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With the publication of Old Testament Law for Christians, Roy Gane has provided a substantial resource for students and scholars regarding the role of the Old Testament laws in the modern Christian’s life. Building on the premise that Old Testament laws are “a neglected source of wisdom regarding values” (xiii), Gane writes to help Christians understand “how Old Testament laws reveal wise and enduring values and principles,” which “reflect the divine character of love” (xiv).

Gane divides his work into four major sections. The first two sections cover standard introductory matters such as the cultural background, literary context, purpose, functions, types, and roles of the Old Testament laws in ancient Israel and the Old Testament. Within this section, Gane explains how the Old Testament laws reflect divine principles and values (22–25). Although Gane admits that divine values and divine principles “in a sense … can be viewed as interchangeable,” he argues that the term “values’ also conveys the idea of things assessed as carrying high priority on a scale of relative worth or importance” (23). In other words, “divine values are God’s priorities” (23) and are commonly “expressed by ‘principles’” (24) in Old Testament laws.

The third and fourth sections of Gane’s book focus on the application of Old Testament laws to modern Christians. After reviewing the common Christian approaches to Old Testament laws under the categories of “Radical Continuity” (163–68), “Radical Discontinuity” (168–73), and “Both Continuity and Discontinuity” (173–95), Gane outlines his approach to applying the Old Testament laws: “Progressive Moral Wisdom” (PMW) (197–18). Gane provides a thorough five-step (based on 16 questions) process for Christians to apply the Old Testament laws responsibly (202–03). Perhaps the most distinct aspects of Gane’s model are in the fourth step of his process. The goal of this step is to “analyze the law within the process of redemption” by relating the law to “creation and new-creation ideals” and searching for “moral growth beyond the stage represented by the law” in the Old Testament and New Testament (208–09). Gane concludes his third section of the book with a case study of the PMW model applied to Exodus 23:4 (219–35). In the work’s final section, Gane focuses on various values reflected in the Old Testament laws and their application to modern Christians. The concluding chapter consists of Gane’s rebuttal of “five common misconceptions” about Christians and Old Testament laws (400–01).

Gane’s work has many commendable features. First, Gane’s emphasis on the Old Testament laws’ continued relevance reflects his desire to take the continuity between the Old Testament and New Testament seriously. More specifically, his emphasis on love as the “paramount value and virtue” (148) from which sub-principles can be derived underscores the similar ethical ideals of both testaments. Second, Gane’s attention to the creation and new creation ideals within his PMW model
provides a helpful lens for readers to identify God’s priorities. Third, Gane does an admirable job of explaining the historical-cultural background for the Old Testament laws. His explanations of the historical context behind certain laws enhance his chapter entitled “Old Testament Law and Theodicy.” In particular, he shows why some of the accommodations Yahweh made for the Israelites’ sinfulness make sense in light of their ANE context. For example, he demonstrates how the law of servant concubinage in Exodus 21:7–11, although not ideal, ultimately protected the concubine (312–314).

In spite of the strengths I have noted, Gane’s work has several issues. Instead of interacting with many particular points, I will deal with a couple of Gane’s foundational views on the law. First, Gane uses 2 Timothy 3:16 as the rationale for his PMW model. In his interpretation of this passage, Gane argues that Paul’s “All Scripture includes all Old Testament laws, including those that directly apply to us and those that do not so apply” (142). However, this interpretation of 2 Timothy 3:16 is too much. To be sure, we can and should apply Old Testament laws to our lives, but 2 Timothy 3:16 does not require an application of all the Old Testament laws just as we would not apply all the instructions for Noah’s ark to our lives. Furthermore, Gane’s claim that some laws directly apply to us appears to be another way of saying that Christians are still “under” some of the laws, including the Sabbath (156–61), dietary restrictions (350–58), laws related to breeding cattle (344), and the prohibition of sexual intercourse during menstruation (358). Gane needs to clarify how direct application differs from being “under the law,” especially in light of Paul’s assertion that Christians are not under the law (e.g. Gal 5:18). Moreover, conspicuously absent from Gane’s PMW model is an emphasis on the cross. (He does mention Christ’s sacrifice at several points in his book, but he does not include it in his PMW model.) In his five-step process, Gane connects the laws to creation, the fall, and restoration, but he does not highlight the central figure of our redemption and the point in the redemptive process where Paul locates a significant shift in the law’s role (cf. Eph 2:11–21; Col 2:11–15).

Second, Gane criticizes another scholar for dismissing the Sabbath for reasons other than Scripture, reasons “such as consensus and tradition regarding practice” (193). However, Gane himself gives significant evidence of being “shaped by factors other than Scripture” (193), in particular, his theological tradition. For example, Gane—in his arguments for Christian obedience to the dietary laws—argues for a novel translation of Colossians 2:16–17 with his only support being an unpublished paper. Furthermore, he promotes the Christian observance of the Sabbath day, but he does not deal with Romans 14, a passage that certainly challenges his view. Throughout the book, his theological presuppositions influence many of his specific conclusions (e.g. ch. 15).

In conclusion, Gane’s work is a good introduction to a Seventh-day Adventist’s approach to the law. The primary strength of this work is Gane’s explanation of the laws in their ancient context and the interplay between the various pentaehual laws; however, when it comes to applying the laws to modern Christians, Gane’s work does little to move the discussion in a helpful direction. Gane seems to operate on the assumption that Christians are directly under the authority of every Old Testament law except those that relate to “situations that do not occur in our lives” (139), “social and legal institutions in which we in the modern West are not involved,” “the ancient Israelite theocracy,” and practices that the New Testament “has terminated” (140). Like other approaches that assume Christians are under
some Old Testament laws, Gane’s approach leads to inconsistencies and often looks like a pick-and-choose approach based on the interpreter’s tradition and/or wishes.

James M. Todd III
College of the Ozarks


The book Texts and Contexts of Jeremiah examines the intersection of reception history and textual history. The assumption of this work is that while both are to be distinguished from each other, they are linked since the textual history of a biblical book is also part of its reception history (v). Focusing on Jeremiah 1 and 10, the authors consider these chapters as ideal “test cases” for the study of reception history and textual history for two reasons. First, both chapters encompass the first major section of the book of Jeremiah. While Jeremiah 1 begins the book by explaining the prophet’s role, Jeremiah 10 closes the first large unit. Second, in both chapters the Masoretic Text (MT) and Septuagint (LXX) differ significantly in rhetoric, structure, and content (v). During the first three quarters of the twentieth century most scholars considered MT and LXX of Jeremiah to be different but still going back to the same textual tradition. However, in recent times the majority view has become that these two point to different editions of the book, meaning that LXX was translated from a Hebrew Vorlage different than MT.

Alex P. Jassen starts off the first part of the book by exploring how the rabbinic literature has developed more fully the few biographical data given in Jeremiah 1. In addition to the connection to his father Hilkiah as priest and prophet, Jassen shows how the rabbis have also seen Jeremiah as a descendent of Rahab. In so doing, they drew “a metonymy for the Israelites in the land of Israel from conquest to destruction” (18). Jassen argues that the overall purpose of this connection reflects the rabbinic attempt to connect themselves to the past and to the experience of territorial loss and national suffering. Next, Georg Fischer studies the reception of Jeremiah 1 in the New Testament as well as Early Christianity. While Fischer identifies almost no connection between Jeremiah 1 and the New Testament, he sees that the Early Church Fathers drew links between Jeremiah’s commission and Jesus. Sharing interests in the spiritual dimension of Jeremiah 1, the Early Church Fathers also pointed to the relevance of Jeremiah 1 for the life and faith of believers (35).

The following two essays deal with text criticism and exegesis of Jeremiah 1. Norbert Jacoby contests the view that the translator of LXX used the proto-MT as his Hebrew Vorlage. Based on a study of MT and LXX of Jeremiah 1:1–2, Jacoby argues that a translation out of MT would have necessarily produced a Greek sentence different in syntax and structure. Finsterbusch’s essay extends this work by comparing Jeremiah 1:4–7 and 18 in MT with LXX. For Finsterbusch, both text editions show a distinct profile. While LXX emphasizes YHWH’s message, the focus in MT is on Jeremiah and his words.

To start the second part of the book, focusing on Jeremiah 10, Moshe Lavee shows that the late haggadic midrashim saw a dichotomy between Israel and the gentiles. According to Lavee, the rabbis attempted to rehabilitate Jeremiah in two
ways. First, although the prophet harshly rebuked Israel, he never fell short in terms of his great love for Israel. Second, by reinterpreting passages that might support universalism and missionary approaches, the author argues that the rabbis portrayed Jeremiah as a defender of Israel’s divine election. Lavee closes his paper by pointing to the contrary trend in the writings of the Early Church Fathers: for example, John Chrysostom used Jeremiah 10 to argue for God’s abandonment of Israel. Next, Martin Meiser, who explores Jeremiah 10 within the New Testament and Early Christianity, points out that this chapter was used primarily in an anti-pagan context. He sees a fundamental difference before and after 390 AD, since the stop of the veneration of the Greco-Roman gods was seen as a fulfillment of Jeremiah 10:11.

The following two essays concentrate on text-critical and exegetical issues of Jeremiah 10. Hermann-Josef Stipp shows that LXX of Jeremiah 10 lacks verses 6–8 of MT and places verse 9 of MT in the middle of verse 5. Since the erasing of these verses with their strong adoration of God’s incomparability and universal kingship seems odd in this context, it raises the question of who is responsible for these changes. Based on the assumption that it was either the translator of LXX or the scribe of the proto-MT, Stipp argues that MT of Jeremiah shows a proto-Masoretic idiolect that cannot be observed in the Greek translation, which leads to the conclusion that the first possibility is very unlikely. Accordingly, the proto-Masoretic idiolect definitely points to a Hebrew Vorlage different than MT tradition.

In the next essay, Richard D. Weis focuses on Jeremiah 10 as a whole. By presenting two independent studies on the structure of both text versions of this chapter, Weis argues that both MT and LXX have a coherent and meaningful structure but were addressed to two different audiences. Weis thinks that LXX-Jeremiah 10 was aimed to an exilic audience, showing “that Yahweh is reliable and worthy of trust and worship in contrast to the gods of the nations” (134–35). MT-Jeremiah 10, on the other hand, was directed towards an audience in the Persian period, focusing on the praise of Yahweh and using the foreign gods as foil for this purpose.

The third part of the book consists of Christl Maier’s response to how the preceding essays illuminate the intersection of reception history and textual history. Among other things, they show that every act of translation is already an act of interpretation that is informed by the setting and worldview that the translator inhabits.

Overall, this volume treats the intersection of reception history and textual history successfully. The essays are very informative and even a reader who is not highly familiar with the problem of MT and LXX in Jeremiah will benefit in better understanding some of its key issues and important exegetical issues. Weis’s essay in particular (“Exegesis of Jeremiah 10 in LXX and in MT: Results and Implications”) is stimulating by opening up a new path for approaching the textual critical problem as often done in Jeremiah scholarship. He analyzes the MT and the LXX text version of Jeremiah 10 independently and compares their structure and intent. Although in view of the present writer Weis’s conclusion regarding the distinct audiences and time periods of both text versions goes too far, his approach might still be fruitful for establishing stronger internal criteria for cases where MT and LXX differ.

