

## Book Reviews

*A Modern Grammar for Classical Hebrew.* By Duane A. Garrett. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2002, i-vii, 395 pp. plus tables, \$34.99 hardback.

Hebrew teachers sympathize with their student's difficulty in learning to read biblical Hebrew. Writers of introductory Hebrew grammars, however, may not appear to sympathize quite as much with students. Paging through Duane Garrett's textbook might make many beginning Hebrew students weep, as well as some teachers. The problem with this volume, as with many others in my opinion, is "too much, too soon."

Garrett's work has much to commend it. The author knows his subject matter and has produced a clearly-written and relatively error-free volume. The typeface used is large and very clear, making the Hebrew characters easy to distinguish within the text and in the tables. Dr. Garrett has included a number of helpful features not always found in introductory grammars. For instance, students will enjoy, and perhaps learn more quickly, from the answer key to the exercises. Many of the technical terms used in the grammar are defined in a glossary. The Hebrew-to-English vocabulary is keyed to the section in which the term is introduced (and sometimes discussed). In addition, some sections have "Special Vocabulary" which includes phrases, conjugated verb forms, plural nouns, and etc.

On page thirty-one Garrett provides the first "Guided Reading," a biblical text with helps, giving students exposure to the biblical text quite soon. Some exercises call for simple English-to-Hebrew translation, a difficult but pedagogically rewarding technique. Garrett has developed what he calls a "diglot weave," an English sentence incorporating a few Hebrew words. This eases a student into using Hebrew words in context. In many sections, Garrett has a *Pesher Hadavar* ("The interpretation of the matter") which tells the student what she or he needs to memorize.

Students often need a framework for what they are studying. Garrett first includes a good, brief overview of Hebrew grammar which helps to put things in order (27-29). Later, when students have mastered the basics, Garrett provides more grammatical information in Part VI, "Additional Details and Introduction to Advanced Issues" (298-54). This section provides quite helpful discussions of Hebrew Text linguistics and helps on how to read specific genres (poetry, predictive discourse, law, proverbs, and prophecy). Ordinal numbers, suffixes on verbs, textual criticism issues, and other specific discussions are included in this part.

When I came to seminary as a student, I did not want to study Hebrew (or Greek). My first-year Hebrew teachers, though, made the experience so positive that I went on to study and to do graduate work in Hebrew. Now, as a professor, I recognize many students are afraid of Hebrew. Many will not go further in their study of this language. And those who will go on need a solid and positive

experience on which to build. I have to ask, then, “What do students need at this time in their study of the language? How much detail is necessary and will the volume or the complexity of the material overwhelm students?” I am concerned that the class or the textbook not provide “too much, too soon.” Unfortunately, I believe a good bit of Garrett’s material in the first two-thirds of this book is “too much, too soon.” It is good and true, but is not needed in the first semester, perhaps not even in the first year of study.

Part of the issue is what is included and part is the arrangement of the material. For instance the heavy discussion of “Accent Shift, Vowel Changes” (already on page 25!) greets students when they are typically still trying to master the alphabet and the vowels. How can a beginning student sift through the material to find the typical and common? Yes, a good teacher can help here. But the material raises questions that are unnecessary at this point.

The author arranges his material in an odd fashion, too. He introduces the *waw* conjunction just before discussing the imperfect. He teaches the adjective immediately prior to the participle and the rule of the *sheva* before the infinitive construct. Allowing for idiosyncratic arrangement of material, Dr. Garrett’s attempts to present the characteristics of derived stems in the strong verb (133-141) followed immediately by an introduction to derived stems in weak verbs (142-148) seem guaranteed to bog down the average student (and her or his teacher).

Teachers write grammars because they believe their approach has something to offer. Only a long period of use by another experienced teacher can determine when a new approach or arrangement is productive. Glancing at Garrett’s paradigms, the reader notes that instead of tables arranged by verb type (strong verb, guttural verbs, III-h verbs, and etc.), the author presents the Qal for basic verb types in one paradigm. The second chart is the Niphal for all basic verb types. The third is Piel, and so on. The paradigm form reflects the way the verb is treated in the text. Perhaps this is a good arrangement. However, most teachers will have great difficulty matching Garrett’s order and content with any course organization they might have used before.

