

Rapt in the Name: The Ramnamis, Ramnam, and Untouchable Religion in Central India. By Ramdas Lamb. SUNY Press, 2002, x and 237 pages.

In November, 2000, the eastern sliver of Madhya Pradesh, a state in central India, was carved off to create a new state named Chhattisgarh. This new state is home to one of the largest populations of *Dalit* (untouchable) and tribal communities in India, and is also, not surprisingly, one of the poorest regions in the nation. Though the religions of Madhya Pradesh, called the Central Provinces under the Raj, have been of great interest to researchers for some time, few scholars have attempted to investigate the religious life of Chhattisgarh as a distinct region. Ramdas Lamb's *Rapt in the Name* is among the first to do so. Lamb examines the Ramnamis, an "antinomian devotional sect" (ix) which originated among the *chamars* of eastern Chhattisgarh in the 1890s. The *chamars*—traditionally leather workers but now rarely so—are the largest *Dalit* community in India and are near the bottom of India's socio-religious hierarchy.

Lamb's text is an excellent complement to Saurabh Dube's *Untouchable Pasts: Religion, Identity, and Power among a Central Indian Community, 1780-1950* (1998), which focused on another religious movement among the Chhattisgarhi *chamars*, the Satnami *Samaj* ("Society"). The Satnami movement was so successful among Chhattisgarhi *chamars*, in fact, that many now list *satnami* as their caste name. Both texts appear in the outstanding SUNY series in Hindu Studies, ably edited by Wendy Doniger.

Rapt in the Name begins with an historical overview of the interaction of orthodox, upper-caste Hinduism, on the one hand, and the popular religiosity of India's masses, on the other. Lamb summarizes the state of scholarship on the topic and provides succinct and useful definitions for the terms scholars have used to describe it (e.g. brahmanization, sanskritization, vedacization, etc.).

The two central practices of Ramnami devotion are chanting *Ramnam* ("the name of Ram") and reciting *Ramkatha* ("the story of Ram"). These practices are shared by the larger Ram tradition in India, and so Lamb offers, in Chapter Two, an account of the historical development of that tradition, and in particular of the *Ramkatha*. The Sanskritic and orthodox versions of the Ram story, such as Valmiki's *Ramayana*, present him as a very human hero with, at most, suggestions of divinity. But in later vernacular versions of the story such as Tulsidas's sixteenth-century *Ramcaritmanas* (*Manas*), Ram and everyone associated him (e.g. his wife, Sita) undergo a

process of apotheosis. In addition, whereas texts such as the *Ramayana* tend to reinforce the predominance of brahmins and the impurity of the lower castes, texts such as the *Manas* undermine this hierarchical perspective by emphasizing the devotion of low-caste Ram *bhaktas* (devotees).

What makes Chhattisgarh such an interesting field of study is the unusually high degree of religious ferment in the region, particularly among the lower castes. In Chapter Four, Lamb briefly discusses two other religious movements prominent in the region, the Kabirpanthis and the Satnamis. Though the Kabirpanth in Banaras, that bastion of Hindu orthodoxy, has become a rather upper-caste sect, the Chhattisgarhi *sakha* (“branch”) has managed to retain its lower-caste appeal. The Satnami movement originated with a Chhattisgarhi guru (Ghasidas, 1756-1850) but was almost certainly inspired by other earlier movements of same name. Both the Kabirpanthis and the Satnamis are religiously indebted to Kabir and the *sant* tradition of which he was a part. The orthodox hierarchy has rejected both movements, primarily because they draw upon low- and out-caste communities and yet aspire to religious and social equality with upper-caste Hindus.

Parasuram, the founder of the Ramnami *Samaj*, was born a *chamar*, in a poor village in eastern Chhattisgarh, midway through the nineteenth century. Stricken with a disease many believed to be leprosy in his mid-thirties, Parasuram decided to leave home, renouncing family life, in order to spare his family the shame and ostracism his disease would bring them. On the eve of his departure he had an encounter with a mysterious *sadhu*, a wandering ascetic who told him that Lord Ram was pleased with his devotion, and that, if his faith was deep enough, the name of Ram would appear written on his chest during the night. It did, and Parasuram’s family and villagers celebrated the miracle. Eventually Parasuram gained a following which he instructed to chant *Ramnam* and recite *Ramkatha*. Parasuram increasingly emphasized *nirgun bhakti* (devotion to Ram “without properties,” as equivalent to *Brahman*, the principle of Being articulated in some more philosophically-oriented traditions of Hinduism) and insisted that the only devotional act necessary was chanting *Ramnam*. Like the Kabirpanthis and Satnamis, the Ramnamis drew the ire of upper-caste Hindus, particularly because of their practice of tattooing “Ram” (rama) on their bodies to demonstrate devotion and to link themselves with Parasuram. The upper-caste Hindus believed the practice, which associated Ram’s name with the bodies of impure outcastes, was sacrilegious.

In addition to tattooing Ram on their bodies, the Ramnamis have developed several other distinctive practices. They are encouraged to wear *ordhni*, cloth covered entirely with the name of Ram, when chanting *Ramnam* (thus the title's play on words). Ramnami men—and occasionally women—wear *mukut* (literally, “crown”), a hat made with peacock feathers, which are traditionally associated with incarnations of Vishnu such as Ram. In addition, the *Samaj* holds an annual *mela* (festival) which brings together Ramnamis from around Chhattisgarh, as well as visitors from other religious communities. Each *mela* is centered on a *stambha*, a large pillar covered with *Ramnam*. More than a dozen fine black and white photographs complement Lamb's description of these visually stunning practices.

In Chapter Six, Lamb demonstrates how the Ramnamis localized the *Ramkatha*, which, as already mentioned, is not unique to the Ramnamis. In the early days of the *Samaj*, the *Manas* was used primarily as a source of *mantras* perceived to be spiritually efficacious. As literacy increased in the community, Ramnamis began to realize that the *Manas* contained some verses and sections which upheld the dominance of brahmins and denigrated the lower castes. This discovery motivated Ramnamis to become more literate in order to be able to choose verses from the corpus that were more positive in their presentation of lower castes. At Ramnami *bhajans*, where these verses were chanted, or exchanged in philosophical debate (called “*takkar*”), a distinctly Ramnami *Ramkatha* began to emerge. The process continues today, and the *Ramkatha* has come to be recited less for the spiritual efficacy of its phrases than for the meaning contained therein. Perhaps the greatest strength of this chapter, and indeed the entire volume, is that Lamb consistently presents the Ramnamis as a dynamic, evolving community in which religious symbols are not static, timeless forms, but are rather constantly reinvented and given new meanings in response to changes within the *Samaj* and in the world about it.

Lamb includes six biographical sketches of Ramnamis in the penultimate chapter. With these biographical sketches, Lamb exhibits the diversity of the Ramnami community. Chhattisgarhis were attracted to the Ramnami movement for various reasons. Some were impressed by the aesthetic beauty of Ramnami *bhajans*. Others experienced psychological healing within the community. Still others saw in the Ramnami *Samaj* a community which refused to accept brahmanical orthodoxy but instead flaunted its autonomy and distinctiveness. The biographical sketches also highlight the creativity, freedom and initiative of female Ramnamis.

In the final chapter Lamb compares the various ways that low-caste religious groups prevalent in Chhattisgarh have attempted to relate to the orthodox religious system of India. Within the Kabirpanthi, Satnami, and Ramnami communities, three distinct approaches can be discerned. The Kabirpanthis have attempted to elevate their status in the Indian socio-religious hierarchy by sanskritizing their religious practices, that is, by bringing their beliefs, rituals and symbols more closely in line with those of the dominant Hindu castes. The Satnamis, on the other hand, have increasingly sought the same results by political agitation. Unlike these two movements, the Ramnami *Samaj* has never sought caste-Hindu status. Rather, Ramnamis have attempted to remain as independent as possible from the control of brahmanical Hinduism. Unlike most low-caste religious movements, the Ramnamis have not attempted to hide their distinctive religious practices; instead, they have flaunted them as a source of identity and pride. This approach has caused the Satnamis and Kabirpanthis to resent the Ramnamis. The Satnamis and Kabirpanthis believe that the behavior of Ramnamis undermines their efforts to achieve social and religious elevation.

The volume includes two appendices. The first discusses the distinctive features of two major categories of scripture in the Hindu tradition, *shruti* and *smriti*. The second appendix discusses the last section of Valmiki's *Ramayana*, which many believe to be a brahmanical insertion because it contains the violent story of a low-caste Hindu beheaded by Ram for having the audacity to practice austerities (austerities are considered by the orthodox to be restricted to upper-caste Hindus). Both appendices are helpful, though the information they contain may have been more useful if integrated into earlier chapters.

Rapt in the Name is an attractive, well-written, thoroughly researched and insightful text. It would be most appreciated by scholars of Indian religions, especially those interested in learning more about the religious experience of *Dalits* than is generally possible in texts on Hinduism. But because it is so clearly written, *Rapt in the Name* would also be accessible to students with a minimum of exposure to Hinduism and would help balance introductory texts on the subject which are, with several notable exceptions, generally more focused on upper-caste and brahmanical Hinduism.

CHAD MULLET BAUMAN
PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Christianity, Art and Transformation: Theological Aesthetics in the Struggle for Justice. By John W. de Gruchy. Cambridge University Press, 2001, 254 pages.

In *Christianity, Art and Transformation*, Reformed theologian John de Gruchy, Professor of Christian Studies at the University of Cape Town, sets for himself the ambitious task of exploring the “deep underlying relationship between theological conviction, aesthetics and ethics” (p.1). He argues that art, and particularly the visual

arts, has the power to dehumanize or humanize, to enslave or free, to damn or redeem. Thus, questions of the good, the right, and the beautiful rightly confront the artist. Consequently, de Gruchy calls the church to unite with those artistic efforts that challenge the images in the world that “lead to the destruction of human life and the environment,” thereby opening up “possibilities of transformation” to a more just society (p.253).

De Gruchy makes his case over the course of three main parts, each comprised of two chapters. Part One tells of how Christianity became suspicious of art and how the modern age drove a wedge between art and religion, and even between art and ethics. Chapter one traces the history of Christianity’s suspicion of art, and recalls how the early church saw the images of imperial Rome as idolatrous; the Iconoclastic Controversy of the 8th century issued in the removal of all images from churches; the Reformation imparted a Protestant iconoclasm; and the Council of Trent called for more chaste art. In the end, de Gruchy balances this history by suggesting that not all art is idolatrous, and it can represent the goodness and truth of God and our lives.