It is striking, on the other hand, that all four essays that deal directly with the textual differences between MT and LXX (Jacoby and Finsterbusch on Jeremiah 1 and Stipp and Weis on Jeremiah 10) argue in favor of the majority view, that the translator of LXX used a Hebrew Vorlage different than the proto-MT. However,
other viewpoints are mentioned only a few times but discussed thoroughly nowhere in the book. This gives an unbalanced impression. For example, Jacoby’s own analysis on reflections of the Greek translation in Jeremiah 1 indicates that the translator had the capacity and the freedom to engage in constructing the text as he was translating. Whereas many aspects of the four essays mentioned above are convincing (e.g., Stüpp’s point regarding the absence of MT Jeremiah 10:6–8 and displacement of v. 9), a more balanced approach would still be preferable.

All in all, this volume is a valuable study of Jeremiah 1 and 10, demonstrating the importance of each text version as a distinct and coherent unit and how vital it is to consider their own worldview and hermeneutical perspectives.

Daniel Buller
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary


The scholarship on the book of Jeremiah experienced considerable changes during recent decades. The primary focus in the twentieth century lay on the historical person of Jeremiah. Jeremiah Invented represents a new direction in Jeremiah studies by focusing on Jeremiah as a literary persona. The editors Else K. Holt and Carolyn J. Sharp state that the characterization of Jeremiah as a literary persona is what holds the volume together. The essays probe the various ways in which the person of Jeremiah has been construed in ancient and contemporary contexts and how ancient scribes, modern biblical scholars, and contemporary artists have refracted the Jeremiah traditions (xvi).

Joe Henderson and Mary Callaway start off this volume by exploring biases and methods that have been used in the early twentieth century to account for an allegedly authentic portrayal of the historical person of Jeremiah. Henderson interrogates the ideological biases of the works of Bernhard Duhm and John Skinner. Next, using Jeremiah 20 as a case in point, Callaway explores the assumptions of historical-critical analysis and postmodern interpretations of the so-called “confession” of Jeremiah.

Barbara Green and Amy Kalmanofsky probe distinct communicative aspects in different passages of Jeremiah. Green investigates the interactions between Zechariah and Jeremiah within chapters 20–39. She argues that the scenes “work narratologically to make visible the political options available to the besieged people of Jerusalem” (xvi). Kalmanofsky presents a gender critique to show how shame functions in Jeremiah 13 and argues that the text metaphorizes the naked body of Israel as a disgraced woman.

The essays of Kathleen M. O’Connor and Mary E. Mills explore aspects of lamenting and suffering in the book of Jeremiah and beyond. Focusing on links between Jeremiah and Isaiah’s suffering servant, O’Connor investigates how the life and suffering of the prophet was “evocative and meaningful for members of the post-exilic community seeking to explain their suffering and claim power as survivors” (xvii). Mills, on the other hand, investigates how the books of Jeremiah and Lamentations symbolically depict Jerusalem as a textualized “site” refiguring the materiality of loss, collapse, and grief so that “mourning can be engaged productively and redemption can be envisioned” (xvii). In response to O’Connor and Mills, A.R. Pete Diamond and Louis Stulman mention an explosion of scholarly interest on
Jeremiah’s “confessions” and offer several questions regarding future research.

The last three essays represent readings of Jeremiah in light of modern phenomena from artistic constructions. Stulman’s paper may be understood as a theoretical groundwork, arguing that the book should not only be studied by the standard means of critical interpretation, but our interpretation of the horrors envisioned in Jeremiah should also take into account the perspective of the dangers, the suffering, and the pain of “the world that we inhabit” (97). Thus, he pleads for a “hermeneutic of engagement” consisting of a close reading of the text, an understanding of its reception (Nachleben) as well as an immersion “in a broken world in dire need of healing” (103). Next, using Jeremiah 27–28 as a case in point, Johanna Erzberger probes structural parallels between prophetic sign acts as presented in the biblical narratives and contemporary performance art. She argues that both can be used to understand the way in which prophetic sign acts assumed in biblical narratives produce meaning (104). The productive interaction between artist, audience, and specific public context causes an immediacy from which the audience cannot withdraw themselves forcing them to either accept or reject the message presented (115). In the final essay, Else K. Holt presents an exegetical “reading” of Rembrandt’s 1630 painting of Jeremiah lamenting the fall of Jerusalem. Describing the evocative intertextual biblical references in the painting, Holt situates Rembrandt’s work “within the political and ecclesial concerns of seventeenth-century Holland” (xix).

Overall, this volume is helpful for getting an understanding of the scholarly interest on the literary persona of Jeremiah. The strengths and weaknesses of this book can be shown by looking at three specific points. The first strength is at the same time the most stimulating aspect of all essays, namely its interdisciplinary connections with structuralist analysis, trauma theory, Mesopotamian art studies, gender criticism, contemporary performance art, and more. The basic justification for this approach is given by Holt and Sharp who assume that “what interpreters miss when they read may be as important as what they ‘find’” (xix). For example, “the reader who has never thought deeply about trauma may miss significant ways in which Jeremiah can serve as a catalyst for healing within communities that have been silenced” (xix). The same may be true for politics and other social-political realities.

As far as the second strength is concerned, most of the contributions show a profound thoroughness on the development of several key issues in the history of Jeremiah scholarship. Particularly Henderson’s “Duhm and Skinner’s Invention of Jeremiah” and Callaway’s “Seduced by Method: History and Jeremiah 20” are helpful in understanding the presuppositions and agenda of the historical-critical portrayal of the historical person of Jeremiah and the role of the prophet’s “confessions” in Duhm’s and Skinner’s methodology. For example, exploring the ideological basis of these two scholars, Henderson shows that their source-critical work was fundamentally based on their adoption of the Grafian view of the decline of Israelite religion (3). Furthermore, Henderson not only shows the impact of Romanticism and poetics such as Johann G. Herder and Robert Lowth, but he also explores how Duhm and Skinner’s judgment of the authenticity of Jeremiah traditions, situated in nineteenth century German liberal Protestantism (8–10), was influenced by “particular European convictions about individual piety and religious inspiration” (xvi).

Third, the weakness of the book, which is evident in most essays following Henderson’s and Callaway’s contributions, is the lack of any explanation or definition of the concept of literary persona. For example, while Stulman (“Art and Atrocity, and the Book of Jeremiah”) and others rightly contest the old historical-critical
paradigm that separates the historical and “real” Jeremiah from later “secondary” additions (96), the alternative can hardly be a complete erasing of interest in the historical person of Jeremiah from scholarly inquiry. The book surely fits the current trend of Old Testament scholarship that takes it for granted that the books of the prophets have basically nothing to do with the historical persons of the prophets. However, it still does not answer what the concept of a literary persona actually means. Does this concept mean that the person of Jeremiah is a mere invention suited to the needs of certain Israelite communities in different time periods? Is there a relationship between the historical person of Jeremiah and what the authors of the book assume as literary persona? More clarification on these issues would surely strengthened many of the valuable essays of this book.

Overall, Jeremiah Invented is a valuable volume for scholars and students joining the conversation on the person of Jeremiah in the book that bears his name.

Daniel Buller
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary


With this new Greek textbook and its accompanying workbook and instructional DVDs, the authors Gibson and Campbell offer a fresh, different approach to teaching Greek, by presenting a new curriculum consisting of 83 lessons in total and 83 video sessions that are on the accompanying DVDs. The large number of lessons makes each lesson noticeably short, keeping material manageable at each step. The explanation of the approach is clear in the first lesson, which shows that each page correlates to one lesson that is divided into three sections for (1) learning each new topic, (2) material for memorization and (3) examples and exercise.

From the onset, there is a brief lesson on the history of Greek along with lessons for the alphabet and pronunciation. The authors are aware of both Erasmian and modern pronunciations, but in the end, leaves the final decision to the instructor. A short lesson on manuscripts provides an appropriate amount of cursory material for textual criticism. Lessons explaining basic grammar then follow from lesson 13 and on. Each video lesson, recorded by Campbell, lasts approximately six minutes—helpful for an audio-visual demonstration of the material in the book. Campbell is clear in his explanations and well-paced.

The vocabulary work begins from lesson 8 and continues sporadically in the book (the next one is in lesson 15). Each vocabulary section is in small portions with about 20 in number. The list is taken directly from Mark, which is helpful for students to get acquainted with biblical texts quickly, and the curriculum prompts the audience to start memorizing words in lesson 8.

The noticeable strength of this curriculum is the workbook, which assists students in translating Mark 1–4. By utilizing the lessons in the grammar book, students are encouraged to read through the Greek text with the vocabulary glossed with all parsing information available to the student for translating the Greek. To the right
of the passage on the following page is an area for students to write down their own translation using the provided information. Unfortunately, the students will not get to the workbook until lesson 42. Perhaps, the students could be introduced to the text sooner if the Greek passages may be simplified at first with a gradual increase in difficulty, but then at that point, the students would not be reading the actual biblical text, which would lose the selling point of the curriculum.

Despite the tremendous task of covering first-year Greek in one book, the curriculum is very thorough in its scope and approach to Greek grammar. While the workbook gives ample opportunity to incorporate the grammar, much of the burden is still left to the students to learn the pronunciation and understand Greek syntax and hermeneutics of translating Greek. Video lessons are helpful, but students may need more interaction with the instructor to reinforce their language skills.

The curriculum will most likely last the full two semesters, which is the normal duration of study in a Bible college or seminary setting. Though no textbook is perfect, this textbook can be a great starting point to help students engage Greek at various levels of exegesis.

Since textbooks tend to improve over time with different editions, this curriculum has the potential to assist students examine the Greek at the textual level more quickly than the traditional stale trifecta of grammar, vocabulary, and exercises. Some areas that may improve this curriculum are as follows: 1) more Greek sentences to translate early on to reinforce the grammar, 2) the video lessons could be enhanced with vocabulary studies, and 3) a way to interact with other students online, which would be helpful for those trying to acquire Greek on their own.

Some prior exposure to an ancient language (e.g., Latin or Hebrew) would prepare the students in advance, but the curriculum does not insist on it being a requirement. Any student willing to put in the time and effort would in fact be adequately exposed to New Testament Greek for study and sermon preparation.

Donald Kim
Scarborough College


In The Last Adam: A Theology of the Obedient Life of Jesus in the Gospels, Brandon Crowe’s desire is to examine how the four Gospels present Jesus as the last/new Adam through Jesus’s life and actions. Crowe states that he wrote this book to answer a question he has often asked himself: “What is Jesus doing in the Gospels?” (ix). Crowe seeks to answer this question by arguing that the Gospels do not dichotomize the “lifelong obedience of Jesus … from his death” (16), but that “the work of Christ in the Gospels is a unified obedience that entails both his life and his death” (17). This obedience, then, results in the life of Jesus portrayed as a “saving character” (17).

After a helpful introductory chapter where Crowe surveys the history of interpretation relevant to his thesis, Crowe develops his main point through the next six chapters. In chapter two, Crowe surveys the four Gospels and how they “consistently use Adam language and imagery for Jesus,” as this language and imagery builds upon an “Adamic protology” (23). In the genealogy of Luke, Jesus is represented as standing “at the head of a new humanity” (33), whereas Matthew’s genealogy “presents Jesus as a covenant representative” (35). Crowe further argues that the title
of Son of Man also presents Jesus as the Last Adam because the language of Daniel 7 describes one who is both an individual and a representation of those whom he represents (39). The many texts regarding the Son of Man not only associate Jesus with the figure from Daniel 7 but also provide a variety of Adamic connections as well (43–48).