Dr. Garrett has written a good grammar, but not for beginning students. I would recommend this volume to a student who has had some Hebrew and wants to go further or to refresh her or his acquaintance with the language. Certainly Hebrew teachers can learn much from this colleague as well. But I believe it is too much, too soon.

Albert F. Bean  
Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary

*Biblical Hermeneutics: A Comprehensive Introduction to Interpreting Scripture.* Edited by Bruce Corley, Steve W. Lemke, and Grant L. Lovejoy, 2d ed. Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 2002, xvii + 525 pp., \$29.99.

If teaching a person to fish is better in the long run than giving that person a fish to eat, then teaching a person to interpret Scripture should be better than telling a person what Scripture says. But relatively few pastors and teachers seem

committed to helping people interpret the word of God for themselves. Do we have the tools to communicate the techniques of interpretation? Or are we reluctant to let others see how we handle the Word?

Certainly before teaching others to interpret Scripture, ministers need to insure they themselves know how to read the Word properly. In this revision of their 1996 work, Bruce Corley and twenty-six other scholars connected with Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary have provided a helpful tool for interpretation and, perhaps, for teaching interpretation. The preface indicates the book was written for the seminary classroom; thus some of the material is beyond the scope of what we might teach in a local congregation. However, most of the book can be understood and profitably used by the average person.

This second edition includes new and re-arranged material while omitting two chapters from the first edition. Rodney Reeves' first-edition article "Reading the Genres of Scripture" was replaced with seven chapters, each focusing on specific genres. A new section on "Contributors" was added to give each contributor's background. The extensive "A Student's Guide to Reference Books and Biblical Commentaries" was updated. Re-arrangement involved bringing together "A Student's Primer for Exegesis," "The Grammatical-Historical Method," and "Inductive Bible Study Methods" in a division entitled "How to Study the Bible." The other major divisions of the work were retitled as well. First-edition chapters on "Early Baptist Hermeneutics" and "Preunderstanding and the Hermeneutical Spiral" were omitted. Use of a more readable font contributed to an increase in the book's size from 419 to 525 pages.

The second edition is an improvement if only in giving additional attention to specific genres. The re-arrangement is not so beneficial. Creating a "How to Study the Bible" section seems logical. Corley's "Primer" gives students a structure for their written work. But, read together, the three chapters of the section seem to encourage the reader to interpret before understanding and without using material from later chapters. Pragmatic people that we are, too many interpreters will use the techniques and plans of the first section and ignore what follows, planning to deal with it later. A more helpful order might be "how the Bible has been interpreted" which explains the reason for "how the Bible is interpreted today" which would lead readers to focus on how they interpret Scripture.

Within the "How to Study the Bible" section Dr. Tolar's chapter helps the interpreter deal with historical questions. But historical questions are more complicated than he indicates. Old Testament interpreters, for instance, often deal with books which address multiple audiences (e.g., the audience Moses addressed in Deuteronomy) and settings. Thomas Lea's teaching that study should be in the order of "synthetic" (overview of a book), "analytic" (focusing on details), "devotional" (application) is helpful. In the press of work, though, often the synthetic is ignored or considered secondary. Lea could have made his point more convincing if he had demonstrated it by putting his analytical example (Phil 4:6-8) in the context of a synthesis (structural analysis/outline) of Philippians.

Part Two, "Biblical Hermeneutics in History," reveals this volume's provenance, the seminary classroom. Persons practicing biblical interpretation in the local church will probably give little attention to "Ancient Jewish

Hermeneutics” or “The Hermeneutics of the Early Church Fathers.” This section does aid the reader in understanding why we deal with the word of God as we do in the modern period. With this goal in mind, Karen Bullock’s chapter on post-Reformation Protestant Hermeneutics is most helpful, dealing with Protestant Scholasticism, Pietism, Modernism, Princetonian Orthodoxy, and classical Fundamentalism.

