JVG* as a primary text. The combination would provide a graduate student with a good example of high-quality scholarly debate. Additionally this book would be helpful to any scholar interested in either the study of the historical Jesus, or in a fuller understanding of Wright's method.

BRIAN D. JOHNSON  
University of Aberdeen

**Mark Allan POWELL.** *Fortress Introduction to the Gospels.* Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1998. 184 pp. \$15.00.

Although many think that another introduction to the Gospels is the last thing we need, this recent publication may end up being the first one you turn to. Powell's book offers students of the Bible yet another scholarly yet readable tool.

A brief introduction makes a respectful nod in the direction of historical and sociological backgrounds of the Gospels and touches on the issue of their genre. One helpful emphasis is on the "preached gospel" which lies behind the written Gospels: the authors are rightly called "evangelists." Chapter one chronicles the quest of the historical Jesus with special attention to some of the contemporary historical reconstructions by Borg, Crossan, and others. It also includes a succinct but surprisingly clear summary of the Synoptic problem and critical approaches to the analysis of Gospel material. Redaction criticism gets the most attention. Especially interesting are short sections on transmission (textual criticism), translation, and reception (reader-response criticism).

The next four chapters treat each of the four canonical Gospels, nicely balancing literary characteristics, historical questions (author, audience, etc.), and theological emphases. Charts and sidebars focus on possible sources and shared material. Powell's own methodological preferences emerge in the good but oddly limited bibliographies which list only literary and feminist studies on each Gospel. An interesting appendix introduces the reader to the noncanonical gospels, followed by end notes, maps, a fine glossary, and indices.

This brief introduction could be a helpful addition to a preacher's library, offering clear overviews of the themes of each Gospel and providing up-to-date information on the state of Gospel studies. It might also be useful for a college course on the Gospels or even as a resource for an adult Bible study in the local church.

It has its weaknesses. It does not avail itself of the finest recent studies such as Tolbert's masterful analysis of Mark. The continuing contributions of the social sciences to Gospel study are acknowledged but largely ignored in the brief analyses. Powell also does not incorporate the provocative insights of liberation theology (like Myers on Mark), although he does focus on liberation themes in Luke.

However, the strengths are undeniable. The concise summary of critical methodologies, the emphasis on literary structure and rhetorical features, and the attempt to balance literary, historical, and theological concerns all recommend this volume to wide use.

J. LEE MAGNESS

Britton Professor of Bible  
Milligan College

**Bruce J. MALINA and Richard L. ROHRBAUGH.** *Social-Science Commentary on the Gospel of John*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1998. 326 pp. \$20.00.

With the present volume, a companion to their *Social-Science Commentary on the Synoptic Gospels* (Fortress, 1993), Malina and Rohrbaugh intend "to present a historically sensitive, cross-cultural, comparative set of lenses with which to hear (or read) the Gospel of John as its original audience did" (ix). This necessitates, according to the sociolinguistic analysis they employ, attention to the social and cultural systems of the eastern Mediterranean in antiquity and of John's group. The authors understand John's group as an antisociety (that is, a society which forms a conscious alternative to the larger society in which they exist). As an antisociety, John's group makes use of a particular antilanguage (that is, a language used by an antisociety which expresses their own social experience). This antilanguage is seen in John's propensity to use new phrases in place of old ones. For example, "being lifted up" refers to Jesus' death, while "receiving," "abiding," and "seeing" all mean believing. John's antilanguage expresses an alternative which opposes the social systems "of first-century Mediterranean Hellenism in general and of its Israelite version in particular" (11), or as the text of John describes them, John's group stands opposed to "the world" and to "the Jews." The Gospel uses this antilanguage to create and sustain the interpersonal bonding of John's group; Malina and Rohrbaugh call this "the process of resocialization" (11). Appropriate for this function is the literary genre of conversation. Several times throughout the Gospel, Jesus enters into a conversation with an individual which progresses from ambiguity to misunderstanding to clarification. Within these conversations comes all the metaphorical language for the new reality which John identifies in Jesus of

Nazareth; such language includes “spirit,” “above,” “life,” “light,” “not of this world,” “freedom,” “truth,” and “love.”