Chapter three focuses upon the title Son of God, and here Crowe argues that this title given to Jesus is not limited only to his connections to Israel; rather, this title is also intimately connected to Adam. Thus, Jesus is the last Adam of Israel's history (55) and where both Israel and Adam failed, Jesus proved to be the better son since “Sonship in Scripture is consistently paired with obedience” (61). Crowe notes that the obedience of Jesus is immediately highlighted in the early portions of the Gospel stories primarily through the baptism and temptation narratives (68–70, 74–78), and in each instance Jesus identifies with “God’s people as their representative” (68) and his “obedience benefits those whom he represents” (78).

Chapter four analyzes the fulfillment passages in the Gospels by examining the obedience of Jesus after his baptism and temptation as well as “what it means for Jesus to be described as righteous and the fuller of righteousness” (83). Crowe’s analysis gives prominence to Matthew 3:15 since Jesus states his purpose is to fulfill all righteousness. Crowe notes both the importance of this verse in the broader context of Matthew (86–93) and its emphasis since these words were the first spoke by Jesus in Matthew’s Gospel (86). Thus, Jesus’s “fulfillment of all righteousness should be viewed in light of the coming day of eschatological salvation that entailed eschatological righteousness” (88–89). Chapter five advances Crowe’s thesis specifically in the Gospel of John. Crowe argues persuasively that “Jesus’s obedience stands in the foreground of John’s narrative, and this obedience is necessary for salvation” (117). What the Baptist declared in John 1:29 finds its fulfillment in the obedience of Jesus within the Passion Narrative as the Last Adam where the obedience/disobedience of Jesus/Adam is uniquely seen (134–37, esp. 137).

Chapter six focuses on the theme of the Kingdom of Righteousness in the Gospels, and Crowe primarily discusses the following: (1) the role of Jesus in implementing the kingdom of God (140–53), (2) Jesus’s authority to bind the strong man (153–166), and (3) the relationship between Jesus’s miracles and his messianic obedience (166–170). Jesus is presented as one who manifested the obedience “that overcomes the disobedience of Adam” and “the effects of Adam’s sins” (170). However, as Crowe notes the kingdom is not fully established since it is the resurrection of Jesus that allowed the kingdom to be fully realized (170). This is a helpful transition to chapter seven, and Crowe argues that the life and death of Jesus are “organically interwoven” so that his work must be viewed as a “unified whole” (171). It is the resurrection that proves Jesus was fully obedient as the last Adam, and his full obedience “to the Father uniquely qualifies him to save his people from their sins… serving as the (new) covenant sacrifice” (176).

Chapter eight brings Crowe’s work to a conclusion, as he attempts a theological synthesis between Adam’s character and Jesus’s obedience. Crowe notes that the incarnation of Jesus allowed Jesus to accomplish what was not possible for another human, and therefore the “incarnation is a necessary, but not a sufficient, condition for salvation” (201). Much remains to be accomplished in the obedience of Jesus, and the four Gospels portray his obedience in full.

Throughout the work, Crowe successfully argues that the Gospels present the obedience of Jesus as necessary for salvation and that Jesus is compared and
contrasted to Adam in his character. This argument primarily falls within the baptism and temptation narratives. Also helpful is Crowe’s observance of both historical and recent scholarship in Gospel studies. Crowe notes throughout his work that it is not intended to cover all areas of his chapter’s respective discussion, but he footnotes a wealth of sources for the reader to conduct further research.

What is absent in this work, however, is a discussion on the event of Jesus as a boy in the temple (Luke 2:42–52). How does Crowe reconcile the obedience of Jesus to his heavenly Father and his earthly parents in this scene, and how does it fit into the Adam/Jesus comparison?

*The Last Adam* is a helpful contribution to the field of Gospel studies. Crowe carefully demonstrates the core of his thesis throughout the work and persuasively shows how the Gospel writers carefully present the obedient life of Jesus as necessary for salvation. This work will prove helpful for any interested and it commends itself to be read widely.

Jason P. Kees
Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary


David Mathewson, Associate Professor of New Testament at Denver Seminary, has written important works on the book of Revelation. *A New Heaven and a New Earth: The Meaning and Function of the Old Testament in Revelation 21:1–22:5* is his published dissertation (2003). He has also written *Verbal Aspect in the Book of Revelation: The Function of Greek Verb Tenses in John’s Apocalypse* (2010). These helpful works show that two of his areas of focus are upon the use of the Old Testament in Revelation and upon the Greek of Revelation.

It is difficult to know how to review one of these handbooks in the Baylor Handbook series. It may be useful for the reader to know that these handbooks are something that Greek students, pastors, and teachers of the New Testament have long desired to have in their possession. They provide far greater assistance than previous resources, like A.T. Robertson’s *Word Pictures*. Each handbook in this series provides a guide to understanding the Greek grammar and syntax of an entire New Testament book. Revelation is known for having some odd grammatical constructions that defy the ordinary conventions of Greek grammar. Mathewson provides invaluable assistance for anyone who needs help with these difficult constructions. More importantly, he will help anyone with some Greek knowledge to come to understand the more straightforward Greek that characterizes the majority of the book.

I came across Mathewson during the last year of my work on a commentary on Revelation. As I was trying to complete my translation of the book and check it for accuracy, I found Mathewson’s work to be insightful and useful on passage after passage. In the introduction, he provides helpful clarification regarding how he will discuss Revelation’s Greek verbs in relation to verbal aspect (xxv–xxviii).

In terms of possible changes or additions that could improve the book’s usefulness, I did note some instances where further clarification or simplification would have been beneficial for many Greek students. For example, there is a difficult relative clause in Revelation 20:4 that begins with *hoi tines*. In his explanation, Mathewson covers some of the options for understanding the relative clause (275–76) but
does not point out that it is a relative clause, which could modify a noun or act as a noun (a substantival clause). That kind of information would help most Greek students and pastors to understand his discussion a bit better. Also, Mathewson makes many informative comments about verbal aspect, but his translation of Revelation may or may not draw attention to instances of imperfective aspect. For example, he translates Revelation 3:20 as “I stand at the door and knock,” where his comments on the verse might lead one to expect “I am standing at the door and knocking” (52). Of course, these are small points that do not take away from the superb work that Mathewson has done. If you want to study or preach the book of Revelation, this book is a goldmine worthy of careful consultation.

Paul M. Hoskins
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary

Theological and Historical Studies


Writing at the intersection of current hermeneutical debates and patristic studies, Hans Boersma claims in this volume that the church fathers read Scripture as a sacrament. Boersma, to an extent, writes with the simple goal of describing the exegetical moves of the church fathers. “The main argument,” he writes, “is that they saw the Scriptures as a sacrament and read them accordingly” (1). By referring to Scripture as a sacrament, Boersma contends that the church fathers understood Christ to be the reality beneath the surface of the Scriptures. As Boersma puts it, “To speak of a sacramental hermeneutic, therefore, is to allude to the recognition of the real presence of the new Christ-reality hidden with the outward sacrament of the biblical text” (12). Boersma, however, is not merely writing a primer on patristic exegesis. Rather, he weaves together description and prescription and calls his reader to both observe and learn from the exegetical moves of the church fathers.

Developing his argument, and following the canonical shape of Scripture, Boersma presents patristic exegesis of Genesis, Exodus, Joshua, Psalms, Proverbs, Song of Songs, Isaiah, and Matthew. By doing so, he introduces evidence which cuts across various genres and provides examples of exegesis done on diverse texts. Similarly, Boersma marshalls a diverse crowd of church fathers as witnesses. Gregory of Nyssa, Augustine, and Athanasius appear, to name a few. However, while Boersma cites many patristic exegetes, his primary exemplar is Origen. Three early chapters examining the exegesis of Chrysostom and Origen, Melito of Sardis and Origen, and Origen, make Boersma’s affection for the Alexandrian theologian clear.

Beyond historical argumentation, Boersma argues a return to patristic exegesis “is both possible and necessary” (274). Among other reasons, to ground the doctrine of the Trinity in the Old Testament (160), renew the life of the church (279), and to retain relevance (275–76), spiritual readings of Scripture must be employed today. According to Boersma, the church fathers serve “as faithful guides in our reading of the biblical text” (104).

Aspects of Boersma’s work are commendable and fascinating. For example, his discussion of literal exegesis by the church fathers pushes boundaries and challenges simplistic understandings (30–31). From a historical perspective, *Scripture as Real Presence* is an informative and helpful portrait of patristic exegesis.

Furthermore, Boersma rightly challenges the tendency of some modern
readers to dismiss the exegetical moves of the church fathers altogether. Far from dispassionate, he writes with vigor and investment, and he leaps to the defense of the church fathers. Without question, there are deep reservoirs of wisdom and knowledge in patristic exegetes, and Boersma’s elegant and passionate presentation could function as a remedy for those who prematurely dismiss them.

He, of course, anticipates this objection: “Spiritual interpretation is about moving from promise to fulfillment, from the outward to the inward, from the law to the gospel, from the letter to the spirit, from type to archetype, from sacrament to reality, and therefore from the Old Testament to the New Testament. As a result, questions surrounding spiritual interpretation often focus on how we are to read the Old Testament” (249–50). However, despite this observation, he argues, “Reading the New Testament text spiritually is exactly what the church fathers did” (250). But in contrast with eight chapters directly dealing with the Old Testament, one deals with the New Testament. When the limited evidence is examined, it does not cut across the diverse genres and texts of the New Testament in the same fashion as the Old Testament evidence. Therefore, his largely cogent historical argument falters at this point. While Boersma may be capable of substantiating his claim, this question remains unanswered: did the church fathers read New Testament epistolary or narrative literature sacramentally?

Additionally, Scripture as Real Presence is a tale of two arguments. On the one hand, Boersma presents a largely cogent historical description of patristic exegesis; on the other hand, he provocatively calls for a return to the exegesis of the church fathers. To be clear, Boersma makes no attempts to disguise his goal. He labels his book as a “project of ressourcement” (273).

Before fully embracing the exegetical methods of the church fathers, a few things must be kept in mind: The church fathers were historically situated and disagreed with one another. They were colored by the heresies they were responding to and the debates that raged during their time. Boersma correctly challenges modern readers to learn from and appreciate their example; however, their mistakes are also an opportunity to learn. More promising, grammatico-historical and redemptive-historical hermeneutical approaches, which Boersma rejects, frequently draw from patristic interpreters in balanced and responsible ways.

Furthermore, Boersma self-consciously argues for patristic exegesis because it lines up with his own metaphysical presuppositions (275). “My Christian Platonist convictions,” he states, “persuade me that everything around us is sacramental” (1). While readers will appreciate Boersma’s candor, those who do not share his basic commitments will predictably disagree with his conclusions.

Despite these critiques, Scripture as Real Presence has much to offer readers. Passionate, engaging, and provocative, Boersma is never a bore to read. In many ways, Scripture as Real Presence makes a notable contribution to wider conversations about the relationship of theology, history, and hermeneutics.