Chapter two recounts the development of philosophical aesthetics during the Enlightenment and the secularization of Western art. Three figures receive special treatment – Kant, Hegel, and Nietzsche. De Gruchy suggests that with Kant “art has been privatized and secularized” (p.59); with Hegel “[w]orks of art are expressions of human consciousness” (p.60); and with Nietzsche one must “prevent reason and morality from controlling the aesthetic” (p.66). The upshot is that not only has art been severed from religion and ethics but it has also forfeited its social role. Art can no longer speak of the good, the right, and the beautiful, but is relegated to personal taste and ideological control. For de Gruchy, however, aesthetics must be reconnected to truth and morality, and indeed to theology.

Part Two, then, is a more direct theological reflection on aesthetics and the arts with attention given to the work of Hans Urs von Balthasar, Karl Barth, and Dietrich Bonhoeffer. In chapter three, de Gruchy brings Balthasar, Barth, and Bonhoeffer into critical dialogue. Balthasar holds that Christian theology should link the good, the true and the beautiful with God's beauty. Thus, the arts are indispensable for a good life, and indeed for Christian faith and discipleship. For Barth, however, true beauty refers to God's beauty, and points us to God's glory and holiness. We experience God's beauty through God's "triunity," which is known in Jesus Christ (p.114). But with Bonhoeffer, one gets a "mediating theology" that "makes it possible to hold in creative tension the revelation of God's beauty in the event of Jesus Christ alone (Barth), and in nature and art as well (Balthasar)" (p.117). Christian theological aesthetics, therefore, seeks to participate in the drama of world redemption, not only through the cross and resurrection of Jesus Christ but through world history.

Chapter four covers Bonhoeffer's theological aesthetics and stresses his desire to reunite theology, ethics, and aesthetics. Drawing on the musical metaphor of polyphony, Bonhoeffer sought a "blending" of these themes, resulting in a "polyphony of life" (p.160). That is, Bonhoeffer sought an "aesthetic existence," which is akin to Kierkegaard's "living poetically" or John Dewey's "integration of art into life" or Wilhelm Dilthey's "philosophy of life" (p.151). Put more theologically, "aesthetic existence" is like the Chalcedonian Definition, in that it seeks "a blending of the bodily and the spiritual without their confusion..." (p.161). The result is "a genuine Christian 'worldliness'" (p.167). It is a way of being that fosters a unity of all things in Christ and in the world.

Part Three focuses on "aesthetic praxis" and takes up the social role of the arts. An important theme for chapter five is the role of architecture in society and centers on de Gruchy's native South Africa, particularly Cape Town. The architectural story of Cape Town is one of European colonialism and tells of Apartheid's power relations and social stratification. Beyond Cape Town's architecture, however, another theme emerges, "the early development of black art in South Africa," which "speaks of art as an 'intervention' which introduces a deeper discourse into the public square, resisting structures of power which dehumanize" (p.196). Artistic creativity has the capacity to "break culture open," making room in the public square for "transformation" to a more just and free society (p.193). For de Gruchy, art can in some sense redeem and has the capacity to participate in the drama of world redemption.

Chapter six raises the question of the role of art in the church. The discussion once again focuses on architecture, and de Gruchy contends that the church building is “an icon in the world,” one which “reflects, reinforces or helps create the values of society” (p.218). Not only, then, should a church building be structured in such a way that it is conducive to worship but it should symbolize to the world the drama of God’s redemptive history. “Bad taste,” therefore, or that which does not reflect the good or the righteousness of God, has no place in the city or in the church. In this way, the public square and the church are connected by “aesthetic experience.”

As noted at the beginning, de Gruchy’s project is ambitious. For the most part, he succeeds in developing a relationship between theology, aesthetics and ethics. At the same time, it would be understandable if one were to quibble about any one of the parts that go into making the whole. For instance, the history of Christianity and art and the secularization of Western art are treated somewhat quickly, often covering major time periods and figures in shorthand. Similarly, uneven treatment is given to Balthasar, Barth, and Bonhoeffer, such that one may wonder if each figure is given his due.

Nonetheless, it is a work that will be interesting and suggestive for scholars and theologians, and creative and encouraging for pastors and church leaders. In the latter’s case, de Gruchy does much to empower a robust use of art in Christian architecture, liturgy, and life. *Christianity, Art and Transformation* is a call, indeed a demand, for Christians to engage, transform, and redeem the art forms of our day.

TODD V. CIOFFI
PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Mark 1-8: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary. By Joel Marcus. Doubleday, 1999, xix and 569 pages.

The long awaited replacement to C. S. Mann’s 1986 volume in *The Anchor Bible* series has finally arrived—at least in part—in the first volume of Joel Marcus’ commentary on the Gospel of Mark. Professor of New Testament and Christian Origins at Duke Divinity School, Marcus provides first-rate biblical scholarship that is both historically insightful and theologically engaging. As the first of a projected two-volume set (going only through Mark 8:21), this work also represents the beginning of a useful one-stop resource for Mark’s modern readers.

Marcus uses the well-known Anchor Bible format: a “new” translation of the text (3-14), followed by a general introduction (17-79), followed by a

passage-by-passage commentary on the text (137-515). Every chapter of the commentary begins with an introduction, dividing then into smaller subunits, each of which consists of sections for “TRANSLATION,” “NOTES” and “COMMENT.” The NOTES, Marcus writes, “explain choices made in the TRANSLATION, highlight exegetical problems with respect to specific words and phrases...and convey other technical information” (80). By contrast, COMMENT sections represent more generalized exposition. They are, in Marcus’ words, “the heart of the commentary” (80), presenting the author’s “vision of what each pericope is centrally about” (81).

Although Marcus inherits rather than creates this format, it does produce a few noteworthy problems, particularly when combined with the author’s own goal of comprehensiveness. Marcus, for instance, suggests that the “impatient” or less “technically minded” reader “may safely skip the NOTES and go directly to the COMMENT, though they will often find that the COMMENT sends them back to individual NOTES” (80). However, such references from COMMENT to NOTES are frequent enough to frustrate those choosing to follow Marcus’ advice, most notably “the pastor trying to get a ‘fix’ on a particular passage for a Sunday sermon” (80). Related to this problem, Marcus’ tends to use the NOTES as scholarship summaries in which no exegetical stone is left unturned (e.g., the discussion of the significance of the number “four thousand” at Mark 8:9). Consequently, readers interested primarily in “the heart of the commentary” may find themselves not only reading in two places at once, but also sifting through the history of scholarship on a specific interpretive detail, hoping to find in the NOTES the exegetical justification for what Marcus claims (in the COMMENT!) to be a passage’s central claim. The fact that Marcus discusses redaction-critical issues (which defy categorization within this format) at the beginning of his COMMENT sections will also frustrate the non-scholar whom Marcus seeks especially to address there. Here again the drive for scholarly comprehensiveness creates a less readable commentary.

At the same time, the all-encompassing scope of this work has its advantages. The massive bibliography (85-133) will serve research-oriented readers well—although books such as Brian Blount’s *Go Preach!* (Orbis, 1998) and Susan Garrett’s *The Temptations of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark* (Eerdmans, 1998) should have been included before publication. Also, as with any great resource work, Marcus’ commentary contains a host of charts (twenty to be precise) that aid the reader in understanding everything from

Mark's use of doublet sayings vis-à-vis Matthew and Luke (43), to the relationship between Mark's baptismal formulae and those of other NT writers (174), to Mark's use of "insider/outsider" language (303). Finally, the comprehensive nature of the Introduction (17-79) makes it not only an excellent preamble to this particular commentary, but also a kind of self-contained introduction to the second gospel as a whole. With well-written and thorough discussions of authorship, historical setting, synoptic relationships, literary composition, and theology, Marcus' introduction can be used by a number of groups—for instance, an upper level undergraduate class or a church school class—that choose not to read the commentary itself.

Readers familiar with Marcus' *The Way of the Lord* (Westminster John Knox, 1992) will not be surprised to find in this commentary a consistent focus on scriptural echoes both strong and faint. Understandably for a commentary, however, here Marcus moves well beyond the issue of Mark's indebtedness to Second Isaiah and into the seemingly limitless world of scripture in general. Indeed, even when overstated, the scriptural allusions Marcus finds constitute one of the most interesting and thought-provoking aspects of the book, a particularly good example being his discussion of the "Exodus background" to Mark 8:1-9 (Jesus' second feeding miracle). Marcus' expertise in Jewish backgrounds also makes for one of the most lucid and insightful interpretations of Mark 7:1-23 (the debate over purity and defilement) that this reviewer has read.

Marcus' exegesis offers a refreshing balance between historical and theological concerns, with neither concern dominating the commentary at the expense of the other. In regard to the former concern, noteworthy is Marcus' suggestion that Mark's story originally belonged to a liturgical—if not specifically baptismal—setting, namely as "a dramatization of the good news" staged by numerous readers (69). In addition, Marcus insightfully notes the possibility that Mark intended to emphasize for his community the spiritual presence of its physically absent Lord (78, 158, 237-8, 288, 435, 437-38).

Theologically speaking, Marcus brings God to the interpretive forefront as a major character/actor in the gospel story. His overtly theological approach begins with an introductory discussion of God as apocalyptic savior who, in the person of Jesus, liberates the world from its bondage to the "strong man" (72), and continues through virtually every chapter of the commentary. Not surprisingly given Marcus' interest in apocalyptic eschatology, God frequently emerges in discussions of this subject. Less expected insights abound

as well, however, such as Marcus' claim that, when Jesus calls his first disciples (Mark 1:16-20), "all human reticence has been instantaneously washed away because *God* has arrived on the scene...and it is *his* compelling voice that speaks through Jesus' summons" (185).

There are, however, theological possibilities that Marcus overlooks. Perhaps most notably, his discussion of Jesus' baptism at Mark 1:10 follows the interpretations of Matthew and Luke, who change Mark's preposition *eis* ("into") to *epi* ("upon") so as to render the dove imagery more palatable ("and the Spirit like a dove descended upon him"). However, Mark's choice of words—"and the Spirit descended *into* him (*eis auton*)"—although logistically difficult, makes the more radical theological claim that God, quite literally, *possesses* Jesus at his baptism. As an exegete concerned with Mark's theology and, more specifically, God's/Jesus' presence in the story/community, Marcus would do well to read Mark 1:10 on its own terms and reconsider its enormous theological significance for interpreting Mark's entire story.