This commentary does not include everything one may expect from a commentary. It does not engage in historical or literary analysis of the Gospel of John; rather, “it is intended to be supplemental to much traditional Johannine scholarship” (20). The work does not discuss such issues as authorship and date, nor does it generally comment on the meaning of words or the significance of grammar. However, focusing on the final form of the Gospel of John, the commentary provides two types of material. First, the sections entitled “Reading Scenario” present anthropological studies of the Mediterranean social system, placing them next to passages which illustrate the particular social norm or value described. Second, the sections called Notes offer specific comments on passages of the Gospel, drawing attention to the language of the social system of the Gospel. Together these two types of material are intended to help the modern reader to “develop a considerate posture toward the ancient author” (22). In addition, an appendix entitled “Gospel Notations” explains the divisions of the Gospel material used in the commentary; these divisions are derived from a chiasmic analysis.

This commentary does raise an awareness of the social context to which John is addressed. Often, their insights are quite helpful, for example, the reading scenarios on wedding celebrations, feasts, temple, patronage, deviance labeling, and final words and the notes on Nicodemus, the Samaritan Woman, and the healing of the blind man. On other occasions, their conclusions seem doubtful as with the identification of the Lamb of God with Aries the Ram, the translation of “Son of Man” as “Sky Man,” and the explanation of resurrection in terms of alternate states of consciousness. The reader may find difficult the sociolinguistic terminology used throughout the commentary; moreover, the minimal number of citations complicates the verification of the authors’ assertions. Nonetheless, the commentary offers a unique interpretive perspective, and the student of John’s Gospel will likely want to consult it along with other standard works.

CLAY HAM

Associate Professor of New Testament and Preaching  
Dallas Christian College

**Ben WITHERINGTON, III.** *The Paul Quest: The Renewed Search for the Jew of Tarsus.* Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1998. 347 pp. \$22.99.

Although the quest for the historical Jesus has consumed much scholarly effort in recent years, the quest for the “historical” Paul has been almost as



intense and on some scores equally controversial. This new work on Paul is a welcome addition to many other fine studies and is characterized by sanity and careful research. An appendix on Pauline chronology along with a full bibliography and complete indexes round out the book.

Witherington, well known in scholarly circles for his enormously prolific pen and respected by both those of evangelical persuasion and those of more liberal inclinations, has not attempted to write a life of Paul. Instead, he seeks to determine what sort of person Paul was. In addition, the format is not, as in many books on the apostle, the simple retracing of his missionary journeys. More to the point, what Witherington does is to treat Paul on his own terms as a Mediterranean person. In my judgment, this is a wise game plan because too often modern works on Paul tend to assume that Paul was a human being just like me and he was not. Without setting Paul against first century life as Witherington does, Paul becomes hopelessly modernized.

The plan of the book is as follows. An introductory chapter surveys Paul's cultural setting and provides great insight on the makeup of ancient personality. Chapter 2 looks at three pivotal features of Paul's life as a Jew, a Roman citizen and as a Christian. Witherington argues that Roman citizenship was the least important of the three. In chapters three and four the author discusses Paul's role as apostle, rhetor and writer. The following chapters investigate how Paul functioned in these roles as realist and radical, anthropologist and advocate, storyteller and exegete. Chapter eight focuses on Paul as a theologian and ethicist. A conclusion draws together the loose ends of Witherington's portrait of Paul.

In several ways, Witherington goes against the grain of much modern scholarship by including the Acts of the Apostles as a legitimate source. In his view, omitting Acts is done at great peril because Paul's own letters have so few of the autobiographical remarks found in Acts. He uses four sources: (1) the Paul of the undisputed letters, (2) the Paul of the later canonical Paulines, (3) the Paul of Acts and (4) the Paul of the later extracanonical sources, such as the Acts of Paul and Thecla.

One of the most interesting parts of the book is his analysis of Paul's personal appearance. Basing his insights on the earliest extant description of Paul in the second century work entitled the Acts of Paul and Thecla, he submits that Paul was a short person because Paulos, or in Latin Paulus meant little or short. The failure to mention Paul's eyes in the description may be due to Paul's likely poor eyesight (see Galatians 4). In the ancient world the eyes—and especially poor or weak eyes—signified a character defect. Although the description of Paul having a hooked nose, meeting eyebrows and bowed legs might seem unflattering, actually by standards of the ancient world they were not.