E. Coye Still IV
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary


The sixteenth-century Reformation(s), which birthed the Protestant movement, is often charged with perpetuating “radical religious individualism,”
“hermeneutical recklessness,” and “interpretive anarchy.” In *Biblical Authority after Babel*, Kevin J. Vanhoozer, Research Professor of Systematic Theology at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, defends the Protestant Reformation against common accusations by retrieving the reformational solas (*sola gratia*, *sola fide*, *sola scriptura*, *solus Christus*, and *soli Deo gloria*). He argues that the rampant “interpretative egoism” and “criminal negligence of tradition” arise from a misunderstanding, rather than genuine appropriation, of the dogmatic principles of the Reformation. The solas provide the theological resources to confront interpretative pluralism while the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers (which he likens to a “virtual sixth sola: *sola ecclesia*”) speaks to the issue of interpretive authority (29).

In chapter one, Vanhoozer argues that *sola gratia* was a Protestant rebuke against late medieval sacramentalism, which, in postulating a “sliding scale” of nature and grace, elevated the human capacity to appropriate grace. Developing the ontological significance of God’s grace for the interpretation of Holy Scripture, Vanhoozer writes, “Grace is not simply the content of the gospel but the overarching framework of its communication and reception.” In this light, the triune God’s antecedent perfection (a corollary of God’s gratuitousness *ad extra*) funds the Christian reading of Scripture. *Sola gratia* therefore answers the problem of secularization: first, by providing a theological center of gravity—the gracious overflow of triune love is the economy of redemption—and second, by viewing the biblical text as “divine address” and thus placing the interpretative act within the economy of redemption. The interpreter is caught up in the gracious “communicative domain of the triune God” (50).

Chapter two appropriates Alvin Plantiga’s Reformed epistemology—mainly, the notion of epistemic dependence—in order to develop an interpretive *via media* that eschews both “absolute certainty” and “relativizing skepticism” (105). *Sola fide* indicates the significance of the ecclesial community as human beings necessarily rely on others in developing their beliefs. Vanhoozer explains, “*Sola fide* promotes, then, not individualism but a righteous *polis*: a city and citizenship of the gospel, an interpretive community whose mandate is to profess and perform a word that indwells yet that also stands over against it, a word to which the church must measure up” (103).

Chapter three puts forward a “catholic biblicism” by setting *sola Scriptura* in relation to the other four solas and the ecclesial community. Within the economy of grace, the Holy Spirit guides the community’s reception of Scripture. As ecclesial tradition is caught up in the economy of redemption, it becomes a faithful arbiter of interpretive authority. The authority of tradition is derived and “provisional” but nonetheless authentic. He concludes, “Scripture *alone* is the supreme authority, but God in his grace decided that it is not good for Scripture to be alone. He thus authorized tradition, and Scripture” (144).

Chapter four looks to overcome Protestantism’s excessive diversity by positing an ecclesiology grounded in Reformational solas. To this end, Vanhoozer repositions the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers as an ecclesiological consequence of *solus Christus*. By virtue of union with Christ, the believer is united to all members of the one true church. Therefore, Scripture’s proper interpretive context encompasses both the local congregation and the universal church.

In chapter five, Vanhoozer argues that the church is commissioned to glorify God (*soli Deo gloria*) through visible and outward unity. Such fellowship is achieved through “strong denominationalism” wherein individual churches come together by
retrieving the gospel “contextually” despite disagreement over nonessentials. Vanhoozer identifies “first-level” or essential doctrines which demand common assent due to their close proximity to the gospel. He also offers suggestions for future cooperation among Protestants, including transdenominational “table talk.” In this vision for outward fellowship, denominational diversity is welcomed and celebrated rather than bemoaned. Provocatively, Vanhoozer argues that “some [doctrinal] differences may be divine, intended by God for the enrichment of the church” (207).

Readers expecting a detailed account of Reformational theology or the historical context of the sixteenth-century will be disappointed. The author’s contribution lies elsewhere in offering a constructive and somewhat fluid theological retrieval (which entails a dose of repetition and creativity) of the past in order to illumine the present. For instance, in retrieving the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers, Vanhoozer discerns the significance of the interpreting community and thereby curtails the common misappropriation of sola scriptura that leads to interpretative anarchy. Evangelicalism often exhibits a certain ambiguity regarding the hermeneutical role of the ecclesial community—a naïve biblicism which tends toward interpretive subjectivism. Recognizing such a predicament, Vanhoozer recasts the Reformers’ vision for “catholic unity under canonical authority” which situates scriptural reading within the ecclesial community, both past or present. Ecclesial tradition is the “long past” of the Spirit’s work which possesses an “appointed role in the economy of salvation” (139, 143). Moreover, tradition is the Church’s “corporate testimony” and “consensus teaching on Scripture’s fundamental story line” (205; 137). This catholic orientation confronts the individualism of many evangelical faith communities.

In conclusion, Biblical Authority after Babel is a welcome contribution on the five-hundredth anniversary of the Reformation. The book exhibits characteristic traits of Vanhoozer’s other writings—commanding rhetoric, compelling argumentation, and theological ingenuity. Vanhoozer offers a persuasive defense of the Protestant Reformation by adequately addressing the concerns of detractors and resourcing the reformers’ dogmatic principles of the Reformation for the church today.

Brent A. Rempel
University of Otega


Exegetical over-reaching of premodern interpreters has often tainted the authority and respectability of the doctrine of the Trinity among contemporary theologians. Conscious of the apparent difficulties for Christian theology, Fred Sanders—professor of theology at Biola University—aims to “make our knowledge of the Trinity more secure by ordering our language about it more accurately” (185). A key component of such revision, which also serves to govern the book’s outline, is that “the manner of the Trinity’s revelation dictates the shape of the doctrine” (19). According to Sanders, revelation of the triune God is located in the historical missions of the Son in the incarnation and the Spirit at Pentecost. It was the early church fathers’ awareness of the theological claims of Scripture, particularly in the gospel narratives, that led them to read the economy of salvation “retrospectively” as the authoritative revelation of the divine life of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Recapitulating this well-trodden path, Sanders guides readers into the theo-drama of Scripture to reconsider the nature and form of the doctrine of the Trinity.
Chapters one through five explore the self-gifting of the triune God in the missions of the Son and Holy Spirit, thereby laying the revelatory foundation for the doctrine of the Trinity. Chapter one situates Trinitarian dogma in the realm of worship; to speak of the triune God is “essentially a spiritual exercise… a doxological movement of thought that gives glory to the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit” (19). Chapters two and three introduce the nature of the triune God’s self-disclosure. Although the doctrine of the Trinity is not “presented to us in a formulated state,” it is nonetheless revealed in a “direct, intense, and personal way” (39, 40). God’s self-witness incorporates “salvific actions” and “explanatory words.” In the New Testament, the “eternal conversation” of the triune God extends outward in the “self-interpreting” economic missions of the Son and Spirit. Chapter four establishes the canonical unity of the biblical text, which serves as a presupposition of Trinitarian theology. The doctrine of the Trinity, Sanders argues, “arises from the totality of Scripture rather than from a congeries of scattered texts” (104). The unity of the Old and New Testament also exhibits a unified narrative that reveals the “agency of the triune God” (105).

Chapter five considers the internal triune relations of origin. The missions-processions scheme (as opposed to the more enigmatic idiom of the economic and immanent Trinity) provides the primary conceptual framework for distinguishing the triune persons. The triune missions and processions must be distinguished—the former terminating in time while the latter in eternity—without severing the link between God’s external and internal acts.

Chapters six through eight further specify the relationship between God’s triune self-disclosure and Holy Scripture. The historical missions are foundational for the New Testament canon, which “receives” and “presupposes” divine revelation. Sanders identifies three aspects of Trinitarian doctrine in New Testament. The Scriptures present (1) raw data in speaking of the Father, Son, and Spirit. The data occurs alongside (2) “patterned reflection” which puts (3) “pressure” on the interpreter to develop distinctions among the persons while maintaining unity. Sanders’ ruminations on the unveiling of the Trinity in Scripture are insightful and carefully nuanced. In chapter eight, Sanders discusses prosopological exegesis of the Old Testament—a favored interpretive practice of early Christian communities—and endorses a recovery of this hermeneutic in the Church today. Sanders’ exposition of Scripture in preceding chapters is limited to the New Testament—a methodology which corresponds to the qualitative difference between triune revelation before and after the economic sending of the Word and Spirit. It is, however, unfortunate that Sanders does not initiate this recommendation by realizing the dogmatic potential of the testimony of the prophets. Nonetheless, the study promotes further rereading of the Old Testament to clarify its distinct contribution to Trinitarian dogma.

The Triune God bridges Christian dogmatics, theological method, and hermeneutics. The dogmatic location of revelation, for instance, is a crucial part of Sanders’ “seismic retrofitting” of the doctrine of the Trinity (180). In its widest signification, divine revelation embraces inscripturated revelation. Verbal revelation, Sanders argues, upholds the unity of God’s being and act, and is therefore necessary for the flourishing of Trinitarian theology. However, revelation is properly restricted to “the actual historical sending of the Son and the Spirit in the incarnation and Pentecost” (185). Sanders thus distinguishes, without separating, God’s triune revelation in the historical missions and the written attestation to those missions. Such an approach accords with the biblical witness, for “God did not first describe the Trinity’s eternal
processions and then display them in missions” (94). This instructive construal serves to curtail interpreters’ heightened expectations to discover a formulated doctrine of the Trinity in the Bible. Theology proper must “generate” a corresponding theology of revelation which in turn governs and shapes bibliology and scriptural reading. Holy Scripture proceeds from the domain of the Word and Spirit. Sanders remarks, “The Trinity is in the Bible because the Bible is in the Trinity” (44).

Theological reading yields a doctrine of the Trinity by tracing the text’s witness to the immanent processions of the Son and Spirit revealed in the economy. In this process, theological discourse remains transparent to the particularity of the biblical writings. When overburdened, linguistic idioms sever the link between revelation and Trinitarian theology. As a result, the biblical basis of the doctrine of the Trinity is undermined. In contrast, according to Sanders’ approach (which comes to view in the exegetically-focused chapters 6–8), the doctrine of the Trinity emerges as an interpretative gloss on the biblical narrative (e.g. Jesus’ baptism in the Jordan). These brief exegetical readings are particularly illuminating and prompt further interpretive work in this mode. Moreover, Sanders overcomes a prevalent criticism against classical Trinitarian teaching by offering a portrait of the triune God deeply rooted in scriptural exegesis.

In grounding all human divine knowledge in the Word and Spirit, The Triune God successfully provides a “more secure footing” for Trinitarian theology (22). The volume may serve as an introductory textbook on the doctrine of Trinity for both undergraduate and graduate classes. That said, Sanders does not present a comprehensive historical or systematic account of the Trinity. Rather, he calls the church to ground the doctrine in the “intentional self-revelation of God” (106). The deity of the triune persons provides the theological anchor which unites the eternal processions and temporal missions. The Son, as God, and the Holy Spirit, as God, are truly “God’s self-gift in the economy” (151).