Overall, Marcus' balance between rigorous scholarship and theological insight constitutes the greatest strength of this volume. Too often commentaries either achieve scholarly sophistication at the expense of theology or merely offer theological interpretation without sufficient exegetical justification. Due to the comprehensive nature of this commentary (not to mention Marcus' own skills as biblical theologian), both of these extremes are avoided. Though the volume's sheer size may create problems for lay readers, it will continue to make Mark's gospel theologically relevant to this generation of readers (at the very least), keeping us, in the meantime, hopeful for the volume that is yet to come.

I. BRENT DRIGGERS

PFEIFFER UNIVERSITY, MISENHEIMER, NC

Powers and Submissions: Spirituality, Philosophy and Gender, by Sarah Coakley Blackwell Publishers, 2002, 172 pages

To speak of 'power' brings notions of influence, domination and control to Western 21st century minds. 'Power' is a term that has gained far more popularity in comparison to what has come to be known as its counterpart, 'submission.' It is to questions of 'power' and 'submission', both divine and human, that Coakley turns in *Powers and Submissions: Spirituality, Philosophy and Gender*. She resists the forced dichotomy between 'power' as liberating and 'submission' as dependent vulnerability and suggests new terms of the debate. With an analysis of the tradition known in the Christian West as

'contemplation,' Coakley demonstrates the possibility of a redefinition of the terms 'power' and 'submission.' In contrast to the secular feminist resistance to 'submission' as harmful dependence, Coakley suggests that the contemplative practices of transparency to and dependence upon God can lead to an understanding of submission that promotes peace and gender equity (xx.)

Coakley presents her argument in three parts. In part one, she considers the ways in which contemplative practice can be "a graced means of human empowerment in the divine which the feminist movement ignores or derides at its peril" (xvii.) She begins in chapter one with a response to the feminist resistance to *kenosis* as perhaps a helpful model for men, but a potentially harmful one to women. Following a detailed analysis of a variety of understandings of *kenosis*, Coakley provides what she sees as 'right' *kenosis* derived from an understanding of Christian contemplative prayer that enables one to hold both vulnerability and empowerment together (p.5.) She moves in chapters two and three to a discussion of the ways in which the tradition of contemplative practice, while potentially a source of wisdom regarding the discernment of right dependence, has been entangled with themes of power, hierarchy and 'submissiveness' (xvii.) Through an analysis of the work of the spiritual director, Dom John Chapman OSB (1865-1933), as well as analysis of Christian iconography and spirituality, psychoanalytic theory, and secular and theological feminism, Coakley reveals the ways in which *right* dependence on God is an elusive goal (p.68.)

In part two, Coakley provides a close analysis of some classic spiritual and philosophical material from the Christian tradition in an effort to warn the reader to avoid reductive interpretations of such classic texts as either a resource for the identification of the 'pure' form of relationality between the divine and human or merely as invitations to sexist submission (p.71.) In chapter four, Coakley examines the *Cloud of Unknowing* in its cultural and historical context and reveals the possible ways in which it is an ancestor to 'modern' Western philosophical thought (p.72.) In chapter five, Coakley provides an account of Enlightenment and Romantic perspectives of the normative male self, and argues that in many ways the views of man promulgated here is one that feminists should not wholly reject (p.89.) And in chapter six, Coakley engages analytic philosophy of religion and demonstrates the ways in which its use of the 'generic male', and its avoidance of the work done in

feminist theology and philosophy, has resulted in the sidelining of significant issues for both feminism and rich traditions of Christian spirituality (p.98.)

In the final part of this work, Coakley addresses Christian doctrine explicitly. She examines primarily the work of Gregory of Nyssa (c.330-c.395) and demonstrates the ways in which he provides possibilities for understanding the implications of contemplative practice for doctrinal exposition (p.109.) In chapter seven, Coakley questions the tendency to read Gregory's trinitarianism only in terms of the 'three men' analogy. Rather, Coakley contends, Gregory's work on the trinity should be read alongside his spiritual writings which demonstrate the complexities of his thoughts on the trinity and his views about gender and epistemological transformation (p.129.) In chapter eight, Coakley continues her work with Gregory of Nyssa and, through engagement with the work of Wittgenstein, argues that the believer's ability to give meaning to the language 'encounter with the risen Christ' is the result of a transformation of the believer's epistemic *apparatus* (p.131.) And finally, in chapter nine, Coakley engages the work of Gregory of Nyssa in conversation with the feminist theorist, Judith Butler. In this process, Coakley demonstrates the ways in which the obsession with the 'body' among secular feminist theorists, in particular, and late twentieth-century Western culture, in general, reveals an eschatological longing that only a theological vision can fulfill (p.153.)

Coakley's efforts in *Powers and Submissions* are best-suited for scholars of religion with interests in theology, spirituality and feminist theory. Each of her essays are written with clarity and conciseness, but the depth and detail of her investigations could leave the lay reader progressing at a snail's pace in an effort to discern Coakley's primary points. For those familiar with the history of Christian thought and philosophy of religion, however, Coakley's work here offers a rich and challenging journey into the variety of interpretations of 'power' and 'submission' and the ways in which these terms have an ambiguous history in Christian theology and spirituality, as well as in feminist theory and analytical philosophy of religion. Through an engagement with the Christian contemplative tradition, Coakley challenges the reader to consider anew the ways in which submission to divine power can be a process of life-giving empowerment. Coakley challenges as well those who find a valuable critical tool in the work of feminist theorists to reconsider those feminist tendencies to view the practice of contemplative prayer as necessarily leading to political apathy and

sexual submission. She is sure to acknowledge the dangers of any form of submission that is de-humanizing and harmful to women. In her efforts to engage the tradition of Christian contemplative prayer, however, Coakley offers a challenge to feminist theorists and speaks to a sense in which, through the practice of silent prayer, 'submission' to divine power can be life-giving and empowering for both women and men.

Finally, it is important to note that the chapters comprising Coakley's book were each written as individual essays "for particular events and deadlines" (preface.) Through reading the book in its entirety, it becomes evident that, while there are common themes throughout, it is difficult to discern the ways in which these essays are interrelated. Coakley expresses in her preface that these essays are centered "on the profound paradox of an inalienable surrender ('submission') to God that—as I argue—must remain the secret ground of even feminist 'empowerment'." However, many of the essays include such a wide variety of interlocutors and address such an assortment of concerns that it often becomes difficult to discern this shared center. Despite this limitation, Coakley's work serves as a valuable resource to any scholar of religion with an interest in the Christian tradition of contemplative prayer, the ways in which this tradition speaks to and potentially redefines the standard binary of 'power' and 'submission', and the significance of this tradition to feminist conceptions of 'submission.'

MOLLY CLAIRE HASLAM
VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY

Justification and Variegated Nomism, Volume I: The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism. Edited by D. A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien, and Mark A. Seifrid. Mohr Siebeck/ Baker Academic, 2001, xii and 619 pages.

Justification and Variegated Nomism is a projected two-volume set. The current volume, *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism*, will be joined by a volume entitled *The Paradoxes of Paul*. The purpose of project is to reassess the monumental work of E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977). This first volume aims to reassess the validity and usefulness of the term "covenantal nomism" as an overarching description of Judaism in the Second Temple period (3).

The contributors covered much of the same material as Sanders, with a few additional witnesses and topics also being assessed: D. A. Carson, "Introduction;" Daniel Falk, "Prayers and Psalms;" Craig A. Evans, "Scripture-Based Stories in the Pseudepigrapha;" Peter Enns, "Expansions of Scripture;" Philip R. Davies, "Didactic Stories;" Richard Bauckham, "Apocalypses;" Robert A. Kugler, "Testaments;" Donald E. Gowan, "Wisdom;" Paul Spilsbury, "Josephus;" Philip S. Alexander, "Torah and Salvation in Tannaitic Literature;" Martin McNamara, "Some Targum Themes;" David M. Hay, "Philo of Alexandria;" Markus Bockmuehl, "1QS and Salvation at Qumran;" Mark A. Seifrid, "Righteousness Language in the Hebrew Scriptures and Early Judaism;" Roland Deines, "The Pharisees Between 'Judaisms' and 'Common Judaism'." The final lengthy chapter, by D. A. Carson, consists of summaries of each of the articles and an attempt to evaluate this first stage of the project.

This first volume is a tribute to the work of Sanders. The very fact that fifteen scholars are called upon, twenty five years later, to assess the material and theses that Sanders himself proposed, testifies to the importance of his work. More substantively, however, the articles by and large uphold the thesis that "covenantal nomism" appropriately designates the pattern of religion found in the texts: "If the aim was to define a sort of 'lowest common denominator' soteriology that would be recognized by most of the divergent expressions of Judaisms, Sanders's covenantal nomism would serve fairly well" (56); "Sanders's basic assessment of the situation in *Jubilees* seems to be sound" (97). Other conclusions are similar, offering "qualified support" (213) and affirming the absence of merit-based salvation (239).

It is this last point that reveals the most pervasive point of consensus in the book, a point for which Sanders labored hard: "Earlier analyses of the literature of Second Temple Judaism often found merit theology everywhere, and Sanders, as we have seen, is right to warn against a simple arithmetical tit-for-tat notion of payback" (544). Thus, this volume affirms the movement beyond the earlier caricatures of Judaism that blemish the history of New Testament scholarship.

Though generally affirming, the conclusions in support of Sanders are usually qualified, and several of the articles deny altogether the applicability of the term "covenantal nomism" to a particular text. Sometimes the rejection of Sanders's label is perplexing. For example, the assessment of *Joseph and Aseneth* rejects the label "covenantal nomism" in this way: "God's grace is the presupposition, to be sure, but apart from wholesale adoption of Jewish food and purity laws, the conversion of Aseneth could not have taken place" (66).

Oddly, the footnote that follows this sentence ends with the following quote from *PPJ*: “They understood obeying the law as the Jews’ appropriate response to the prior grace of God.” The description of *Joseph and Aseneth* fits Sanders’s description of covenantal nomism. Similarly, the essay on Philo finds it “not very useful to speak of Philo as a representative of ‘covenantal nomism’” (370). And yet, the article goes on to say that Philo “seems to assume . . . biblical claims about God’s election of Israel as a people” (370), and to show Philo’s concern with obedience to the Mosaic law (372). Again, it is doubtful that Sanders would find his view challenged.