I liked the book and at the end one does feel like they know Paul much better. Especially is one able to see Paul against the backdrop of his

Mediterranean culture and come to appreciate the enormous contribution Paul has made to our own culture. Preachers will find many astute observations and little known insights about Paul that will spice up any sermon on the apostle. General Bible students will appreciate the clear writing style, and any Christian who longs to get inside the mind of Paul will find this book of great value. Nuggets and little known information abound on every page. Experienced students of Paul will appreciate Witherington for giving them a cutting edge look at one of the most important persons who ever lived.

PAUL POLLARD  
Professor of New Testament  
Harding University

**N.T. WRIGHT.** *What Saint Paul Really Said: Was Paul of Tarsus the Real Founder of Christianity?* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997. 192 pp. \$14.00.

In recent years, Ham Maccoby, a Jewish scholar, and A.N. Wilson, a popular biographer/novelist, have written books taking up a theme that has been explored and rejected many times: Paul reinvented the historical Jesus and so became the founder of the Christian religion. The careless, albeit engaging, work of Wilson seems to have provided the immediate inspiration for Wright's work. It is hardly the first time that the author has turned his analytical skills and thorough scholarship to Saul of Tarsus.

Perhaps it is because he has aimed his work at the popular audience expected to have read Wilson's book that Wright addresses the nonspecialist, taking time to define such words as Midrash, Torah, and Septuagint. While footnotes are infrequent, there is no mistaking the depth of the author's learning. Wright begins with a brief historical sketch of scholarship, examining the contribution of Schweitzer, Bultmann, Davies, Käsemann, and Sanders to Pauline studies. (If Wright had only one work on Paul to take to a deserted island, it would be Käsemann, but it is Sanders who has revolutionized Pauline scholarship.) While acknowledging the insights of others, Wright describes his own work as an attempt to explore Paul on his own terms. The author accomplishes his aim with admirable success. Anyone expecting a mere rehearsal of contemporary Pauline themes has little experience with Wright.

As the book progresses, Wright brings proposals to the table, critiques current Pauline scholarship, and ferrets out neglected areas that call for additional research. For example, while the author is in full agreement with the major conclusions of the W.D. Davies, E.P. Sanders trajectory, that basic Pauline concepts arise out of a Jewish matrix, he points out that Paul understood his mission in terms of the Gentile world. From within Judaism Paul engaged pagan

worldviews of the divine, of cult, of power, and of human need. At the same time, from within Judaism, he offered a critique of Judaism. "Paul . . . retains the shape of Jewish doctrine, while filling it with new content" (132).

Constantly returning to Romans, Wright explores the concept of "the righteousness of God," on the one hand, and "justification" on the other. From within Judaism Paul radically redefined Jewish concepts in terms of the crucified and risen Messiah. The righteousness of God, Wright concludes, refers to God's own covenant faithfulness. God's righteousness has been demonstrated in the coming of the Christ, and his righteousness will result in the final vindication of those who come to God through faith in Christ. Justification for Jew and Christian alike was about how one decides who is a participant in the community of God; it is not about how one gets saved.

The most refreshing aspect of Wright's work is also its most frustrating feature. The boldness of his critique of contemporary scholarship offering is stimulating. At the same time, one sometimes has the sense that rhetoric has taken precedence over substance. As I read Wright, I find myself alternately engaged by his rhetoric and put off by it. Sometimes his boldness leads him to make assertions where caution would have been the better part of wisdom. For example, he makes statements about the emperor cult in the Greek world which seem to suggest that Julio-Claudian emperors sought divine honors while living (88). Such is hardly the case.

In spite of occasional, rhetorical flourish brandished about with unsupported assertions, Wright's works, this one among others, are well worth reading. Wright is refreshing in that he regularly challenges conventional wisdom, stirring the reader to reconsider views he has taken for granted, or extending old arguments to conclusions which have hardly been considered. He is an independent thinker, a quality in rare supply among students of Paul.