Brent A. Rempel
University of Otega


Malcolm Yarnell’s *God the Trinity: Biblical Portraits*, offers an excellent study on the biblical foundations of the doctrine of the Trinity, one that is conducted with significant interaction with historical theology. Yarnell, research professor of systematic theology at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary (and, full disclosure, my close colleague), maintains that the Bible definitely affirms God’s triune nature, but that only those with eyes to see will discern this. Modern interpreters trained by an Enlightenment hermeneutic often miss seeing God’s triune nature in Scripture primarily because they approach the text with interpretive methods that are alien to the text itself. By contrast, those steeped in the Scripture’s own communicative “idiom”—like the church fathers and other “pre-modern” exegetes both reformation and contemporary—have consistently underscored God’s Trinitarian nature. The structure of Yarnell’s study is consistent with what he understands to be this biblical idiom. Scripture is not a human document to be subjected to modern methods of historical-critical analysis; it is divine revelation which paints for us various portraits of God and his interactions with the world. Subsequently, Yarnell, like an art connoisseur, chooses eight of these portraits, displays them, and then offers rich comment and theological reflection.
Throughout *God the Trinity* Yarnell notes the inadequacies of modern (i.e. Enlightenment) interpretive strategies for understanding Scripture and how these thwart a robust Trinitarian theology. Modern exegesis underscores the historical-critical method, scientific analysis, and is dominated by mathematical and experiential claims. From the outset, these methods avoid considerations related to God’s nature or being, concepts which today are deemed off-limits because of their metaphysical and/or Greek implications. In short, modern exegesis is inherently anti-Trinitarian and anti-Hellenistic (93, following Francis Watson). It is thus no surprise, Yarnell notes, to see some current evangelical interpreters make statements intimating that the doctrine of the Trinity is not revealed in Scripture even though it might contain the raw materials for such a doctrine (10–11).

Yarnell wants to counter these trends: “The Trinity is definitely revealed in the New Testament and, for those with sensitive enough ears, across both testaments” (11). The key to this hearing lies in broadening one’s approach to interpreting the Scriptures. Yarnell does not wish to discard the historical-critical method altogether; he seeks to employ it in a chastened and limited manner (11) alongside of other “pre-critical” interpretive methods (86) that have appeared throughout the Christian tradition: typology, personalism, and theologia to name a few. Collectively, these approaches affirm that God does reveal his nature to a limited degree primarily through his acts (18, 99–100).

The structure of Yarnell’s gallery of texts is easy to discern. His initial portraits, Matthew 28:19–20, and 2 Corinthians 13:16, are placed first because these texts relate to the Christian’s first encounter with the Triune God, namely, through gospel proclamation and baptism (the Great Commission passage), and through the church’s ongoing encounter of grace in its discipleship (the closing of 2 Corinthians). His next portrait, the Shema (Deuteronomy 6:4–6), considers the Old Testament’s portrait of God in an effort to demonstrate the continuity between the one God of the Old Testament, the Christological monotheism of the New Testament, and the Trinitarian monotheism of the early church fathers. From there, Yarnell spends three chapters in the Gospel of John (John 1:18, 16:14–15, 17:21–22) where he explores the contours of John’s rich immanent Trinitarian theology. These chapters lie at the heart of Yarnell’s project as they represent an extensive exploration on the divine nature. The final two portraits address God’s Trinitarian activity in the world (Ephesians 1:3–14) and the Trinitarian features related to his future coming (Revelation 5:6). Taken together, *God the Trinity* invites Christians to a refined way of seeing God’s triune glory throughout the art gallery of the Christian canon.

Yarnell’s Trinitarian theology deftly draws from multiple traditions throughout the history of the church, a feature which comprises one of the book’s great strengths. *God the Trinity* is not written by a Cappadocian or Augustinian specialist; neither is it the product of a specialist in biblical studies or philosophical theology. As a theologian, Yarnell is well read in each of these fields and integrates them nicely into a coherent Trinitarianism that is biblical, Baptist, and supportive of the church’s mission.

Several points are worthy of note. First, his study favors the Cappadocian or Eastern approach to the Trinity over Augustine’s since, he contends, the former does a better job at avoiding modalism, Unitarianism, and a blurring of the divine persons (83–84, 167). He thus is generally critical of the Augustinian doctrine of filioque (154) while affirming numerous Eastern theological themes related to Trinity, specifically the doctrines of deification and theosis (though understood in an
evangelical way; “deification by grace, not by nature,” 51).

Second, Yarnell is somewhat critical of the Trinitarianism articulated by the reformed tradition, a point that appears to derive from his preference for Eastern Trinitarianism over Western. B.B. Warfield is specifically singled out numerous times for criticism for the way he prioritizes the divine essence (9) and minimizes the sub-numeration within the ontological Trinity (147, see also 157n, and 175). Warfield, however, should not be treated as the standard bearer for the reformed view on the Trinity for the simple reason that the reformed tradition admits a variety of views on the doctrine (a point Yarnell would no doubt agree). Yarnell’s study would have benefitted from greater interaction with the broader swath of the reformed tradition on the Trinity, including such writers as Bartholomew Keckermann, John Owen, and Jonathan Edwards.

Third, Yarnell creatively repackages and incorporates elements of modern scholarship to bolster his Biblicist Trinitarianism. He affirms the basic vision of Karl Rahner’s famous axiom, but with important qualifications: “The economic Trinity reveals the immanent Trinity truly but not exhaustively” (173). This allows him to affirm a continuity between the economic and immanent Trinity without threatening divine transcendence and the priority of the immanent Trinity in our theological reflection. From this he correctly challenges the tendency, demonstrated by some in the complementarian-egalitarian debate, to allow theological anthropology to drive Trinitarian theology (172). He also incorporates aspects of Richard Bauckham’s understanding of the “Christological monotheism” found in the New Testament as a healthy counter-balance to the way modern interpreters accentuate the differences between the God of the Old Testament and the God of the New (71–74, 83).

Systematic theologians, biblical scholars, historical theologians, as well as serious students of Scripture will find God the Trinity stimulating, accessible, and rich with theological wisdom. I highly recommend it.

Robert W. Caldwell III
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary


Building on an ever-increasing volume of literature on the eighteenth-century theologian, this volume is an introductory guide to the major writings of Jonathan Edwards. While other books have written about his life, systematized his theology, or chronicled the pastor’s legacy, this book provides detailed analysis of his principle written works. The book orients the reader to each work’s historical context, basic contents, and theological legacy. Each chapter on the major works ends with a point of contemporary application.

This volume is edited by Nathan Finn and Jeremy Kimble. Finn currently serves as Provost and Dean of the University Faculty at North Greenville University in Tigerville, SC. At the time of publication, he served as Dean of the School of Theology and Missions and professor of theological studies at Union University in Jackson, Tennessee. Kimble is assistant professor of theological studies at Cedarville University in Cedarville, Ohio. Together, they have assembled an impressive group of contributors from a variety of backgrounds and institutions.

The work begins with an introduction from the editors. They explain the
purpose of this work is “to bridge the gap between the work of scholars and the interests of general readers, especially pastors and ministerial students” (18). The major writings of Edwards include those that were popular during his lifetime, as well as works published posthumously which influenced later generations of missionaries, scholars, pastors, and laypeople. The book is organized by an initial chapter on how to read Edwards, followed by nine chapters dedicated to Edwards’s major writings, and finally an appendix on John Piper’s personal encounter with Edwards.

The first chapter, written by Dane Ortlund, will be the most helpful to the reader who does not have direct experience with reading Edwards. But before he offers a view on how to read Edwards, he offers an apology on why to read Edwards. Why would today’s busy pastors and seminarians have any interest in reading this eighteenth century Puritan preacher? What are the benefits of engaging with his writings? In sum, Edwards ushers the reader into the presence of God. This chapter sees reading Edwards as a journey that is both theologically rigorous and devotionally stimulating.

In chapter two, Finn looks at Edwards’s autobiographical writings. These important texts provide a look into the inner thought life of the eminent pastor. Immediately, the reader is directly introduced to the personal spiritual life of Edwards. Starting with Edwards’s private reflections is helpful because it connects the reader to the heart of the pastor. Chapter three, written by Jeremy Kimble, analyzes Edwards’s revival writings. These works constitute the works most widely read by non-specialists. These writings outline Edwards’s theology of revival, salvation, and the church. The fourth chapter analyzes Edwards’s *Justification by Faith Alone*. Michael McClenahan guides the reader through a key soteriological debate in the eighteenth century. In these debates, Edwards shows his skill, not only as a constructive theologian, but also as a polemicist. Arguing against Arminian doctrine, Edwards presents a sophisticated account of Reformed theology. McClenahan’s chapter is helpful because it introduces the reader to contemporary scholarly debates over Edwards’s teaching on justification. Gerald McDermott looks at Edward’s *Religious Affections* in chapter five. The work covers a variety of intellectual disciplines and proves to be a very helpful work for contemporary evaluations of revivals and individual piety. McDermott’s chapter helps the reader to understand and apply Edwards’s interpretation of spiritual revitalization for today. In chapter six, Rhys Bezzant presents *The Life of David Brainerd*. This chapter sheds light on the background to a popular work. The next two chapters, written by Joe Rigney and Robert Caldwell respectively, deal with some of the most philosophically sophisticated works by Edwards, *Freedom of the Will* and *Original Sin*. These tomes are technically challenging reads which defend a Reformed perspective. In chapter nine, Sean Michael Lucas introduces Edwards’s *History of the Work of Redemption*. This work is a sermon series delivered by Edwards from his Northampton pulpit. It is a biblical-theological work that Edwards hoped to be the foundation for a major work later to be published. Unfortunately, Edwards never completed that work due to his untimely death. Contemporary readers might find Edwards’s interpretations on history and eschatology strange, but Lucas helps in identifying key insights and applying them for today. Chapter ten is devoted to Edwards’s affecational ethics. Paul Helm outlines three of Edwards’s works to give a broad sketch of Edwards’s ethical writings. Finally, the reader is provided with an appendix, written by John Piper. It charts his personal encounter with Edwards. The appendix will be especially
enlightening for those who are familiar with the preaching and writing of Piper. He shows how Edwards shaped his theology and encouraged him in his Christian walk.

This volume proves to be an outstanding introduction to Edwards’s major writings. It gives broad outlines to the contours of Edwards’s theology. Each author brings a unique and insightful contribution to the work. However, R igney and Caldwell’s essays provide the most helpful essays to the book’s intended audience. The dense nature of those works proves to be difficult reading for the normal pastor and seminarian. Yet, their essays make Edwards’s prose much more accessible.

Adam Cavalier
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary


Since 1984, the _Evangelical Dictionary of Theology_ has been an indispensable resource for students of theology. Both the first and second edition (2001) were edited by Walter Elwell, but with his 80th birthday arriving in 2017, Elwell turned the responsibility for this, the third edition, over to Daniel Treier.

Of course, as a third edition and not a new book, much of the content remains the same from the previous versions. But in the preface to the third edition, editor Treier gives four of the “chief components” of this revision: (1) a reduction of overall length (from 1312 pages to 972); (2) addition of new content (150,000 words) and new contributors (younger, women, ethnic minority and Majority World perspectives); (3) updating every remaining article; and (4) updating all bibliographies. Each of these components deserves comment.

The shortened length comes from a narrower focus, on systematic theology per se, with less material on biblical or historical matters, and from a decision to omit articles on living theologians. The narrower focus is seen in the article on Pentecostalism. The new article is barely two-thirds the length of the article in the second edition, and has much less of the historical development and much more of the global expansion. Similarly, two articles on the Attributes and Doctrine of God are combined into one article on God that is less than half the length of the previous two. I am not sure how many articles there were on living theologians in the first edition, but flipping through the second edition I found articles on Millard Erickson, Gustavo Gutierrez, and Jurgen Moltmann. I am sure there were many more; all are omitted in the third edition.