The value of this book lies in questions raised by several contributors that push the reader to reflect on what, exactly, has been established once a pattern of religion has been labeled “covenantal nomism.” As Falk points out, this label does not say anything about “the problem of sin, the balance of focus on nationalism and individualism, and most significantly the boundaries of the covenant” (56). Enns raises questions that point out the ambiguity in the term “salvation”: “If salvation can be lost by disobedience—i.e., if obedience is necessary to ‘preserve’ salvation—in what sense can we say with Sanders that ‘salvation’ *depends* on the grace of God? How can there be sins unto death when *election* is the basis of salvation” (97)? Are legalism and covenantal nomism truly antithetical conceptions? Also, several scholars asked whether Sanders’s categories of “getting in” and “staying in” do justice to the texts of Second Temple Judaism (e.g., 98, 298-301). Such issues raise the further question of whether an investigation of the Second Temple texts from the standpoint of Sanders’s Pauline category of “participationist eschatology” might be more fruitful for discovering the contours of salvation that distinguish Paul from his context.

This volume is not without its problems. First, not all the contributors seem aware that Sanders explicitly denies that *Paul’s* pattern of religion is appropriately labeled covenantal nomism (*PPJ*, 511-5). One hopes that the second volume will show greater sensitivity on this point. Second, one contributor contends against Sanders that there is a deep contrast between “the term ‘nomism’ [which] tends to denote a static position,” and covenant which “has reference to a living God . . . a God active in the past, the present and the future” (355). One wonders whether this contributor has carefully considered the identity between covenant and law in passages such as Deuteronomy 4. Finally, the most substantial criticism must be leveled against the editorial hand of D. A. Carson. Although the overall tenor of the various contributions to this volume lends qualified support to Sanders’s thesis, the title, introduction,

and conclusion all steer the reader toward a more critical judgment of his work. Carson concludes, Covenantal nomism “is too doctrinaire, too unsupported by the sources themselves, too reductionistic, too monopolistic” (548). Such a ringing conclusion, while not lacking in rhetorical flourish, hardly does justice to the actual content of the essays. Carson thus detracts from the carefully nuanced studies that he is supposed to be representing.

Justification and Variegated Nomism is for serious students of early Judaism. The discussions delve into the details of primary texts with close and careful readings. In light of the lengthy academic conversation that this book engages, uninitiated readers will likely find it overwhelming. The last 71 pages of the volume consist of several indexes, making the volume accessible for a topical study; however, it is anticipated that the greatest benefit will be found in sitting down with each chapter, and carefully reviewing both the primary text discussed and Sanders’s previous discussion of it.

Overall, this book makes a valuable contribution to the study of Second Temple Judaism in that it raises important questions that have the potential for setting trajectories for fruitful discussion for many years to come.

JAMES R. DANIEL KIRK
DUKE UNIVERSITY

Paul’s True Rhetoric: Ambiguity, Cunning, and Deception in Greece and Rome. By Mark D. Given. Emory Studies in Early Christianity. Trinity Press International, 2001, xix and 219 pages.

Among the many problems that Paul faced during his controversial ministry, and that his interpreters have come up against ever since, is the unsettling impression he sometimes gave of being rhetorically ambiguous, cunning, and even deceptive, or to put it another way, of being sophistic. That, argues Mark Given in this provocative revision of his dissertation, is because he *was*.

Given, Associate Professor of Religious Studies at Southwest Missouri State University, begins by noting the present scholarly consensus, developed especially in the thirty years since Hans Dieter Betz’s seminal study, that Paul was rhetorically astute, possibly having received formal rhetorical training. That consensus, says Given, usually assumes both that Paul’s brand

of rhetoric sides more with the philosophic than with the sophistic tradition, and that Paul therefore put his considerable rhetorical skill in the service of “unambiguous and truthful” discourse. But such assumptions depend upon a mistaken notion, increasingly acknowledged as such by classicists, that philosophic and sophistic rhetoric are distinct, antithetical categories. In fact, Given argues, they are inseparably intermingled in the very person who posited the distinction in the first place, Socrates himself. Socrates was a master of ambiguous, cunning, and deceptive effect, all in service of the Truth for the sake of enlightening the truly deceived. As with Socrates, Given stresses, so with the later sophisticated proponent of Truth, Paul.

Signs of ambiguity, cunning, and deception in Pauline passages abound, says Given, though he explores them in three main areas: (1) the Lukan portrait of Paul in Athens in Acts 17; (2) several key texts in the Corinthian letters; and (3) three sections of Romans.

Luke portrays Paul in Athens with ambiguous brush strokes as a new (sophistic) Socrates. Polyvalent words and phrases subtly but unmistakably alert perceptive readers to discover here a multilayered drama and to hear echoes of both Jewish and Greek ideas and figures. In the opening scene, for example, as Paul observes the plethora of idols around him, Luke oddly enough employs a Septuagintalism—“his spirit in him” was provoked—where one would expect only Atticisms. Seeking to explain this highly unusual phrase, Given notes that the word for “provoke” is used in the LXX overwhelmingly of the divine response to idolatry in Israel. This fact, coupled with the recollection that Paul has already been introduced as one who bears the name/presence of Jesus and is endowed with the Holy Spirit, leads to the realization that “his spirit in him” is none other than God’s Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Jesus. At the same time, those steeped in Greek cultural currents would no doubt hear echoes of Socrates, who in post-Platonic manifestations similarly possessed a “deity” that gave him insight and direction. Luke thus sets up readers to see in the following verses an ambiguous Socratic/sophistic Paul in dialogue with the Athenian philosophers. In fact, that is precisely what one finds. Paul in Socratic fashion dupes his seemingly wise but deluded Athenian audience with repeated double messages. So Paul both compliments and insults his listeners by noting with one and the same ambiguous word how “thoroughly religious” and how “thoroughly superstitious” they are, though they could only take him to mean the former even while Luke’s readers hear the lat-

ter. A bit further on Paul says that God has “overlooked” their ignorance of God, though Luke’s informed audience senses he really means by this word that God has “despised” their ignorance. As the speech wraps up, the only way for the philosophers in Athens to join the ranks of the informed is to repent, enabling them to see through the “mask of Paul’s Ambiguity in Athens” to the real esoteric message he presents.

Yet showing a sophistic Paul in Acts, Given notes, demonstrates only that a later generation remembered Paul as rhetorically slippery. But is that the kind of Paul we find in Paul’s own writings? In fact, Given says, when we turn to the Corinthian correspondence that is exactly what we find, notably in 1 Cor 1–4, 1 Cor 9:19–23, and 2 Cor 2:14–4:6. Paul’s willingness to use deception and pretense stands out particularly clearly in 1 Cor 9:19–23. “Just as Plato’s Socrates feels free to break the rules of dialectic if necessary in order to win an argument...so Paul feels free to leave the world of being for that of seeming, ‘to become all things to everyone,’ in order to propagate the Truth....The deceived must first be deceived for their own good.” Rejecting readings of this passage that transpose Paul’s rhetoric of becoming into mere accommodation, or that dismiss it as hyperbole, Given sides with those who see in these verses a Paul who traffics in “deceptive metamorphoses.” This classic missionary text serves as “the prime example...of a sophistic Paul.” Further evidence of Paul’s sophistic tendencies surfaces especially in 2 Cor 4:1–4. Distancing himself from cunning and deceptive practices, Paul in the same breath acknowledges that his “gospel is veiled” to some. Like Socrates’ medicinal *pharmakon*, which is remedy to some but poison to others, Paul’s gospel is both “moronic” and “Wisdom of God,” a mask both transparent and opaque.

Cunning and deception also accompany Paul as he writes to the Romans, according to Given. In Romans 7, for example, Paul praises the Law, all the while showing the Law really to be weak, thus hardly praiseworthy. Sophistic Paul once again plays to two divergent audiences at the same time. But as the letter progresses, at least some (“Judaistic”) readers will have caught on to Paul’s ambiguous and cunning ploy, suspecting that he throws in a heavy dose of irony when he identifies himself with his Jewish kinsmen in Rom 9:1–5, listing Jewish prerogatives as if they mattered now. Such examples of Paul’s ambiguity, cunning, and deception, and others like them, are reason enough, says Given, to deconstruct the protective canonical and ecclesiastical veil that shrouds an innocent, guileless “Saint” Paul and to look unflinchingly at the real Paul, the sophistic Paul.

Given's project interweaves the disciplines of classics and biblical studies using the thread of a nuanced and complex view of rhetoric. Drawing upon deconstructions of the canonical view of "Saint" Socrates, Given likewise offers the theological guild a similar deconstruction of "Saint" Paul. Highly suggestive, sometimes brilliant in his proposals, Given nevertheless produces a fabric composed of a number of exegetical loose ends. In hearing echoes of Socrates' *daemon* in Acts 17:16, for example, Given notes that Socrates' form of divine leading "was a personal phenomenon not available to others" (quoting Ian Kidd). Yet in Acts the Holy Spirit motivates numerous people, not just Paul, whom alone Given singles out as the Lukan Socrates. Nor is it certain that the construction "his spirit in him" refers to the Holy Spirit. That Septuagintalism appears twice (not once, as Given says) in the LXX, in both cases simply meaning "he." Still, Given's reading of this verse is worth serious consideration. More problematic is Given's equation of Paul's "recruitment" strategy in 1 Cor 9:19–23 with deceptive rhetoric. Paul, we are told, engaged in "pretense" when he ate with Gentiles and refrained from food troubling to the "weak" ("food matters are probably meant"). Given even distinguishes this from the practice of Jesus, whom the Gospels portray "as one who associated freely with tax collectors and sinners, but [never] as temporarily assuming the identity of a tax collector or sinner in order to 'gain' tax collectors or sinners." Yet did not such "association" often involve table fellowship, the very behavior Given equates with "assuming an identity" in Paul's case? Perhaps that is why Given says, "I think the extent of his 'becoming like' goes beyond this minimal dietary example," though he offers no others. Given's reading of 2 Cor 4:1–4 is similarly questionable. He construes the "veil" over the gospel as something that either the gospel or Paul set in place, rather than as a metaphor used to describe the blinding activity of the god of this world, suggesting that it is "a slip of the tongue/pen" that provides a glimpse of the (real) sophistic Paul. Readers of *Paul's True Rhetoric* just may wonder whether Paul's alleged rhetorical cunning, here and elsewhere, is surpassed by that of Given himself.

Paul's True Rhetoric demonstrates a salutary methodological eclecticism and affords a number of insights into both Socrates and Paul. Given has read broadly and deeply and is a stimulating conversation partner especially for those interested in Paul and Luke-Acts, though missiologists and students of rhetoric may want to engage him as well. Footnotes rather than endnotes facilitate the conversation, as do a bibliography and an index.