DUANE WARDEN

Professor of Bible

Harding University

**Jack COTTRELL, *Romans*, 2 vols. The College Press NIV Commentary. Joplin, MO: College Press, 1996–98. 525 pp. \$ 29.99; 499 pp. \$29.99.**

Historically, College Press, a publishing arm of the Independent Christian Churches/Churches of Christ movement, has not been known for producing many scholarly works of the kind generally reviewed in academic journals. In recent years this has begun to change, and the College Press NIV Commentary series forms part of this change. Particularly some of the most recent contributions to this emerging series, like this two-volume work on Romans, merit careful, scholarly scrutiny.

Jack Cottrell is a well-established and respected scholar at Cincinnati Christian Seminary. Justification for yet another commentary on Romans comes not only from the unique series in which it appears but from the consistent anti-Calvinist, pro-Restorationist perspectives that Cottrell adopts. Some of the views defended here cut against the grain of virtually all the major commentaries currently in print, inasmuch as Calvinist and Reformation perspectives have tended to dominate the more scholarly scene. Cottrell has read most of these and interacts with a comparatively large volume of commentary literature but with a surprisingly small selection of other scholarly writings.

A brief review can address only scattered selections of Cottrell's commentary. The introduction contains few surprises: Paul penned Romans in the mid-50s to a Jewish- and Gentile-Christian church in Rome still dealing with the aftermath of the expulsion and return of Jews, including Jewish Christians, from that community, due to Claudius's edict of AD 49 and its rescission in AD 54. Paul takes this opportunity to present a comprehensive outline of his understanding of the gospel. While couched in the framework of combating a Judaizing dependence on works of the Law for salvation, Romans actually opposes any attempt to save oneself by meritorious deeds. This conviction guides much of Cottrell's exegesis of the letter, though it would have been better to acknowledge this as subsequent application of an original meaning that was tied more directly to Jewish backgrounds.

Cottrell's treatment of 1:16-17 reflects a frequent pattern—introducing significant theological discussion at key junctures of the text that goes considerably beyond the issues the text itself raises. Thus, we are here offered the first of several asides on the normal necessity of baptism for salvation. Caricatures of Calvinism frequently intrude, as with the claim that Calvinists “do not really believe the word of the gospel is able to produce faith in the sinner's heart” (1:109). The discussion of 1:18–3:20 clearly distinguishes between general and special revelation, and what each can accomplish, and reflects an admirably nuanced interpretation and application of Paul's remarks on homosexuality. Within Romans 3, more comments on baptism appear, where Paul has none, including statements that would seem to deny salvation to millions of contemporary Christians (myself included!), during the (sometimes lengthy) periods between their conversions and baptisms (see esp. 1:223).

Cottrell's treatment of salvation and the key metaphors Paul uses to explain it (justification, propitiation, redemption) in 3:20–4:25 is generally sound, though the statement that while we are not under law as a way of salvation “we are always under law as a way of *life*” (1:273) blurs the distinction that the Law is binding on Christians only once they understand how it is fulfilled in Christ. More as in traditional than recent commentaries, Romans 5 belongs with the preceding material as the results of justification. These results (peace, hope and joy) can be summed up as “assurance,” which even tribulation does not annul.

But Cottrell will later, arguably inconsistently, stress that we can choose to opt out of salvation ourselves. Somewhat more idiosyncratic is Cottrell's analysis of Rom 5:12, in which he argues that the original sin of all people has been nullified by an original grace which Christ's atonement provides for everyone. However, one's own personal sins in turn nullify that grace, after one reaches an age of accountability, requiring a conscious response of faith on the part of all who desire salvation. This explanation, however, holds the door open for some never voluntarily to sin, which is contradicted by the second half of the verse ("because all sinned").

The commentary on Romans 6–8 in general resembles classic Christian exegesis, although Cottrell's limitation of "flesh" to the physical body seems difficult to sustain. Unlike others who have made this distinction, however, Cottrell does not insist on limiting the "wretched man" of 7:14–25 to the unregenerate. His treatment of 8:28 is generally better than that of most Calvinists, who often mistranslate or misquote the text as if God caused everything to work together for good. But he mistakenly calls *panta* a direct object on the NIV's understanding of the text (1:499); in fact, it would be an adverbial accusative, as fellow Stone-Campbell Restorationist, Carroll Osburn, demonstrated in 1982. Perhaps, the least satisfactory part of the commentary are the remarks on 8:29–39. It is exceedingly difficult to see how fair exegesis can affirm the possibility of breaking the chain of those whom God foreknew being the identical people as those predestined, called, justified and glorified (8:29); Cottrell departs from even classic Arminianism at this point (1:513). And the assumption that the all-embracing promises of 8:31–39 presuppose "that we *want* to stay within the love of Christ, and that we are going to make every effort to do so" (1:524) read into the text suppressed premises that seem explicitly contradicted by the phrase, "nor anything else in all creation."