A spot-check did find some of the new content mentioned by Treier. There was a completely new and much more up-to-date article on Church, Canon of Scripture, and Systematic Theology; numerous other new articles which were subsections of other articles (an article on the Trinity when it was a short subsection of the article on Doctrine of God; the same with Original Sin); new articles which were replacements or supplements to previous articles (a much more up-to-date article on Human Beings replacing Mankind; an article on Gender supplementing a much weaker article on Male and Female and replacing a dated article on Woman, Biblical Concept of), and some articles on totally new topics (such as Creation Care).

In terms of new contributors, I did not make a thorough comparison. There was a mix of names of those whose books I have on my shelves, and others unfamiliar to me. There were 75 authors who were noted as deceased (out of a total of about
350 contributors) and at least twenty whose names were almost certainly female.

The third new component, the updating of every remaining article, I will not dispute, but I will note that the revisions in many cases were very minor, especially in the cases of articles from authors now deceased. For example, an article on Adam by Leon Morris was quite dated, but had very little revision from the article in the second edition. The article of Justification was written by J.I. Packer in the second edition; it was reproduced almost verbatim in the third edition, but a new co-author, R. M. Allen, added a short paragraph relating to the New Perspective on Paul. Surprisingly, the article on Postmodernism was almost entirely the same.

In terms of the fourth new component, the updating of bibliographies, my spot-check of articles and their accompanying bibliographies was much more uniform and positive. Almost all the articles I checked had extensively updated bibliographies, remedying the chief complaint I had of the second edition. Having the bibliographies accompanying the articles was a very valuable feature of the second edition, but was weakened by bibliographies that were very often seriously dated. That is much less of an issue with this third edition.

There is another change, not mentioned by the editor, but of great value to readers. In the second edition, one could usually track down the article one wanted through cross-references (for Trinity; see God, Doctrine of; for Original Sin, see Sin). But occasionally I would struggle to find the article that addressed the topic I was studying. The improvement in the third edition is in the inclusion, at the very end, of an alphabetical index of articles. There will still be a need for cross-referencing, and editor Treier states that they have taken that task “very seriously.” But the index allows one to easily find if the specific topic desired is treated, and if not, one can usually see a related topic for which there is an article.

While no book is perfect, least of all one with hundreds of contributors and articles, the third edition of *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology* is a definite improvement over the second edition, which was, for all its faults, by far the best sourcebook for theology students. This third edition is even better, and should serve students of theology for the future in the same stellar way the second edition has served students in the past.

John S. Hammett
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary

**Studies in Philosophy and Ethics**


This volume is divided into two parts. The first seven chapters deal with the art and practice of teaching, and the second part deals with specific philosophical topics and how best to introduce them to students. The final chapter focuses on the importance institutions of higher learning should place upon good teaching. I limit my comments to Cahn’s philosophy of teaching as he develops it in the first six chapters, dealing only with his thoughts about teaching undergraduates.

Cahn lays out a teacher’s responsibilities. Teachers are responsible to know their subject better than their students. A teacher’s authority derives from the fact that a teacher is expected to be an expert in the subject he or she professes (2). Cahn makes the important but often forgotten point that “knowing a subject and knowing how to teach it effectively are quite different” (4). Cahn thinks there are three things
that contribute to a teacher’s success: “motivation, organization, and clarification” (13).

Motivation can take many forms. Here the focus is on the kind of rhetoric calculated to foster in students the attention needed to engage philosophy with joy. Beginning class by asking students to imagine a scenario is much more effective than telling students to turn to page 40 of their textbook.

Organization involves the careful arrangement and presentation of material. Here Cahn is unsparing in his criticism of those teachers who are interested in helping only the best or most talented students. “Poor teachers,” he writes, “may not care whether their students understand a presentation, but successful teachers are eager to explain basic points to those who have trouble with them” (9). He concludes, “If someone has no interest in offering such help, that person is not cut out to be a teacher and is akin to a surgeon who is unhappy about having to deal with sick people” (9).

Clarification involves ensuring that students understand material presented to them. Clarification can be undermined if instructors speak too quickly and not as deliberately as they should (11). Lack of clarity can also result when teachers use terms with which students are unfamiliar.

Next, Cahn deals with a teacher’s concerns, such as the preparation of syllabi, the professor’s regular attendance at class sessions, keeping office hours, etc. Cahn singles out for discussion the importance of knowing student names. He recalls that a colleague with more than 200 students had managed to remember the names of all his students and even a little about their lives (21–22).

Regarding papers and examinations Cahn discusses the importance of making writing assignments clear. He also discusses preventative measures teachers can take to help students avoid such things as caricaturing positions with which they disagree, quoting sources improperly, and turning in written work with grammatical and spelling errors (24–25). Furthermore, Cahn provides a good reason for assigning exams. Exams motivate students to read the material assigned (28).

Regarding grades Cahn characterizes grades as “an expert’s judgment of the quality of a student’s work in a specific course” (32). He cautions against two equally misleading practices: never awarding high grades and never assigning low ones (35–36).

As far as a teacher’s relationship to students, Cahn singles out for discussion three pitfalls to be avoided by professors: becoming a student’s counselor, friend, or lover (40). The emotional difficulties faced by some students can lead caring professors to adopt the role of a counselor, and this is a role for which professors of philosophy, considered from the standpoint of their professional credentials, are unsuited. Friendship with students can also lead to preferential treatment that is inappropriate for the relationship between teacher and student, which is defined by the professional responsibilities of each. Furthermore, romantic relationships between professors and students, particularly when those students are members of a professor’s class, are inappropriate, and constitute, on the professor’s part, a blatant abuse of power (40).

I have one critique. An adjunct instructor reading this book is likely to feel a deep sense of inadequacy. Many adjunct instructors, because they are not paid enough money to live on, must devote several hours a week to another occupation to make ends meet. Some are fortunate enough to land several teaching gigs, but my surmise is that just as many are not. Some advice to adjunct instructors about how to deal with the problems they face as part-time teachers would be a welcome addition.
Cahn has offered important considerations about the noble task of teaching. If any aspiring or veteran teacher reads *Teaching Philosophy* and as a result becomes better at the craft, then Cahn’s purpose in writing the book will have been fulfilled.

Cody Dolinsek
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary


Platonism is one of the oldest and most prominent systems of philosophical beliefs, but is it compatible with a theistic worldview? That is the question that William Lane Craig considers in his book *God Over All.* Craig asserts that Platonism (as it regards the existence of abstract mathematical entities) is not compatible with a theistic worldview due to its violation of the doctrine of divine aseity. Aseity is the belief in God’s self-sufficiency. He alone is eternal and uncreated, and all other things in existence proceed from him (1–2). Platonism, however, argues that there exists abstract entities independent of God that are eternal, uncreated, and potentially exemplified in reality; therefore, God is not the source of all other things in existence (2–3).

In support of divine aseity, Craig cites John 1:1 to emphasize that God alone is eternal and uncreated. All other reality is created and dependent on God (13–24). He claims the same idea is found in Paul’s writings, specifically 1 Corinthians, Romans, and Colossians (24–27). The church fathers as well supported the notion of aseity. Some of the fathers even referred to Platonism as heresy (31–40). From a theological viewpoint, Platonism is also heretical because it implies that there is an abstract entity called deity that God exemplifies making his existence dependent on something (43).

The modern issue of abstract entities involves mathematics stemming from the Indispensability Argument which claims that there are abstract entities that are needed in order to have referents in certain types of sentences (45–46). Singular terms and existential qualifiers are tools of ontological commitment: there is/are ____. Since a sentence such as 2+2=4 has simple terms and an object to which we supposedly must be ontologically committed, then there must be abstract entities to represent those terms (49–50). Thus, mathematics seems to commit the theist to the existence of necessary mathematical entities.

Craig reviews a number of potential approaches the theist could take in order to overcome this theological problem. Absolute Creationism argues that abstract entities were necessarily emanated/created by God. Divine Conceptualism, the view of the church fathers, reduces abstract entities to God’s thoughts. Craig ultimately is dismissive of these realist views (though he thinks they are still available to a theist) and favors an anti-realist approach to mathematical entities. He prefers to reject the Indispensability Argument as committing one to the existence of abstract entities since it seems to imply that numerous strange and dubious entities exist. Views such as neutral logic and free logic state that the existential qualifier should be neutral in its claims of what does and does not exist. One should get rid of any preconditions in logic that settle what does and does not exist (140).

This opens a way to other approaches to mathematical entities which include fictionalism, figuralism, and pretense theory. Each of these theories regards
mathematical entities or discourse about such entities to be either literally false, merely figures of speech, or make-believe; however, mathematics still conveys some sort of truth. As a result, Platonic mathematical entities do not literally exist and a theist need not be ontologically committed to their existence. Craig believes that this is the best approach to overcoming the threat of Platonism to theism.

It must be said that Craig presents a strong biblical case against Platonism from which a Platonic theist will not easily extricate himself. If God is the source of all reality apart from himself, then a theist has good reason to suspect the theological adequacy of standard Platonism. It is difficult to see how a theist could make Platonism consistent with the biblical data on this issue, but perhaps it is possible.

That being said, I find Craig’s criticisms of absolute creation and divine conceptualism (outside of the bootstrapping concern) rather insubstantial. Further, it seems to me that the bootstrapping concern is easily overcome without giving up a constituent ontology as Craig suggests, such as appealing to Aristotelian substance theory. I also find it strange that Craig notes that divine conceptualism is the historical theistic ontology but does not cover the classical approaches, only a modern one. Lastly, Craig treats the Indispensability Argument as the crux of Platonic thought; however, I am not convinced that it is. It seems to me that a (modified) Platonic theist has other arguments both philosophical and theological to bolster his claims for abstract entities besides the Indispensability Argument. Even if that argument fails, it seems that abstract mathematical entities could still exist based on other grounds.

Craig’s appeal to anti-realism also bothers me. According to Craig, mathematical truth can be maintained via fictionalism, figuralism, and pretense theory. I do not see how. I can understand what truth *The Lord of the Flies* is conveying even though it is fiction. I can understand what truth “It is raining cats and dogs” is conveying even though it is figurative language. I can understand the truth behind hypothetical situations even though they are make-believe. But what truth am I to receive from *2+2=4* if this claim is literally false, metaphorical, or just make-believe? When science claims that light travels at 186,000 miles a second, what truth am I supposed to conclude if this claim is not literal?

In fact, why should anyone accept mathematics if it is not a literal claim about reality? People do not accept works of fiction as guides to history or figurative language and imagination as statements of fact. Could not a person simply reject mathematics as irrelevant to understanding reality? What does it matter that mathematics is internally consistent within its own rules? Why accept the rules in the first place? It seems to me that Craig’s preferred path leads to an epistemological relativism regarding mathematics and any truth claim that relies on it, which undercuts anti-realism’s warrant.

Graham Floyd
Tarrant County College


Bringing together 22 scholars, editors Ben Bradley, Fred Feldman, and Jens Johansson have given us a very engaging philosophical contribution to the philosophy of death. As the editors tell us in the introduction, the philosophy of death is not an orthodox branch of philosophy, since the philosophy of death is
“intersubdisciplinary”, unlike strict metaphysics and ethics. The pivot of this volume is for analytical metaphysics and ethics to contribute to more precise conceptual analyses of death.