STEVEN R. MATTHIES
PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Mission: An Essential Guide. By Carlos Cardoza-Orlandi. Abingdon Press, 2002, 127 pages.

Upon first inspection two features of this book immediately stand out: 1) the title is very bold, and 2) the book itself is quite thin. The combination of these two elements has the effect of not only arousing the potential reader's interest, but also perhaps creating a certain amount of skepticism. After all, how can anyone possibly claim to provide *an essential guide* to the complex and often confusing field of missiology within the scope of only 127 pages? While this is the question asked before one actually starts reading the book, afterwards the reader is faced with a new question: how did he pull it off? Not only does Carlos Cardoza-Orlandi live up to the expectation created by the title he does that in a fashion that is uniquely creative. Not only does he provide an easy to follow guide through a field that could sometimes look like an academic labyrinth, he also gives a number of important new insights along the way, the insights of someone "who was missionized and who believes in mission" (11).

Like his uncle Eugenio's fishing net, which the author uses as a metaphor for the way the *missional hermeneutic* functions (69-70), Cardoza-Orlandi manages to bring together the different stands of mission throughout this book, describing both the problems and the challenges, giving both a critique and an affirmation. As such this book serves as an introduction to the field of missiology, but also a new perspective to those who have already been initiated.

In the introduction entitled *Objects and Subjects of Mission: A New Perspective* the author explains his own position of experiencing a double identity, "we have been the *object of mission* and we are *subjects of mission*" (12). This dual identity evidently enables the author to be free from the need of becoming involved in the unhelpful apologetics, which so often characterizes missiological writings. Instead Cardoza-Orlandi himself walks the proverbial *tightrope*, understanding both sides of the coin, by being involved in both the *transmission* and *reception* side of God's mission. Furthermore, the introduction contains some very important distinctions between the terms *missions*, *mission*, and *missiology*. It closes with a nicely summarized outline of the rest of the book.

In *Chapter One: The Captivity of Mission in North American Churches* Cardoza-Orlandi sets the stage of a North American church context that stands in need of a "mirror" in order to become aware of their own

contextualized gospel. The author emphasizes the value of “cross-cultural mission encounters” in helping Christians from both sides to critically assess their own openness or cultural captivity (18). He furthermore describes and evaluates some historical missional models, such as the *mission as an overseas task* model, the *efficiency model*, the *nostalgic model*, the *disappearing model*, and the *mission-is-everything model*. His example of how public water faucets when replaced by improved water systems could actually be detrimental to a community’s cultural cohesiveness (21-22) is especially apt in its critique of the *efficiency model of mission*. Finally he critically evaluates the importance of the *mission-in-the-West framework* as a way of addressing some of the previously held misconceptions.

Chapter Two critiques the *Christendom* legacy of mission as a “one-directional activity” of the church as it manifested *itself* in both Roman Catholic and Protestant circles. The author then underscores the *Missio Dei* understanding of mission as a Trinitarian activity in which the church is called to participate.

Chapter Three deals with the *Bible and Mission*. It dispels all Bible-as-recipe book type of notions, whether the interpretations come from the *center* or the *margin*. Despite the lessons learned from the *Hermeneutical or Interpretive Circle* model Cardoza-Orlandi argues that this model is still inadequate to deal with interreligious and intercultural encounters, because it “continues to be a method primarily for the Christian community” (54). He advocates instead for the *Missional Hermeneutic* model, which emerged as a “theological and biblical dialogue between biblical scholars and missiologists” (54). Looking at both the Old and New Testaments this model seeks to address the *Why, How, and What* questions of mission. In this chapter Cardoza-Orlandi makes it abundantly clear that Bible has much more to say about mission than that which has traditionally been derived from the “Great Commission,” for instance. When read comprehensively the Bible would have us reconsider some of our preconceived notions about mission.

Concerning the increasingly popular issue of mission theologies, in *Chapter Four* Cardoza-Orlandi argues along with Andrew Walls that good theology “is born where the Christian faith has vitality” (71). Furthermore he says that the church is in the *matrix of mission*, which means that the church is not only the subject, but also the object of mission, thereby “completely ‘covered,’ ‘embraced’ in God’s missionary activity, called to repent, change, and renew its missionary commitments and practice in the world” (79). The author concludes this chapter by synthesizing and reinterpreting the last section of David Bosch’s groundbreaking work, *Transforming Mis-*

sion, where the latter deals with the “ecumenical paradigm of mission.” Cardoza-Orlandi does a great job of reworking this section, which is possibly the most important part of Bosch’s book.

In *Chapter Five* Cardoza-Orlandi returns to what is perhaps his most provocative metaphor, “Mission as *Walking the Tightrope*”. Walking a tightrope is a risky business and the author relates how in the Acts 10 narrative of Peter and Cornelius both evangelizer and evangelized are faced with the prospect of losing old securities in order to gain something new from the Holy Spirit (90-91). The author narrates a couple of concrete examples of how the supposed givers actually become the receivers, and *vice versa*, in the borderline situations of “cross-cultural missional encounters”.

Chapter Six elaborates on the interdisciplinary nature of missiology. Thus, it is both a rediscovery of some old conversation partners, *Theology, History, Bible, and Worship Studies*, but also a discovery of some “new disciples”, *Anthropology, Religious Studies, and Economy*. Cardoza-Orlandi hopes that the integration of these latter disciplines with missiology will “*help eliminate the naïve approach of many among the people of God regarding issues of community development, health, environmental issues, and sound economic sustainability*” (107).

Perhaps the most beautiful part of this skillfully constructed monograph is Cardoza-Orlandi’s concluding statement of faith in mission. He consciously contextualizes this statement in his missiological identity of “living at the border” (111). His borderline experience is described as a series of trepidations and commitments that manage to skillfully negotiate the “tightrope” of faithful Christian witness.

Mission: An Essential Guide is a book that should be read and enjoyed by students, scholars, and Christian communities engaged in mission, alike. It is scholarly enough to be intellectually challenging to professional missiologists, on the one hand, but at the same time it is so user-friendly and practice oriented that it would be a great resource at the grass-roots level of local churches. As such it spans the gap between academia and the local manifestation of the global church, a major achievement in itself. Hopefully we will hear a lot more from Cardoza-Orlandi’s pen in years to come.

RETIEF MÜLLER
PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

The Kingdom and the Power: The Theology of Jürgen Moltmann. By Geiko Müller-Fahrenholz. Translated by John Bowden. Fortress Press, 2001, 262 pages.

In *The Kingdom and the Power*, Geiko Müller-Fahrenholz offers an accessible introduction to the theology of Jürgen Moltmann, which will be useful not only to those unfamiliar with Moltmann's thought, but also to those to whom Moltmann's theology is a familiar experience. Working chronologically, Müller-Fahrenholz proceeds systematically through each of Moltmann's major works, making reference throughout to the various occasional works Moltmann has published over the course of his long career. While not primarily a critical treatment of Moltmann's thought, this book does stop at points to raise important questions about problematic aspects of Moltmann's theology, and thus points to a number of issues to which Moltmann scholars (and Moltmann!) would do well to pay attention.

One useful contribution of this book is its close consideration of Moltmann's work prior to the publication of *Theology of Hope* in 1964. Müller-Fahrenholz spends an entire chapter considering the importance of Moltmann's early work, *The Community Against the Horizon of the Rule of Christ*, which Müller-Fahrenholz notes, "already contains important notions which are developed in the later books" (26). This is a helpful analysis that sheds light on some of the roots of Moltmann's later theological project, although this work itself was "without an echo" (36).

Müller-Fahrenholz divides Moltmann's project into two major stages. The "programmatic" stage of Moltmann's work begins with *The Community Against the Horizon of the Rule of Christ* and continues through his first three major publications: *Theology of Hope*, *The Crucified God*, and *The Church in the Power of the Spirit*. Although Müller-Fahrenholz is very positive about Moltmann's work in these books, he is not uncritical. For example, he writes that *Theology of Hope* seems "dated" to him (59), and he notes (perhaps incorrectly) "our distance from the concerns of that generation" (60). Similarly, he gives consideration to the critiques offered by Dorothy Sölle and others of *The Crucified God*, and asks pressing questions about the relationship between Moltmann's theology of the church and his approach to ethics.

Müller-Fahrenholz points to 1977 as the year in which Moltmann's theology underwent a shift away from the concerns of his "programmatic" writings and toward the themes of his subsequent "systematic contributions to theology." At this point, according to Müller-Fahrenholz, Moltmann under-

went a crisis as a result of criticisms lodged against him, particularly by liberation theologians: "Certainly he was not black, not a woman, not oppressed. But wasn't it enough to be 'pro-black,' 'pro-woman,' and 'pro-oppressed' to be accepted as a partner in liberation theology? Evidently not, or not for all. But why not?" (123-4). It was in seeking an answer to this question that Moltmann's second major period of scholarship developed.

Throughout this period, Moltmann continues to rely on the themes that motivated him in his programmatic period, but he enters into new dialogues, and considers the "classical" (136) questions of Christian theology in a more organized manner. Beginning with *The Trinity and the Kingdom* and continuing through his latest book, *Experiences in Theology*, Moltmann has continued this process of development and opened new lines of inquiry. He asks, for example, in *God In Creation* questions of ecology and the natural world, and in *The Coming of God* the more detailed questions of eschatology, such as the fate of the dead and the millennium.

The last two chapters are by far the most intriguing and instructive portion of the book. Having reviewed each of Moltmann's major works, Müller-Fahrenholz seeks to discern the golden thread that ties the whole of Moltmann's corpus together. He notes that on the one hand, "Moltmann develops his theology and offers it for discussion as a committed contemporary" (219). In other words, Moltmann's theology has to be understood as an apologetic theology in the Tillichian sense of an "answering" theology. It seeks to respond to the questions raised by the cultural milieu in which it finds itself and provide the answers implied by the Christian gospel. The significance of this contemporary aspect is carried forward, not only in more complex theological works, but also, as Müller-Fahrenholz notes, in "a whole series of books with sermons, addresses, and more popular discussions" (220). Moltmann's work always seeks to address the direct situation of the day and respond accordingly. His theology is thus broadly ecumenical and rooted in the concrete experiences of Christians around the world.