With most contemporary scholars, Cottrell recognizes Romans 9–11 as necessary replies to the question almost certainly on the minds of many Roman readers: why have so many Jews rejected the gospel? Cottrell persuasively stresses that the statements in 9:1–18 deal with the election of Israel only corporately for service, not individually for salvation. Less convincingly, the rest of chapter 9 does, he argues, reflect individual salvation, but only inasmuch as God is choosing spiritual Israel out of ethnic Israel (see also his treatment of 11:25). It is not clear if this mixture of Arminian and Calvinist thought avoids self-contradiction; the Lutheran articulation of single predestination seems more compelling as a mediating perspective.

The discussion of Paul's exhortational material in 12:1–15:13 reflects fewer idiosyncrasies, though Cottrell's penchant for inciting controversy remains in his opening salvo that describes 12:1–2 as reflecting "a synergistic concept of salvation, i.e., the basic and efficacious grace-works of God are joined with the human acts of submission and surrender in order to bring about the trans-

formed life” (2:308). Such language vividly reminds one of certain nineteenth-century debates in which aspects of Restorationism more resembled the Mormonism that it also in part spawned than historic Christian orthodoxy! After this, however, Cottrell proceeds to provide accurate and nuanced exegesis of the tensions between personal and civil retribution (Romans 12–13) and between strong and weak Christians (Romans 14–15). He also recognizes the unusually prominent role given to women in the greetings of Romans 16, correctly identifying Junia as a woman apostle (in the sense of missionary), though overly playing down the evidence for Phoebe as deacon(ess).

As a sympathetic “outsider” to many Restorationist commitments (a “Calminian” Baptist), I was pleasantly surprised to find more consistency and plausibility to Cottrell’s overall theological perspectives than I had anticipated. When he sticks to exegeting the text, he generally does a superb job. But there are still too many places where he allows his own theological presuppositions to guide the commentary into issues the text does not address, and from perspectives that I do not find sufficiently compelling for me to change any of my “centrist” perspectives and opt for unambiguous Arminianism. And I find it not a little ironic that in a series that stresses itself as spearheading a movement to unite all Christians (back covers, 1:5, 2:5), that an almost sectarian opposition to one large and influential portion of Christianity is pursued with such vigor!

CRAIG L. BLOMBERG  
 Professor of New Testament  
 Denver Seminary

**Brian S. ROSNER, *Paul, Scripture, & Ethics: A Study of 1 Corinthians 5–7*. Biblical Studies Library. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1999. 248 pp. \$19.99.**

Rosner argues for the Jewishness of Paul’s background and ethical sources, a view underestimated or ignored because scholars have not recognized a common ethical interpretation of Scripture among Jewish groups during Paul’s day. The basis of Paul’s ethic is not simply developed by direct quotations and allusions from Scripture; rather, Paul received an “interpreted Scripture,” a Jewish moral worldview. He either (1) passed on this worldview to his Gentile converts or (2) he made an appeal regarding this shared worldview (by way of reminder) to his Gentile converts from among the “godfearers” (most likely Rosner’s preference, 184).

A brief look at 2nd Temple, Rabbinic, and LXX texts (and limited archaeological evidence) produces a sketch of the contents, expressions, and vehicles of Jewish moral teaching: standard biblical texts (Lev 18–20); standard virtues and vices (sexual ethics, compassion/greed, truthfulness, social ethics; follow-

ing K.-W. Niebuhr); standard arrangements of ethical material (the so-called “double love commandment”); standard forms of paraenesis (“two-ways” motif, the household code, catalogues of virtues and vices, the paraenetic topic, topical figures, and the farewell discourse); standard developments of biblical themes (idolatry); and standard exegesis/exposition of biblical passages (see directly below).