The two chapters on modern interpretation of the Old Testament and New Testament focus on standard critical methodologies but the chapters would be more helpful if parallel. Canonical, social-scientific, and structural criticisms, for instance, are used in the study of Old and New Testaments. Moreover, Rick Johnson (Old Testament) added comments on multiple fulfillments, New Testament use of the Old, and the authority of the Old Testament, which are not critical methodologies. Johnson did best Lorin Cranford (New Testament) by evaluating each critical methodology discussed. John Newport’s contribution has an awesome title (“Contemporary Philosophical, Literary, and Sociological Hermeneutics”) and proves helpful with such approaches as structuralism, Reader-Response, liberation; feminist; and deconstructionism. Newport ends with a focus on the significance of these issues for evangelical hermeneutics.

The highlight of the third part, “Authority, Inspiration, Language,” is Millard Erickson’s article on language which provides a healthy perspective on “literal.” Steve Lemke’s chapter provides help with terminology (revelation, inspiration, illumination) and points to strengths and weaknesses of common views of inspiration. He ends his chapter by discussing seven elements of a high view of Scripture, but along the way devalues the “hermeneutics of suspicion” (cp. Newport, 172, and Lemke, 190).

Part Four, “Genres of Scripture,” is new in this edition. The chapters deal with the expected genres: law, narrative (separate chapters on Old and New Testament), wisdom (combined with poetry), prophecy, letters, and apocalyptic. Not every chapter is equally helpful, but Robert Ellis’ discussion of law is quite good. He avoided the civil, cultic, moral trichotomy used by many scholars and bravely illustrated interpretive methodology by focusing on Leviticus 19:19 and making it meaningful to modern believers.

Cole’s work on narrative is helpful, but the reader might begin with the chapter summary and work backward. Rick Byargeon’s chapter on wisdom literature and poetry is technically accurate, but does not offer much interpretive help to the reader. Unfortunately, Byargeon wrote the chapter on the genre of prophecy ignoring the poetic nature of most prophetic writings. As is typically done, he followed Westerman’s form critical approach to types of prophetic oracles, but failed to emphasize the reason why this approach should be used and how it contributes to understanding. Writing on NT genres William Warren (Narrative and Apocalyptic) and Rodney Reeves (Letters) offered sound advice but little that is new.

William Kirkpatrick began part five, “From Exegesis to Proclamation,” with the idea of providing help in moving from biblical text to theological formulation. Except for making the reader aware of the importance of doing something with the results of interpretation, Kirkpatrick, unfortunately, did not substantially help the local church practitioner (clergy or laity). Daniel Sanchez’ chapter on contextualization is a little confusing as it moves back and forth

between the context of the biblical text and the context of the modern interpreter. His attempt to help the interpreter understand culturally-conditioned texts is too brief to be helpful. The final three chapters of part five focus on preaching—despite the fact that teaching scripture, whether from pulpit or lectern, is a vital ministry of church. Many seminary trained pastors, directors of missions, missionaries, etc. will spend at least as much time teaching as preaching. Seminary educators should know that!

This volume is good and is helpful. Southern Baptists may want to use a textbook produced by our own scholars. However, the volume does not seem quite as helpful as such works as Klein, Blomberg, and Hubbard's *Introduction to Biblical Interpretation* or Grant Osborne's *The Hermeneutical Spiral*.

Albert F. Bean  
Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary

*Leviticus*. by Mark F. Rooker. The New American Commentary Series. Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 2000, 352 pp., \$27.99 hardback.

Dr. Mark Rooker writes that Leviticus “loudly speaks” of Jesus (22). Why then do evangelical teachers and preachers struggle so with the book? Why do Christians know so little about its contents, meaning, and application? Why has the church largely ignored the book, while Jews taught it first to their children?

Readers expect authors to be knowledgeable and enthusiastic about their writings, and Dr. Rooker meets those expectations. Holding a Ph.D. from Brandeis with additional study at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, Dr. Rooker teaches at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary. He is a translator and an editor for the Holman Christian Standard Bible. His enthusiasm for Leviticus is evident in the opening articles of this volume in which Dr. Rooker stresses the importance of Leviticus for contemporary Christians, deals with the issue of Christians and Old Testament Law, and connects the sacrificial work of Christ to the system of sacrifice laid out in Leviticus.