The other theme that Müller-Fahrenholz emphasizes is Moltmann's status as "comrade of the Kingdom." The theme that runs throughout Moltmann's work is his commitment to an anticipation of the reality of the Kingdom of God in the world. "Kingdom of God' is the basic symbol for the eschatological dimension which shapes his theology" (221). Moltmann's work emerges out of these themes and seeks to illuminate their significance for the church.

Müller-Fahrenholz finally considers the growing mysticism that can be detected throughout Moltmann's theology. Moltmann's theology is rooted in the practice of prayer, and, as Müller-Fahrenholz notes: "Moltmann also wants his theological talk about God to be understood as talking to God" (237). Prayer, as "inviting mystery" (237) is at the heart of Christian life, and thus should stand at the heart of Christian theology as well. Müller-Fahrenholz remarks that Moltmann's work stands in a tradition of mystical theology "which extends from Jacob Böhme through Friedrich Oetinger and Benedict Baader to nineteenth-century philosophy. Without it Moltmann's eschatological process thought would be inconceivable" (240). This is the root of the speculative character of much of Moltmann's work, and provides a means of understanding the utopian hope that continues to permeate Moltmann's theology.

This volume provides readers of Moltmann's theology a fresh and articulate summary and evaluation of Moltmann's thought from the perspective of an appreciative scholar. Müller-Fahrenholz offers readers a lens into the major themes of a major theologian, whose impact on ecumenical theology in the post-war period has been of great significance. One problem that emerges, however, is that Müller-Fahrenholz is perhaps *too* appreciative and not enough of a critic. He does not dwell at length on some of the important criticisms that have been leveled against Moltmann's Trinitarian theology, his utopian approach to social issues, and his Christology. Each of these issues has been the subject of often-heated discourse in the theological community, and while it is true that Müller-Fahrenholz addresses these critiques, he does not give them their full weight, nor does he provide an adequate defense of Moltmann on these points. His important insight into the mystical element in Moltmann's work may serve as a screen more than as a shield, covering rather than deflecting attacks.

This is, nevertheless, an excellent introduction to Moltmann's thought for those who have never encountered his work, as well as a needed refresher for those of us for whom Moltmann's theology is an old friend.

SCOTT ROBERTS PAETH
ALBERTSON COLLEGE

God and Globalization, Vol. 3: Christ and the Dominions of Civilization. Edited by Max L. Stackhouse with Diane B. Obenchain. Trinity Press International, 2002, xii and 347 pages.

While the possibility of a “common moral discourse” is one of the chief aims uniting this collection of essays, the reality of religious diversity is the major obstacle toward achieving it. Nonetheless, the central thesis of this four-volume project—that the predominant analytical framework guiding most analyses of globalization ignores the normative role of religion in cultural development—is unaffected by the existence of competing religious perspectives.

The very fact that every human culture manifests some form of religious worldview—defined by the editors as the capacity “however modest, to transcend its bio-socio-economic-cultural enmeshments by the reception of transcendent inspiration or an exercise of commitments and covenants beyond interests” (8)—warrants an analysis of globalization that recognizes some power beyond our socially constructed patterns of culture, economics, and politics as motivating human action. Consequently, an intellectually honest and comprehensive examination of the many forces categorized under the rubric of “globalization” demands an analysis that attempts to understand how particular religions in specific cultural contexts respond, resist, and adapt to the forces of globalization.

So far so good. Unfortunately, this much needed perspective within globalization studies is accompanied by another thesis (not necessarily shared by all the contributors) articulated by editor Max. L. Stackhouse that the (primarily positive) socio-cultural forces identified with globalization “were formed in societies fundamentally stamped by Christian theological ethics” (12). A corollary to this thesis is the affirmation that the negative forces associated with globalization, such as colonialism, imperialism, cultural hegemony, sexual exploitation, racism, and genocide, are not generated by (nor are they unique to) Christianity. Some logical consequences of these two affirmations include: (1) the belief that globalization is a positive and highly-desired reality, and (2) the claim that a Christian worldview (or a worldview sympathetic to the values and norms of Christianity) is therefore a more “evolved” or advanced perspective.

The editors recognize the negative consequences of globalizing forces while championing the positive. They are also aware of the criticisms leveled at Christianity for its complicity in perpetuating the more imperialistic and

totalitarian aspects of globalization, yet they suggest that the secularizing forces of the Enlightenment project that sought to “liberate” culture from religion became “the sources of more devastating forms of colonialism, imperialism, hegemony, forced migrations, patriarchy, slavery, conquest, sexual exploitation, and genocide than the world had previously known” (13). Consequently, the solution is not to remove religion from the public discourse, but to better understand how religion is not only affected by cultural, economic, and political forces, but is itself a force forming and transforming these other spheres.

Furthermore, by recognizing that globalization arose within a Christian theological-ethical framework, the editors do not mean to imply that Christianity is superior to other world religions. Rather, a fundamental presupposition of the essays included in this collection is “that something deeper than the religions themselves stands beyond every religion” (16), i.e., that which John Hick labels “ultimate reality” and which the world’s theistic religions name God. The goal of collecting these essays, representative of a wide diversity of religious perspectives, is not to postulate some abstract “religion in general” but to incarnate theological diversity in all its particularity and through that process recognize not only differences, but that which is held in common by most (if not all) world religions.

Perhaps it is unfair to evaluate the contribution this third volume of *God and Globalization* makes to the academic discourse on globalization solely on the basis of its shortcomings within the academic discourse on religious pluralism. Yet it seems that too many differences have been glossed over for the sake of “common human logic” (25). The fact that all the contributors engage world religions from a Christian religious perspective (though not necessarily an explicitly confessional stance), coupled with the fact that postmodern critiques that question the very possibility of a “common moral discourse” have been all but ignored, suggests an underlying commitment to a particular view of globalization (as those forces that generate capital, promote democracy, protect human rights, and encourage religious tolerance) that limits our definition of religion (as those beliefs and practices that foster the previously stated values). Arguably the chief question being investigated in this volume is not how to deal with the challenges of religious diversity (“Can we affirm all the great religions equally?”) but the more difficult question concerning the Christian assessment of other religions (“Is it the case that all religions are not equal when it comes to promoting the values that foster a global society?”).

Surprisingly, given that globalization is defined by the editors as “the fruits of the Christian impact on civilization” (56), the resulting picture of how Christianity interacts with other religions (while simultaneously contending with the forces of secularization) is remarkably open to difference and disagreement. The authors are not proposing a new Christian imperialism. A more accurate representation of their project is that they are exploring the consequences of one their guiding theses—that globalizing forces arose within a Christian theological-ethical context—by analyzing how other religions and cultures have engaged this “Christian” worldview (often manifest in highly secularized form). Sometimes the interaction with Western globalizing forces leads to approval and adoption, at other times the result is disapproval and resistance; the hope shared by all the contributing authors is that deeper engagement between different traditions will lead to a mutual appreciation of shared perspectives while allowing other perspectives to challenge, instruct, and even transform our own.

Overall, this third volume in the series provides a much needed corrective to the highly secularized academic discussion of globalization. While offering guidelines for trans-contextual conversation between different religious perspectives the authors do not reduce religion to generalized abstractions but respect the particularity of competing truth claims. The result is not an easy resolution to the challenges raised by religious pluralism, which are heightened by the forces of globalization that have reduced geographic as well as cultural distance, but a model for navigating difference that is open to the other *as other* while speaking from a position of deep personal commitment. The spirit of this work is best captured by the words of George Peck, quoted by S. Mark Heim whose book *Salvations: Truth and Difference in Religion* has influenced many of the essays in this collection: “I have committed my life to Jesus Christ; *therefore* I am open to other religions.”

RUBÉN ROSARIO RODRÍGUEZ
PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

The Social God and the Relational Self: A Trinitarian Theology of the Imago Dei. By Stanley J. Grenz. Westminster John Knox Press, 2001, xii and 345 pages.

In this first volume of a projected six-part series (*The Matrix of Christian Theology*), evangelical Baptist theologian Stanley Grenz (Truett Seminary and Baylor University), offers his readership an illuminating and wide-rang-

ing historical-exegetical investigation into the doctrine of the *imago dei*. The object of this work, as Grenz points out in his introduction, is the construction of a communal understanding of the *imago dei*, drawing from contemporary trinitarian discourse, in particular the insights of the social model, as a response to the postmodern eclipse of the self. By defining the *imago dei* as an anthropological, theological, ecclesiological and eschatological concept, Grenz has justifiably situated this book as the introductory primer to the subsequent volumes, which would cover theology, Christology, pneumatology, ecclesiology and eschatology.

Grenz begins by tracing the contemporary reemergence of trinitarian theology, initiated by Hegel's philosophical theology and decisively asserted by Barth, albeit within the analogy of the one divine subject. Summarizing the various contributions of Rahner, Moltmann, Pannenberg, LaCugna, and Zizioulas, Grenz points to the contemporary redirection of the doctrine away from monarchical, essentialistic conceptions to more egalitarian, personalistic models.

In chapters two and three, Grenz presents a panoramic survey of the rise and demise of modern Western individualism. Drawing substantially from the work of philosopher Charles Taylor, Grenz tracks the modern focus on the inward, "centered" self, seen in both the rationalistic and romantic variants, to its genesis in Augustine's mystical inward turn. In the rejection of the instrumental rationality of the Enlightenment by the Romantic Movement, the seeds were sown for the subsequent dissolution and death of the unitary self in the twentieth century. What the poststructuralist critique has left us with, Grenz avers, is a highly unstable, fragmentary self.

In chapter four, Grenz questions the common opinion that, in the history of doctrine in the West, there exists only two interpretive schemas in understanding the *imago dei* - the substantialist, structural anthropology of patristic-medieval theology and the dynamic, relational reconceptualization of the human person during the Reformation. He suggests that hints of a third option - Irenaeus' "telic" or eschatological anthropology, which highlights the developmental nature of humanity - can be seen in the work of the Scottish theologian James Orr, and in eighteenth century German dogmatists, like Herder and Dorner.

In the next two chapters, Grenz draws together a vast array of exegetical studies on the biblical notion of the *imago dei*, highlighting, firstly, the various creatiocentric interpretations of the creation narrative followed by the New Testament focus on Christ as the true *doxa* and *eikon* of God. This Christocentric anthropology, because of its "already-not yet" nature, inspires

hope in an eschatological *telos* which, in turn, gives impetus to an ethical imperative for the present.