The heart of Rosner’s work is an investigation of 1 Corinthians 5–7 which suggests Paul’s divisions according to the use of Jewish standard expositions: Ezra excluding sinners (1 Cor 5:1-13), Joseph fleeing immorality (1 Cor 6:1-11), Moses appointing judges (1 Cor 6:12-20), and the Torah regulating marriage (1 Cor 7:1-40). Using his broad paradigm of the Jewish moral worldview as a foundation, along with his thematic designations as guide, Rosner interprets each 1 Corinthian section in relationship to the corresponding OT passages and their interpreted history. In conclusion, Rosner attempts to refute eight objections to acknowledging that the Scriptures were an important source for Paul’s ethics. An appendix on the origin and interpretation of 1 Cor 10:22b follows.

The success of Rosner’s efforts are hard to evaluate with precision. I acknowledge Paul’s Jewishness (as he, Paul, did). I like to think that Paul knew the Scriptures well and that the stories of Joseph, Moses, and Ezra would have been familiar and important in Paul’s constructing his worldview. Does Paul, however, give enough clues in 1 Corinthians 5–7 to allow us to think that *his audience* has these stories resonating in their minds during the reading of the letter? I think not. Rosner does not engage this question head on, and where he comes up against it, he rather weakly suggests that the Corinthians may very well have been godfearers or familiar with Jewish culture prior to conversion (184). More likely, the majority of believing Corinthians were Gentiles to whom Paul provided some biblical instruction on key themes (1 Cor 5:7b; 10:1-13).

Only in 1 Cor 5:13 does Paul quote Scripture directly: “Drive out the wicked person from among you” (Deut 7:7). Yet, it is acknowledged that this statement is most likely proverbial by the time of the NT. Still, Rosner provides little criteria for distinguishing the identification and gravity between key terms like quotation, allusion, echo, or direct or indirect influence. It is fair to ask what might be the fluidity/retention range of these background stories in the audience’s mind over the course of the letter? To take but one example: Ezra (purportedly the main influence behind 1 Cor 5:1-13) has a still stronger word to deliver about mixed marriages than Paul ventures to enforce in 1 Cor 7:12-16.

The divisions of 1 Corinthians follow the form of a deliberative rhetorical speech. Is it possible to incorporate Rosner’s thematic divisions into this scheme? We should allow overlapping argumentative strategies in Paul’s writ-

ings. However, Rosner argues too strongly that his Jewish paradigms must govern the whole and not simply contribute to it, and at points he anchors his position uncritically from later rabbinical traditions (157, 164–65, 199–201).

Should we read Paul through his Jewish inheritance or according to the Hellenistic environment? The answer is both. But how Paul expresses himself is surely determined by his target audience. Rosner's reading aims towards "to the Jews I became as a Jew" (1 Cor 9:20). Does not the audience of 1 Corinthians demand a more nuanced perspective, such as "to those outside the law I became as one outside the law—not being without law to God but under the law of Christ" (1 Cor 9:21)? From this viewpoint we will surely find in 1 Corinthians the broad variety of expressions, conventions, and forms common to a Jewish thinker interacting and persuading Gentiles in a hellenistic world.

Rosner reminds us of what Paul *may* have had in mind, but he falls a bit short of elucidating Paul's contextualization of his message to a predominately Gentile audience. *SCJ* readers would do well to read Rosner's work in tandem with one of broader perspective, such as J. Paul Sampley, *Walking between the Times: Paul's Moral Reasoning* (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity, 1991).

ROLLIN A. RAMSARAN

Assistant Professor of New Testament  
Emmanuel School of Religion

**Jan LAMBRECHT. *Second Corinthians*. Sacra Pagina. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1999. 250 pp. \$29.95.**

Jan Lambrecht, Professor Emeritus of New Testament and Biblical Greek, Catholic University, Leuven, Belgium, and instructor at the Pontifical Biblical Institute, Rome, has written a lucid and at times insightful commentary on this most difficult letter of Paul to the Corinthians. The Sacra Pagina series, of which it is part, to date has produced a number of very helpful commentaries—including Matthew, Luke, Acts, Romans, Galatians, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, and Revelation—since 1991. The series itself, as does this volume by Lambrecht, very much lives up to the series aim of providing "sound critical analysis without any loss of sensitivity to religious meaning."