New American Commentary (NAC) users will already be aware of the characteristics of the series. The editors' Preface notes the series focuses on the “theological structure” of each book as well as the content. Theological structure deals with the way in which the pieces of a book fit together, noting the flow of the inspired author's argument. This healthy approach undercuts “prooftexting” and the ignoring of a text's literary context. Further, attention to structure assumes and builds on the unity of a biblical book. The NAC is a series for modern Christians, maintaining that the principles and theology of God-breathed works from an ancient time and place are directly applicable to contemporary believers' lives. Thus, Leviticus, according to Dr. Rooker, is concerned with the preservation of the covenant relationship between a sinful people and their holy God, which is a contemporary need as well as an ancient one (44).

The journey from the second millennium B. C. to the third millennium A. D. passes through the New Testament. Consequently, the interpreter and reader must deal with three contexts: Old Testament, New Testament, and

contemporary. Obviously the original understanding and use is important, but how is the Old-New Testament link to be understood?

In the New Testament, the book of Hebrews makes countless connections between the sacrificial system of Leviticus and the work of Christ. Some interpreters through the centuries have keyed on that sort of study and produced works which reflected more of the interpreter's mind than biblical truth. Dr. Rooker's more balanced methodology is to seek the intention of the original author while recognizing correspondences and patterns which link the Old Testament events with the New Testament events and persons. His *typological* method of study is more restrained and helpful, giving place to the original setting and avoiding allegorical excesses. Recognizing the correspondences and patterns, Rooker links Leviticus and Christ without reducing the importance of understanding Leviticus in its original setting (43-44).

Readers should never skip the introductory material provided by a commentary author, and Dr. Rooker has written a helpful introduction to his volume. Of course some portions of the introductory material are more helpful than others. This reviewer assumes that most readers of the NAC series have already made up their mind about the Graff-Wellhausen Documentary Hypothesis (JEDP theory). Although the theory may have had some value in the time of its development and despite the occasional attempt to "tweak" the theory, today evangelical scholars have ignored or moved beyond it. Still Dr. Rooker devotes fifteen pages or so to a seemingly unnecessary critique of this theory.

This critique leads into a discussion of Leviticus' authorship and date. Following many other evangelical scholars, Rooker's view is that Jesus' reference to Moses in connection with the Law, traditions of authorship, and scholarly evidence prove that Moses wrote the Law, including Leviticus (39). Other scholars, like John Hartley for example (*Leviticus*, Word Books, 1992, xli), suggest a complex developmental history for the book.

Dr. Rooker devotes about twenty pages to theological themes from Leviticus. Many readers will find this material dense. Generally, however, Rooker's views are helpful and encourage further study. He does not overwhelm the reader with Hebrew or with comparative data from cultures surrounding Israel. When dealing with sacrifice, though, the author, not quite as forthcoming as he should be, needs to admit that we do not know as much about the everyday use of the sacrificial system as we imply that we do. Within the twenty pages dealing with themes, Rooker devotes fourteen pages to the theme of atonement. The longest portion in his discussion of atonement, in turn, is devoted to atonement in the New Testament.

"The Law and the Christian" (71-77) is, in this reviewer's opinion, one of the most important. Rooker discusses the purpose of the Law for Israel, the New Testament and the Law, and the unity of the Law. He points out that obedience to the Law was not a way for Israel to be saved. God's people, both then and now, are saved by grace through faith. The Law was a means of living a holy life. Dr. Rooker sided with Gordon Wenham, in Wenham's discussion of the moral and civil laws, in seeing the principles behind those laws as enduring and applicable to believers today (*Leviticus*, Eerdmans, 1979, 35). Dr. Rooker plays down the Law versus grace dichotomy (which this reviewer would reject even

more strongly), while pointing to the Law as a way of shaping a holy life in response to God's grace. The Law was a badge and a boundary that does not apply to Christians today, but the Law still demonstrates what it means to live a life of holiness (69).