Grenz returns to the Genesis narrative in chapter seven to expand on Barth's notion that an *analogia relationis* exists "between human relationality as sexually differentiated creatures and the relational God" (294), though God ultimately transcends all gendered descriptions. Because the *imago dei* is an eschatological concept, human sexuality is presently incomplete and as such, does not find its culmination in marital union, but in ecclesial being - "the person-in-bonded-community" (305). Grenz notes that a social-eschatological notion of the *imago dei* is corroborated by contemporary social psychology, and argues for its grounding in the perichoretic dynamic of the divine *agape*. Drawing from the rich sacramental ecclesiology of the Eastern theological tradition, Grenz concludes that the Church is to be the prolepsis of the eschatological *imago dei*, since its *telos* is *theosis* - participation in the divine life.

In his usual even-handed and careful treatment of the subject matter, Grenz has widened the practical application of present-day trinitarian discourse by critically engaging the anthropologies which are at the root of both cultural and ecclesial life. Grenz's censure of "the unified, autonomous, isolated human self," which was theologically motivated by the Western emphasis on the unity of God, is, without doubt, timely and proper (332). There are certainly gains to be made in formulating a theological anthropology which draws primarily on "a more appropriate social understanding of the divine reality" - that of perichoresis. However, this begs the question as to whether the rejection of Western individualistic anthropology necessarily demands the corollary denial of "the outmoded and helpful idea of God as the single divine subject"? It might be argued that unipersonal analogies of the divine ought to be retained in order to safeguard the aseity and independence of God in contrast to the contingent nature of humankind. Hence, one has first to ask whether psychological and social paradigms of the Trinity could not be utilized as mutually correcting concepts in order to affirm the antinomy of the Persons and the Essence? Secondly, if Grenz's intention is to treat the notion of perichoresis as a "root metaphor" to illuminate his concept of the *imago dei*, where are the limits of this concept when applied to the sphere of human relationality?

While we can profit by grounding different human loves, and to that end, our ecclesiology, in the coinherence of the divine life, the discontinuity be-

tween human and divine personhood must be addressed. There appears to be little disagreement that the idea of coinherence, as applied to both the divine and the human, is an extremely serviceable way of underlining the fact that personal individuation cannot be had apart from relationality. Where some clarification is needed is in the manner in which the circumincession of the divine Persons radically transcends the reality of mutually productive relations and, even, deep communion among human persons. Though humankind share a single essence and are multi-hypostatic in a way that is analogous to their triune Creator, the orthodox tradition has consistently maintained that, as human beings possess discrete wills and actions, this separates them from the Trinity, who has but a single will and operation. A social trinitarianism that affirms three distinct divine centers of consciousnesses, or the like, cannot escape the tritheistic charge; a communalistic theology is merely the alter-ego of, and thus no improvement over, an individualistic anthropology. Since Grenz explicitly privileges a relational, social trinitarianism over against a more unitary, essentialist approach, one wonders where he stands on this issue, as he does not appear to deal with it here.

In highlighting the eschatological nature of the *imago dei*, Grenz does the Western theological tradition a great service by reintroducing patristic doctrine of *theosis*. Though not entirely absent, as evident in the Reformers' notion of *participatio Christi*, the Latin Church has tended to emphasize, in their soteriology, the instrumental over the ontological. Despite this laudable inclusion, a few doubts remain. Is it possible to embrace the patristic notion of deification within a Western conception of the trinitarian processions without lapsing into either pantheism or tritheism? If there can be human participation in the reciprocal Love between the Father and the Son - the Spirit, who is "the concretization of the divine essence" (315), is the Church not drawn into the eternally essential unity and personal distinctions that are the sole prerogatives of divinity? On the other hand, if the redeemed do actually share in the very *koinonia* of God without participation in either the essence or personal distinctions, the divine Persons cannot be said to be eternally constituted by their essential relations, but only enter into intentional relations akin to that of human beings. If the Church has a real share in the eternal, divine *gloria*, which is neither a created reality nor the essential *perichoresis* of the divine persons, what of the divine do we participate in? Can Grenz affirm the patristic doctrine of deification, without also accounting for the Eastern distinction of essence, persons *and energies*, alluded to by the

Cappadocian Fathers, elaborated by Maximus the Confessor and John of Damascus, and systematically defined by Gregory Palamas?

But these questions may fade into irrelevance in the face of Grenz's forthcoming sequels. In the meantime, his readers wait with eager anticipation.

SENG-KONG TAN

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

The Eschatology of the Old Testament. By Geerhardus Vos, ed. James T. Dennison Jr. P & R, 2001, x and 176 pages.

Geerhardus Vos, the inaugural holder of Princeton Seminary's professorship of biblical theology from 1894-1932, never composed a work on the Old Testament's eschatology. The bibliographical labors which produced the present volume showed that he had in fact undertaken the task, but the final product as it now stands is a synthesis of Vos's nascent manuscript, several of his other papers on the topic, and the syllabus and lecture notes from his class on Old Testament eschatology (p.vii). The editor has gone to the trouble of updating all Vos's bibliographic references, compiling a Scripture index as well.

An excellent introductory chapter opens the work, followed by two brief chapters that survey the field in Vos's day. The remaining half or so of the work studies specific epochs in biblical history (within Eden, before the flood, the Mosaic theocracy) or specific pericopes (Gen 49:10; the Sinai theophany; Balaam's oracles in Num 24; the promise made to the Davidic monarchy). Additional chapters are dedicated to the eschatology of theophanies and of the Psalter (the latter is not to be confused with Vos's article in *The Princeton Theological Review*, now reprinted elsewhere). Finally, a selection of stimulating excerpts from the sources used in preparing the present volume is offered in the appendix; these extracts will be particularly appreciated by those who have found Vos's other writings to be overly selective in biblical coverage.

Here as in his other writings, Vos employs the Reformed biblico-theological method of interpretation: he proceeds in temporal order (insofar as is possible) through the material, identifying seeds of "subsequent progressive revelation" and tracing their development (p.19). The introductory chapter (the longest in the work) applies itself to sketching the broad contours of individual and collective eschatology in the Old Testament. Hardly

a proto-Fundamentalist, Vos makes clear that he has no intention of putting words into Scripture's mouth by seeking a fully developed eschatology in the Old Testament; on the contrary, "it would be a perverse method to seek to prove from the Old Testament alone or chiefly that at the moment of death the pious Israelite went straight up to heaven" (p.8). Indeed, he concludes that in the Old Testament "the general outlook on death was a dismal one" (p.11).

Having said that, Vos also points out the exceptional instances of individual eschatology that are found in the Psalter. For example, in Psalm 16 Vos avers that the psalmist's confidence that God will not leave his soul in Sheol is not to be understood as mere assurance that the original author's life was to be spared. Rather, taking his cue from Peter's "veritable stroke of interpretative genius" in Acts 2:25-8, Vos sees the psalm as expressing "a general principle" which Peter applies to "the one case in which it could find an exhaustively perfect fulfillment," the resurrection of Christ. Vos concludes that in Psalm 16 "the prospect of death has not been removed..., but the state of death itself has been transfigured and become a prophecy of glory" (p.15).

It is in this manner that Vos, in the rest of the book, works his way through a variety of Old Testament passages. Addressing the issue of soul sleep terminology in the Old Testament, Vos points out the limits of the metaphor as prohibiting a "death-sleep," since "the sleeping of the dead was so-called because there was expected an end to it, sooner or later, through a resurrection" (p.28).

Vos's treatment of collective eschatology is valuable for a number of reasons, not least of which is his treatment of the New Testament's "transposition of [Old Testament entities] into a higher spiritual key," or what is often understood as spiritualization. Vos defends this practice by noting that its warrant derives from "the example of our Lord and his disciples." Indeed, he argues that the Old Testament prophets themselves (e.g. Jeremiah's treatment of the ark of the covenant, Jer 3:16) began "to see through the cover of earthly, material representation in which the institutions of the Old Testament were enveloped" (p.36). The interpreter's task, however, is not hastily to generalize the relationship between prophecy and fulfillment, but "to study carefully the principle on which the Old and the New Testaments both proceed in their discriminating treatment of the eschatological material...[and] handle the matter...in its large, broad aspects" (pp.36-7). This, in short, is Vos's methodology: to pursue the meaning of prophecy by focusing on "the

New Testament teaching in regard to [its] fulfillment. It teaches us that the form is cast aside and that the substance is brought to light” (p.119).

Readers of Vos’s other writings will know that his insight often transcends the question at hand and suggests very fruitful lines of thought that extend throughout the canon. The present volume is no exception, as his reflections on the Mosaic theocracy show—indeed, they raise the possibility that Old Testament theology may exhibit an eschatological substructure similar to the eschatological framework which Vos sees in Paul’s theology. Vos begins his discussion by noting the dynamic interrelation which obtains between a present reality and its future antitype. In Israel’s case, “the theocratic structure projects its own character into the picture of the future” (p.117). This, if nothing else, accounts for the “ideal or unattainable” nature of some of its facets. In fact, Vos claims, the theocracy supplies much of the Old Testament’s eschatological vocabulary. This actually became a problem when the eschatological fulfillment came, since the New Testament made a “distinction...between the substance and the form of revelation” by spiritualizing the perfection suggested by the Old Testament theocracy: “the holy city is center; offices, organization, peace...are there, but this is all to be eternalized in the messianic era” (p.118). Here the solution to the problem of discovering authorial intent is again guided by the New Testament, and applies to “unfulfilled as well as to fulfilled prophecies because the New Testament does not proceed mechanically...but enables us to fix certain general principles...” for interpretation (p.120). In other words, while not every element of antecedent revelation is explicitly picked up by the New Testament, the canon’s structure and self-interpretation are sufficiently clear guides for thorough investigation of any eschatological passage.

Though dating back a number of decades, Vos’s insights into eschatology (having only now been rendered accessible) are far less dated than their date of origin would suggest. Ironically, and to the editor’s credit, it also may be the most easily read of all Vos’s productions. Overall, *The Eschatology of the Old Testament* is of great value for understanding the essence of the subject as well as its wider interconnections with the rest of Scripture and theology. Those studying either testament, professionally or otherwise, will doubtless appreciate it.

DANIEL C. TIMMER
TRINITY EVANGELICAL DIVINITY SCHOOL

Preaching the Whole Bible as Christian Scripture. The Application of Biblical Theology to Expository Preaching. By Graeme Goldsworthy. Eerdmans, 2000, xvi and 272 pages.