The approach is good because the more subdisciplines interact with each other, the more such subdisciplines can benefit and flourish. However, the goodness of such an approach contrasts with the book’s restricted diversity of thematic perspectives. In a handbook such as this, one expects the variety of the contributions to come from as many subdisciplinary perspectives as feasible in the space allotted. What one finds, however, is an excessively cramped focus on only a limited set of topics from a limited set of thematic perspectives. Enlarging the handbook’s scope would have greatly helped with clarifying the multifaceted nature of death itself. Nonetheless, such limited scope is entralling within the boundaries of its exploration.

The strength of the present volume is twofold, as we will show in what follows. First, the authors represent a diversity of proposals within the few thematic horizons wherein they conduct their investigations. Second, the handbook offers the reader the first constructive treatment on the subject of death nurtured, almost entirely, within the analytic tradition.

The strength of the present volume is twofold, as we will show in what follows. First, the authors represent a diversity of proposals within the few thematic horizons wherein they conduct their investigations. Second, the handbook offers the reader the first constructive treatment on the subject of death nurtured, almost entirely, within the analytic tradition.

The first theme of the handbook treats what death itself is. Cody Gilmore’s “When Do Things Die?” investigates when things die by helping us find metaphysically necessary and sufficient conditions for the timing of death, construed as cessation of life. Fred Feldman’s “Death and the Disintegration of Personality” challenges the idea that a person’s death implies a cessation of existence. In “Person and Corpse”, Eric Olsen explores, and finds wanting, the possibility that we continue to exist as an unconscious corpse after death, which brings up the ontological issue of what corpses are, and whether a corpse is identical to a living person prior to death.

The second theme is the relationship between death and time. Dean Zimmerman’s “Personal Identity and the Survival of Death” explores how personal survival will impact how one understands death and personhood by providing a profitable taxonomy according to which the implications of a criterion for the possibility of survival could depend on the acceptance of the doctrine of temporal parts. Theodore Sider’s “The Evil of Death: What Can Metaphysics Contribute?” is an ethical perspective on such a theme, showing how four-dimensionalism and presentism are compatible with the evilness of death. Lars Bergström’s “Death and Eternal Recurrence” is the only analytic take on a continental perspective on death and time, Nietzsche’s idea of eternal recurrence or “eternal return” (the idea that everything that has happened will eternally happen again).

The third theme is a historical one, with a solitary take on Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle, and an exorbitant amount of attention paid to the view of Epicurus. In “Death in Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle,” Gareth Matthews focuses on the “Socrates” represented in The Apology, Plato’s robust view of the immortality of the soul, and Aristotle’s ideas of the soul and immortality in The Nicomachean Ethics and De Anima. Phillip Mitsis, John Broome, Roy Sorensen, Christopher Belshaw, Kai Draper, all Steven Luper all providing variations on the Epicurean theme of whether death can harm us, whether it should be feared, what attitude it is rationally appropriate to have toward it, whether it is evil, or whether its badness can be retroactive.

We believe the historical theme of the handbook could have been greatly enhanced by confining the variations on the Epicurean theme to one or two contributions. This is not a criticism of the contributions themselves (they are all very well done), but an editorial critique of the restricted scope of the contributions. Where
is an analysis of death from the existential perspective? Why cannot there be a substantial analytic contribution from the continental perspective? And if the handbook is going to focus on Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, and Epicurus, why not touch upon Augustine, Pascal, Schopenhauer, Kierkegaard, Heidegger, Sartre or Camus? And why not include the poetic or literary perspectives of someone like Shakespeare, Coleridge or Tolstoy?

The fourth theme is death and immortality. Both “Immortality” by John Martin Fischer and “The Makropulos Case Revisited: Reflections on Immortality and Agency” by Connie Rosati provide rejoinders to the famous “The Makropulos Case: Reflections on the Tedium of Immortality” by Bernard Williams. Williams launches a critique of immortality based on its undesirability and lack of value. Fischer finds both criticisms off the mark, and Rosati argues for the rationality of longing for immortality given that it is an expression of our autonomous agency.

At this point, the handbook circles back to a variation on the third theme, with Matthew Hanser’s “The Wrongness of Killing and The Badness of Death”, which considers the ethics of killing and its connection with why death is bad. Since killing violates the “special value or worth in virtue of which” persons “are owed respect”, the degree to which killing deprives persons of such a value is the degree to which such a person’s death is bad. The essay should have been positioned before Fischer’s.

The fifth, and final, theme is the relation of death to various issues in applied ethics: abortion, war, animal death, and capital punishment. Don Marquis’ “Abortion and Death” defends four theses: abortion causes the death of a fetus, the abortion of a non-sentient fetus causes death, abortion harms someone if it deprives one of valuable experiences, and harming a fetus presumptively does something wrong to the fetus. F.M. Kamm’s “The Morality of Killing in War: Some Traditional and Nontraditional Views” is an overview of the classic stances thinkers have taken on killing in war along with alternatives stances, with the caveat that such stances spring from nonconsequentialist ethics. Alastair Norcross’s “The Significance of Death for Animals” investigates the issue of whether death is bad for animals, where the degree of badness is in direct proportion to the quantity of well-being that is lost in a particular death. Torbjörn Tännsjö’s “Capital Punishment” is an incisive commentary on whether the killing of those who have themselves murdered other humans deserve killing themselves.

There is one obvious criticism of the present volume, mentioned at the beginning of the review. In one sense, we are not surprised at the lack of other disciplinary perspectives represented in the volume. The vast majority of the contributors are analytic philosophers. On the one hand, this is a strength of the volume, but the fact that it is an Oxford Handbook suggests that it would have a wider influence from other disciplinary perspectives. We have in mind explicit contributions from historians, literary scholars, scientists, and, especially, theologians. One easy way to remedy this problem would have been to publish it in a distinct series, but as it is published in the Handbook series one would expect a wider set of disciplines intended for a wider audience. Relatedly, the topics of a Handbook seem myopic. While there is an extensive discussion on death as cessation and important ethical applications of that discussion, one would expect a more comprehensive set of topics. Some of these might include various religious perspectives on death and how this fits into a broad encompassing systematic and practical theology.

In the end, this is the first sustained analytic treatment of death. It deserves the attention of philosophers and theologians, especially those sympathetic to the
analytic tradition. Both religious philosophers and theologians will siphon out significant resources for additional constructive work on death and the afterlife. Apart from the criticism above concerning its mis-categorization as a Handbook, the present volume is an important contribution to the literature on death as a concept to be mined for wider use in analytic philosophy of religion and theology.

Joshua R. Farris
Houston Baptist University and Heythrop College, University of London

Matthew Damore
Houston Baptist University

Studies in Pastoral Ministry and Missions


Portraits of a Pastor is a collection of lectures that was given at the first annual For the Church conference at Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary. Jason Allen, the president of Midwestern, edited the volume and with eight others contributed to it. This book does not intend to give an exhaustive in-depth look at each of the roles of the pastor. Instead, what Allen has compiled are 9 snap shots of different roles he, and the other contributors, believe are essential to the ministry of the pastor. The central questions of the book are as follow: “What is the pastor to be? What must the pastor do?” (13). The picture that emerges seems overwhelming for one person to perform; nevertheless, the book provides a solid overview of the ministry of the pastor.

The best chapters are Jared Wilson’s chapter, “Pastor as Shepherd,” Owen Strachan’s chapter, “Pastor as Theologian,” and Donald S. Whitney’s chapter, “Pastor as Man of God.” Wilson focuses on the importance of loving people and loving Jesus. A pastor that does not love is not really a pastor at all. He writes, “What I notice a lot every day in the Christian spheres of social media is just how incredibly adept we evangelicals are at doctrinal criticism, cultural rebuke, theological analysis…But what seems less prevalent is love for Jesus” (26). Strachan presents an excellent exposition of 2 Timothy 1:5–14. His argument, that the academy has “boxed theology up,” and that “the demotion of the pastor in American and even Western cultural life is likely the most significant intellectual trend of the last five hundred years,” is something that pastors and theologians need to think through. Would not theology best be done by those serving in the church? Whitney presents the need for pastors to pursue personal holiness. He rightly notes, “Not every man of God is a pastor, but every pastor must be a man of God” (161). Whitney further makes the argument that pastors need to exercise spiritual disciplines to be the man of God that God calls them to be.

Some of the weaker chapters are Allen’s chapter, “Pastor as Preacher,” and Christian T. George’s chapter, “Pastor as Church Historian.” To be clear, these chapters are not defective chapters, they just are not as helpful as the others. Allen makes a few statements that are questionable. First, he states, “I believe preaching is the pastor’s preeminent responsibility” (57). This is understandable coming from a preacher like Allen. But is it correct? Would not a more biblical approach be to say,
the preeminent responsibility of the pastor is prayer and the teaching of the Word (Acts 6:4), with teaching encompassing more than just preaching? Second, he states, “After all, as Broadus observed, if preaching was primary in Jesus’ ministry, ought it not be primary in ours?” (70). Again, is this correct? Was Jesus more focused on preaching to the masses or on teaching his disciples?

George’s argument is the weakest of the chapters because it is probably the most unnecessary of the 9 roles mentioned in the book. That is not to say that church history does not have its place. But it is to say that if a pastor is not a church historian, it would not adversely affect his ministry in a significant way. Yes, he can benefit from church history. But to call it essential seems to be a stretch. Also, George makes a statement that does not align with what typically has been understood throughout history: “Christian history has been called the queen of all disciplines because, like an umbrella, she encompasses the rest of them” (95). Actually, theology is referred to as the queen of all disciplines, not church history.

From an overall perspective, there is a lack of cohesion between the chapters. In other words, how would these different roles function together in the life of a pastor? Also, is there one that stands alone as the most important? While Allen would contend that it is the preaching ministry of the pastor, I think Duesing better captures the preeminent role of the pastor. He wrote, “The pastor can faithfully be a missionary as a natural part of his primary duties of prayer and the ministry of the Word” (145). A helpful addition to the book would have been to show how all these different roles serve the primary duties of the pastor.

*Portraits of a Pastor* was not meant to be a dictionary of pastoral theology. Instead, the goal was to offer a short summary of 9 roles that are essential to the pastor’s ministry. While there were some critiques noted, there is much the reader can gain from each chapter in this book. Allen has done well to compile a strong list of contributors with a strong list of topics. For the pastor who is short on time, but would like to read something meaningful, this is a worthy choice.

Todd L. Tucker
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary


As the latest addition to the stellar Encountering Mission series, which has ably edited by Scott Moreau, this work does not disappoint. In the preface, Mark Terry mentioned Latourette’s seven-volume *History of the Expansion of Christianity* and the difficulty of covering the history of missions in one volume. He then remarked, “Inevitably, students, professors, and reviewers will wonder why we did not include this or exclude that” (vi). This reviewer would have preferred a more detailed treatment of two particularly important missiological issues that will be mentioned later. Also, as researchers in the rapidly developing field of World Christianity uncover more material about key mission figures in the Global South, future history books should provide more examples of such key people. Concerning Global South figures, the book provides a good description of Samuel (Adjayi) Crowther, a Nigerian Anglican priest born in 1807 who “translated the Bible into Yoruba, producing an excellent translation” and opened a mission that prospered (256).