Each volume in the series has a prescribed framework. Original, fresh translation of a paragraph or two is followed by verse-by-verse, carefully selected exegetical notes which deal with Greek grammar, textual matters, and word studies. In consideration of readers untrained in Greek, Greek characters are not used, key Greek words or phrases under discussion always being transliterated and accompanied by an English translation. A separate interpretation section comes next, which subdivides into discussion of Structure and Line of Thought, Characteristics and Problems, Theological Reflection, Critical



Remarks and/or Actualization. Each section concludes with an up-to-date bibliography For Reference and Further Study which focuses on journal articles and specializing monographs.

Dividing up the commentary material in this fashion, though at times somewhat arbitrary in terms of what is dealt with in each section, is helpful both for general and academic readers. People are able to choose which kind of material suits their needs best. The commentaries have no footnotes and avoid mention of modern authors in discussions, even though differences in interpretation are usually carefully summarized. The volumes even have subject indices, a rare commodity in commentaries. These features should appeal to the general reader.

Lambrecht's sectional bibliographies contain only academic offerings, regularly sprinkled with European works (particularly German and Dutch). This will appeal to the academic reader. Lambrecht shows that his reflections on 2 Corinthians come from a mature scholar who has done his homework. Familiar names in 2 Corinthians studies, like Belleville, Bieringer, Murphy-O'Connor, Thrall, and Lambrecht himself, appear frequently in the bibliographies, as well as works by other notable scholars.

Most *SCJ* readers will be delighted at Lambrecht's moderate approach to 2 Corinthians. In a brief but easily accessible introduction, he maintains and argues for the unity of 2 Corinthians. Though becoming more fashionable in these days of rhetorical analysis, it is still somewhat surprising to see him so smoothly sweep aside all the fragment theories that have dogged 2 Corinthians studies for a couple of scholarly generations. For him, Paul's renowned skitterish compositional style, the unrealistic expectations for systematic exposition from critics, the inability of fragment theories to adequately explain the underlying text, and the total lack of manuscript evidence makes the unity of 2 Corinthians easy to embrace.

Quite rightly recognizing the central themes of 2 Corinthians to be apologetic self-defense, reconciliation, and apostleship, Lambrecht does not consider Paul's opponents who engender so much attention in 2 Corinthians to be primarily hellenistic in outlook. He gently urges that more likely they were conservative Jewish Christian missionaries who claimed some legitimate tie to the Jerusalem apostles and who possibly have some connection with Paul's opponents in the Galatian epistle.

Throughout the commentary Lambrecht makes numerous key observations. On 1:8-11, he notes how difficult it is to determine where the opening blessing ends since "for" (*gar*) keeps reappearing, though he winds up determining that the blessing ends at 1:11. On 1:17, he explains that the presence of the article *to* (translated "that") indicates that the doubled "yes" and "no" is formulaic. On 1:22, he believes "anointed" refers to Christian baptism. On 3:7-18, he views the veil as a symbol of Jewish "obdurateness." On 3:13, he

understands *telos* to refer to “end” rather than “goal.” He connects the reference to cunning in 4:2 to the insinuation of financial trickery in 12:16. He aligns himself with the most common evangelical view of 5:1, that the resurrection imagined is not immediately after death because of the conflict with 1 Cor 15:23,54. He writes that 5:13 refers to past ecstatic experiences. He demonstrates the connection of 6:14–7:1 by bookending it within 6:11–7:4. He astutely comments that no neutral word is used for the collection in Paul’s discussion of it in chapters 8–9, only positive theologically loaded words. He suggests regarding the word “pseudo-apostle” in 12:21 that Paul coins the word himself.

This is a solid commentary, well-gearred for upper-level college students, graduate students, and preaching ministers. The knowing scholar will also find nuggets of cogent analysis as well. Because of the Roman Catholic origins of the *Sacra Pagina* series, many *SCJ* readers may be inclined to pass its volumes by, including this one by Lambrecht. However, this book—and the series—deserves a place on our library shelves.

WILLIAM R. BAKER

Professor of New Testament and Greek  
Saint Louis Christian College