Preaching is doubtless the venue in which Christianity most frequently comes to verbal expression. Despite its prevalence, however, only rarely does a congregation enjoy exposure to the majority of the canon, even over a period of years. Further, the small portions of the canon that are covered are often subjected to any number of differing, even disagreeing, interpretations. Graeme Goldsworthy, lecturer in Old Testament, biblical theology, and hermeneutics at Moore Theological College in Sydney, seeks to remedy this problem by advancing “a consistently Christ-centered approach” to biblical interpretation and application (p.ix). Given the problems just mentioned, and the unique challenge the Old Testament poses to Christian preachers, such a work is timely indeed.

Goldsworthy puts forward the essence of his “reformed and evangelical” proposal in the introductory chapter, which bears the unambiguous title “Nothing but Christ and Him Crucified.” There he questions the validity of the usual practices of ignoring the Old Testament, using it as a stockpile of examples of virtuous living, or treating it without explaining its culmination in Jesus Christ. Arguing that such methods are fundamentally flawed, Goldsworthy lays the groundwork for his method by contending that the gospel is central for Christians in two ways: in our own experience of salvation, whereby we are reconciled with, and come to know, God; and theologically, since “the mighty acts of God...are declared by the preaching of Jesus and his apostles to be preparatory for the person and work of Jesus” (p.6). The gospel’s centrality is thus holistic, and the rest of *Preaching the Whole Bible as Christian Scripture* unfolds how “the way the Bible presents its message...that reaches its climax in the person and work of Jesus of Nazareth, provides us with the principles we need” for hermeneutics and homiletics (p.7).

Goldsworthy builds his hermeneutic by demonstrating how the gospel event provides essential unity to the canon while preserving and even bringing to full expression its diversity. He reviews the troubled discussion of biblical theology from Gabler until today, and argues for a synthesis of the often opposed synchronic and diachronic methods, one that will use New Testament insights in dealing with Old Testament texts in their original lit-

erary setting. The core of Goldsworthy's hermeneutical thesis is articulated in a chapter entitled "Was Jesus a Biblical Theologian?" He answers this question affirmatively, reasoning that because the New Testament shows Jesus to be the fulfiller of all Scripture (Luke 24:44-47; John 17:12) and the one who ushered in the kingdom of heaven in the fullness of time (Mark 1:14-15), "the meaning of all the Scriptures is unlocked by the death and resurrection of Jesus" (p.54). This hermeneutic is also seen in the apostles' sermons in Acts (Acts 2, 7, 13).

The second portion of *Preaching the Whole Bible as Christian Scripture* works out the theoretical argued in the first part. Goldsworthy dedicates a chapter to each of the various canonical genres (Old Testament narrative, law, prophets, wisdom, and Psalms; Old and New Testament apocalyptic, gospels, and Acts and epistles) and lays the homiletical groundwork for a representative sampling of such texts using the hermeneutic defined earlier. After determining the genre of the text, Goldsworthy examines the pericope's theological function in its epoch (e.g. the institution of the Davidic monarchy) "in terms of its theological contribution to the overall kingdom revelation." For example, while the united monarchy reveals in a positive manner "the nature of redemption and the kingdom of God, the period after Solomon's apostasy is negative." The latter, therefore, "reinforces the covenant sanctions of judgment" (p.104). In both cases, the interpreter should move forward through prophetic eschatology to the fulfillment of that theological function, and of the text's meaning, in Christ.

Applying a text's meaning to individuals is a challenging step in the homiletical process, but Goldsworthy once again adroitly draws on the centrality of Christ in Christian theology and experience to facilitate proper contextualization of the text's message. Once the theological function of the text itself is known, "the corresponding theological function in the person and work of Christ...is identified as the point of contact with our contemporary situation," and the text's bearing on the believer is "deduced on the basis of what the New Testament says about our relationship to Christ" (p.114). Here the guiding principle is that "the only thing that controls the matter of the relationship of the text to us is its prior relationship to Christ" (113)—hardly the usual line in homiletics, but canonically justified and immensely helpful.

Because of Goldsworthy's stress on redemptive history, one might think that preaching from Proverbs, which lacks a clear date and offers only the slimmest of historical references, would prove unfruitful in his hands. This, happily, does not obtain. In treating Proverbs 8:22-31, for example, he avoids the superficial

typology which sees the text as a reference to Christ, “which of course in the Old Testament it isn’t.” Recognizing the complex literary nature of the passage, but guided by its canonical context, Goldsworthy suggests that wisdom “is not a divine personification like the Egyptian *Ma’at* but rather a metaphor for the place of wisdom in the planning of God for the shape of the universe.” He suggests two avenues for applying the text to Christians: first, “the order established by God in creation is that which can make for order in the lives of God’s people;” and second, “while this passage . . . is not about Christ directly, it certainly foreshadows the role of Christ as the wisdom of God in creation (Col 1:15-17)” (p.189). The final chapter offers helpful suggestions for how to preach biblical theology, whether in a single sermon or a thematic series.

Christian preachers of varying theological persuasions will find this book valuable for the elegance, simplicity, and canonical robustness of the hermeneutic it establishes and demonstrates. Goldsworthy has made a very strong case for giving Christ centrality and authority in both interpretation and application of the Bible. In addition to helping preachers cover the whole canon effectively, Goldsworthy’s Christ-centered method has the additional benefit of making clear to visitors “who just happen to be there [but are not believers] . . . what we are really on about” (p.124). The only weakness of the work is the brevity of its examples; while they are present in sufficient number, their terseness sometimes leaves small gaps between the text and the modern hearer. Thankfully the theory needed to fill in these practical lacunae is clearly presented within the volume, and the numerous helpful diagrams merit praise. Cogent in argumentation and fruitful in implementation (even for portions of Scripture deemed mysterious or irrelevant), Goldsworthy’s work will benefit anyone interested in ascertaining and applying Scripture’s meaning.

DANIEL C. TIMMER

TRINITY EVANGELICAL DIVINITY SCHOOL

Theology After Ricoeur: New Directions in Hermeneutical Theology. By Dan R. Stiver. Westminster John Knox, 2001, xii and 257 pages.

Dan R. Stiver is presently Professor of Theology in the Logsdon School of Theology at Hardin-Simmons University. An Evangelical theologian, he formerly taught at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville, Kentucky and first became known through his eminently readable and helpful *The Philosophy of Religious Language: Sign, Symbol, and Story* (Blackwell,

1996). He is one of the emerging Evangelical voices in the conversation with contemporary philosophy.

The present book exudes an inter-confessional and non-partisan spirit. It attempts to fill a perceived gap in Ricoeur-studies, namely the absence of a comprehensive and integrative treatment of his thinking as a whole. Observing that most theological appropriations of Ricoeur's work have been done in a piecemeal fashion, Stiver believes that this has been the cause of a failure to tap into the resources which his philosophy as a whole promises for theology. This is a somewhat odd observation, since the present reviewer at least can find numerous examples of serious theological engagement with Ricoeur's oeuvre over the past thirty years. Yet the reader is led to believe that the presentation of the whole of Ricoeur's thought, which is what Stiver attempts, will provide the necessary holistic prerequisite to any serious interaction. From the very beginning, Stiver seems to aim for "a bridge too far," for discovering the unity of one's thought is a difficult, not to say impossible project, as Stiver himself acknowledges.

The aim of the book is to propose Ricoeur's philosophy as a timely aid for contemporary theology. Ricoeur's thought is integrated in the transition from modernity to postmodernity and is itself ridden by some of the contradictions attaching to this exodus from modern certainty and clarity. One such contradiction is Ricoeur's too radical separation between his theology and his philosophy, a stance which Stiver interprets as essentially modern. His project undertakes the recovery of this implicit relation between Ricoeur's theology and his philosophy.

The so-called hermeneutical arc provides the conceptual key to the integration of the whole of Ricoeur's philosophy. The two arcs, hermeneutical and narrative, are integrated with the latter folded into the former. This means that each moment of the hermeneutical arc (first understanding, explanation and post-critical understanding) contains two elements of the narrative arc (configuration and re-figuration). In effect this relieves the anxiety that Ricoeur permits moments which do not already presuppose interpretation and appropriation. There may be some debate that Ricoeur's hermeneutical arc should not be interpreted in an overtly sequential fashion. Ricoeur's whole point was not that of separating the moments of understanding, but of revealing its holist character.

Upon creatively appropriating Ricoeur's arc into a "re-figured arc," Stiver turns to some of the major themes of his philosophy. He offers a less subjectivist or idealist reading of Ricoeur's work on metaphor and the surplus of

meaning (Wallace, Vanhoozer). Next Stiver describes the French philosopher's work on the various forms of discourse present in the Scriptures which is a welcome alternative to the privileging of the modality of narrative. Following is an appreciative analysis of the critical tools present in Ricoeur. The promise of his philosophy is that he finds a genuine middle way between objectivism and relativism, showing that critical thinking, the search for truth, reality and reference are still possible in late modernity. Another chapter describes one of Ricoeur's latest books, *Oneself As Another* and in terms of Stiver's proposal it is disappointing. The whole point of offering a comprehensive analysis of Ricoeur's work is that new works by him are now available which make possible the integration of his thought. Yet no such illuminating information is deduced from these texts. They do not shed new light on the earlier texts, nor contradict them, but simply follow them through and reinforce them. The final chapter attempts to draw all lines of inquiry together in Ricoeur's epistemology, which is a hermeneutics of attestation. Here he emerges as integrating a strong account of reality, reference and truth with a sense of the contextual nature of knowledge.

This has been a very readable and intelligible book. It will best serve as an excellent introduction into the thought of Ricoeur. But it hasn't delivered the serious engagement between theology and Ricoeur's philosophy that was expected. Unlike other books in the "Theology After..." category, the theological consequences have not been thoroughly explored. There have only been isolated discussions of some of the theologians which have engaged with Ricoeur, but not a systematic development of themes. Stiver also fails to converse seriously with critics of the surplus of meaning such as Vanhoozer and Hirsch or indeed Stout, although he does correct some misunderstandings about Ricoeur. Speech act theory is too hastily dismissed as compatible with his emphasis on actions as texts, rather than the converse. Its difference and the challenge it presents for Ricoeur is not recognized. Ricoeur's ontology is uncritically likened to that of critical realism, while following through Ricoeur's thought leads beyond alternatives such as realism and idealism.

The overall verdict is that despite its promises this book does not contribute anything new which has not been already intimated by those already engaging with Ricoeur's seminal work. Yet it does give a sense of the numerous theological vistas which Ricoeur opens and in this sense we hope it will play its part in leading theology in a more fruitful direction.