The book is both detailed and accurate. Throughout the book, the tables and
sidebars are helpful rather than distracting. The case studies that were placed at the ends of chapters 1, 8–11, and 13–17 will be helpful for generating discussion in small-group situations in classrooms or online forums. For consistency, case studies should have been placed at the ends of the other chapters as well.

Beyond the requisite dates and locations, human interest stories draw the reader’s attention. Examples abound: Martin Luther played the flute (147), the Moravians cast lots (204), and a woman and her husband sued John Wesley for defamation of character (228). Although some people believe that business as mission (BAM) is a recent innovation, other people view Hans Egede, “a colonist and trader for the Danish monarchy in early eighteenth-century Greenland,” as a pioneer of BAM “because of his efforts to join trade with his passion for mission” (192–96).

Because many young Christians are not familiar with Donald McGavran and the Church Growth Movement (CGM), this reviewer was delighted to see an entire chapter devoted to the CGM. Among the interesting facets of the chapter, readers may be intrigued by the influence of the CGM on the Lausanne Covenant (350). In its fair treatment of the CGM, the book listed both “significant accomplishments” and “needed improvements” (349–52).

Because C-5 insider movements have caused a serious division among members of the Evangelical Missiological Society, more space should have been devoted to the movements in the book. Neither side will likely be offended by the summary statement: “Parshall and others have expressed concerns about the more radical approach, fearing that syncretism will be the result” (289). At the very least, explanations of C-1 through C-6 should have been included in this section.

Like insider movements, ancestral rites are a continuing source of controversy among Christians. A chapter devoted to Jesuit missions in various countries includes this description of how Matteo Ricci viewed the rites in China: “Ricci believed that the Chinese burned incense as a gesture of respect, not worship, and that food was given symbolically as a sign of ongoing care for the family member” (164). By quoting Wenhan Jiang, however, the chapter gives a different perspective when Jiang refers to the rites as “ancestor worship” (167). More clarity and details are needed in this section. A summary statement at the end of the chapter expresses ambivalence: “Not all Jesuit missionaries were good missionaries, and often early Catholic missions seem shallow, theologically thin, and sometimes syncretistic, effortlessly melting Catholicism into the local religions. Still, the Jesuit record shows remarkable faithfulness to Christ and flexibility in expression” (169).

The final chapter, “In Retrospect and Prospect,” includes general descriptions of what missionaries did wrong and what they did right during the past centuries. Another section on the remaining work to be done forms an appropriate conclusion. Encountering the History of Missions is a concise, well-written text, and it will be useful in classrooms for many years to come.

John Michael Morris
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary


This biography of Walter Henry Medhurst (1796–1857) is written by one of his descendants. Medhurst was arguably the most influential missionary during a turbulent first half-century of Protestant mission in East Asia, and influenced other
missionaries such as Karl Gützlaff, Hudson Taylor and David Livingstone.

The author provides excellent insights into Medhurst’s background and milieu. Illustrated color plates and the reduced price make it a highly desirable addition to institutional and personal libraries for readers interested in the history of Protestant Christianity in East Asia, including South-East Asia (Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand), China, Japan, and Korea.

Seven chapters provide excellent information about the early life and upbringing of Medhurst and his wife. Born in London, Medhurst followed when his father became an innkeeper at Ross-On-Wye in 1803. He enrolled at the prestigious St. Paul’s School in London in 1807. In 1810 he moved to Gloucester, where he became a printer’s apprentice. He was converted through the influence of William Bishop at Southgate Street Independent (Congregationalist) Chapel, and responded to an advertisement of the Missionary Society in London to become an assistant to William Milne in Malacca. On the way he visited Madras, India, where he met and married Elizabeth Martin, a biracial English-Indian widow of a British officer with a son.

After arriving in Malacca in 1817, Medhurst received his theological training and ordination from his mentor Milne. He commenced mission work in Penang in 1819 and 1821 before he joined the faltering mission in Batavia (Jakarta), Java in 1822. From there he conducted evangelistic work and tract distribution in the Chinese and Malay (Indonesian) languages, while operating a mission press, developing tracts, preparing a new Chinese New Testament translation and books on East Asian languages and geography. He conducted mission exploration trips to Java, the east coast of Malaya and southern Siam (Thailand), Borneo (Kalimantan), and Bali. If these activities were not enough, he was also pastor of the English community in Batavia, raising funds for a church building, now known as All Saints Anglican Church Jakarta, as well as organized the Parapattan Orphanage. These first two English institutions established in Indonesia exist until this day.

After the death of China Protestant mission pioneer Robert Morrison in 1834, Medhurst assumed leadership among Protestant China missionaries. In 1835 he undertook a mission trip along the coast of China. He then returned to England 1836–1838 where he promoted mission work to a new generation of missionaries. In 1843 he established with the medical missionary William Lockhart the first mission in Shanghai, where he continued his Bible translation work, made a visit to the interior of China, survived a local uprising and a mob attack, and made contacts with the Taiping Uprising.

Influenced by the social reform of early 19th century British Evangelicalism, Medhurst was opposed to slavery and to British participation in opium trade in East Asia.

Of course, much more could be written about Medhurst. Medhurst’s theological views and assistants William Young, Lukas Monton, and Choo Ti Lang were significant. Medhurst is an important and little-studied figure in the history of Christianity in Indonesia. Virtually all Protestant missionaries of his time, including Robert Morrison, two Americans who were martyred in Sumatra, and many other Dutch, German, British and American missionaries visited him on route to their postings in Indonesia and East Asia.

I am interested in Medhurst’s reception by Baptists. Medhurst provided necessary assistance to the English Baptist missionary Gottlob Brückner in Semarang to carry out the publication of the first Javanese New Testament and tracts, which in turn had an influence in the development of a Christian movement in East Java.
Elizabeth Medhurst recommended her biracial pupil Rosemena (also known as Mecha) to the Baptist mission in Bangkok. Mecha eventually was appointed by the Second Baptist Church in Richmond, Virginia, as a missionary to women in Shanghai, China. Jehu Lewis Shuck, the most influential of the early Southern Baptist missionaries in China, was initially very grateful for receiving Medhurst's 1838 revised Chinese New Testament. Shuck agreed with Medhurst on the need for medical missionaries. Shuck served on the Shanghai Delegates Bible Committee with Medhurst for a short time before Medhurst and other British missionaries withdrew to form their own committee. Shuck and other American missionaries preferred the Chinese term Shen for God which had been used by English Baptist missionary Joshua Marshman and the first Protestant China missionaries Morrison and Milne. However, the indigenous term Shangdi used for God by Medhurst was approved by English Baptist missionary Timothy Richard and by twentieth century Taiwan Baptist theologian Chow Lien-hwa. Since the late nineteenth century Chinese Christians have generally used the terms Shen and Shangdi interchangeably for God.

Thomas G. Oey
Schkeuditz, Germany

*Preaching with Cultural Intelligence: Understanding the People Who Hear Our Sermons.*

In *Preaching with Cultural Intelligence* Matthew Kim seeks to “prepare 21st-century preachers for the realities of congregational diversity in North America and beyond” (xiv). Kim, who is an associate professor of preaching and ministry at Gordon-Conwell Seminary, writes from the perspective of a second generation Korean-American. Many preachers unknowingly tend to see the world from their own culture’s perspective. He seeks to help preachers to communicate effectively to the “Other” (xiii).

The book offers two parts, the first being theory and the second practice. The first part sets a grid through which he examines the proper approaches to preaching to various “other” groups. This grid is divided into three stages in which he uses three acronyms: H.A.B.I.T., B.R.I.D.G.E., and D.I.A.L.E.C.T. The first examines the hermeneutical situation and stands for Historical, Grammatical, and Literary Context; Author’s Cultural Context; Big Idea of the Text; Interpret in your Context; Theological Presuppositions. The second examines the Homiletical bridge and stands for Beliefs, Rituals, Idols, Dreams, God, and Experiences. The third aspect of the homiletical situation examines the homiletical situation and stands for Delivery, Illustrations, Application, Language, Embrace, Content, and Trust. After laying out this grid format Kim has a chapter that draws the preacher to introspection. He writes, “One must scrutinize and interrogate one’s own culture” (46). He calls for preachers to embrace other cultures and learn from them in order to effectively minister to them. This will facilitate the move from being a “Xenophobe to Xenophile” (47). There are a few appendices at the end of the book that offer helpful sermon templates and a sample sermon.

Kim begins his examination with a chapter dealing with denominations. Many in the congregation may be from different Christian denominations and still hold to some of their doctrines and rituals. How does one preach in a way that is winsome to others with various views? Kim states, “The culturally intelligent preacher demonstrates theological awareness about doctrinal positions and contextual empathy for
listeners who do not share our theological perspectives" (75). This is not to say the preacher should not have convictions, but he should give a fair hearing and presentation of others’ views. This will in turn disarm them and make them more likely to take the preacher’s view seriously.

Chapter six deals with preaching to a congregation of various ethnicities. Kim sees a tendency of preachers to “put our cultural identity above our Christian beliefs without even knowing it” (108). To prevent this requires a “cultural exegesis” in which the preacher studies and learns the intricacies of a culture’s practices and values. This is done by spending time with others of a different culture and using most of the time listening and observing.

Chapter seven takes into consideration the cultural divide between the genders. Men and women not only communicate differently but also view communication differently. How do men and women see the application of particular texts differently? Generally speaking, women respond to more of a relational tone. This may require asking probing questions rather than stating truth principles bluntly (151).

Chapter eight examines what it looks like to preach in various locations. How does one preach differently in an urban setting than a rural one? What about to suburbanites? This requires a consciousness that the goals of a businessman who lives in a downtown loft may differ from those of a small-town farmer. The preacher would have to vary considerably the way he illustrates and applies the text.

Chapter nine is similar to the chapter dealing with various denominations. This one deals with preaching to a congregation that may have visitors from a different religion or new converts from a different religion. Like preaching to adherents to other denominations, this requires sensitivity of the preacher to the others’ views. The preacher has to assume they will hear with suspicion. He has to anticipate their questions and offenses and then give them an explanation that they can understand. Kim writes, “We frequently lose sight of the fact that they are first and foremost real people” (209). This means they share common struggles, desires, and passions. Therefore, the preacher would do well to show how Jesus relates and offers a solution to their emptiness.

Kim’s writing is permeated with a pastor’s heart. The preacher must have a great love and interest in all of his people. Kim’s writing calls for great introspection in order to expose our blind spots, which all of us have. His insights into the right questions to ask for each culture are helpful. The situational examples he provides help the reader realize not everybody thinks the way we do; however, he does highlight our commonalities to show there are effective ways to build bridges.

Because each chapter in part two is structured according to his three-stage grid, the book tends to be repetitive. Some of the chapters tend to overlap. Also, to illustrate his point in chapter six (Preaching and Ethnicities), he uses Acts 15 as an example of forcing a minority culture to conform to the majority culture’s preferences (109). Although the point is understood, the division between Jews and Gentiles in this context was not a discussion about a mere cultural question but a deeply theological question.

Overall, this book is an outstanding resource for preachers who are ministering not only in other cultures but also those who are in communities with continually growing diversity. It will challenge the reader to put in the work to exegete not only the text but also to exegete the people to whom he is called to serve.
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