Since the New Testament calls us to give ourselves as living sacrifices (Rom. 12:1) students of Scripture can benefit from a better understanding of sacrifice. Dr. Rooker's volume helps provide this better understanding. Unfortunately, Rooker retains most of the traditional terms for the types of sacrifice: burnt, cereal, sin, and guilt offerings (50). But, he does refer to "peace offerings" as "fellowship offerings." Following John Hartley's lead would have been more helpful, referring to: whole, grain, well-being, purification, and reparation offerings (Hartley, *Leviticus*, 17f, 37f, 55f, and 76f). Still Rooker provides helpful explanations providing sufficient detail without overwhelming the reader. He classifies sacrifices, for instance, as either voluntary or involuntary based on the phrase "pleasing to the Lord" (which relates to voluntary offerings). And he retains the theological functions of propitiation or expiation, consecration, and fellowship in discussing the purpose of sacrifices.

In commenting on the priestly sections of Leviticus, Dr. Rooker relates the material to the New Testament. He goes beyond the expected connections with Jesus' identity and ministry as the ultimate priest in order to comment on the role of ministers among modern believers. Another Old Testament-New Testament connection is not so agreeable, relating sins done with a "high hand" (Numbers 15:27-36) and the sin against the Holy Spirit (Matthew 12:31). While "high-handed" sins are deliberate, even defiant, sins, whether or not they are "unpardonable" sins is open to interpretation. Perhaps Rooker relied too heavily on Walter Kaiser's characterization of these sins as "high treason and revolt against God with the upraised, clenched fist" (*Toward an Old Testament Theology*, Zondervan, 1978, 118).

Leviticus raises some questions we cannot answer, such as what was God's principle in designating some animals as clean and others as unclean. Rooker noted six criteria that scholars have used to explain the distinction—none of which is totally satisfying. So he concludes rightly that "the ultimate reason for these laws was simply that God commanded them" (173). This is as close as scholars get to saying "I don't know."

Dr. Rooker maintains that holiness is the main concern of Leviticus (47). This concern is a priestly and a "popular" one (to be incorporated in the lifestyle of non-priests). Consequently, as much as half of Leviticus is devoted to how to live a holy life. In dealing with this portion, the commentary author makes relatively little application. Perhaps this is because modern readers can make contemporary applications of this material with greater ease than with the priestly material.

The NAC volume on Leviticus is quite helpful and offers reliable information to the average reader, whether pastor, Bible teacher, or serious student. More helpful than Wenham's NICOT work on Leviticus, the NAC offering is not quite as helpful as John Hartley's commentary in the Word series when it comes to understanding Leviticus in its ancient setting. Neither of those two volumes, though, has Rooker's New Testament connections. Dr. Rooker did not write a sermonic tool like Alan Ross (*Holiness to the Lord*, Baker, 2002),

but he did provide a good commentary which can be a tool by which this largely unknown biblical book can be opened to all of God's people.

Albert F. Bean  
Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary

*The Making of American Liberal Theology: Imagining Progressive Religion, 1805-1900.* By Gary Dorrien. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001, 494 pp., \$39.95 soft cover.

Gary Dorrien, in this first of a projected three-volume project, has made a unique contribution to our understanding of the dominant theological movement of the past two centuries. *The Making of American Liberal Theology: Imagining Progressive Religion, 1805-1900* traces the special development of theological liberalism on American soil. Dorrien hopes not only to recapture the fascinating and tortuous trajectory of progressive religion in America, but also to define American liberalism inductively through painstaking historical and biographical study. By alternating between careful and colorful attention to the early figures of protestant liberalism and broad but penetrating theological and historical analyses, Dorrien sets a high standard for historical theologians worthy of the title.

In the end Dorrien defines liberalism as a mediationist movement set within a Victorian cultural landscape, offering a third way between atheism and authoritarian orthodoxies. While sharing the mediationist impulse of its older German counterpart, early American liberalism did not take its Kant and Schleiermacher straight. Instead, Continental liberalism was mediated principally through British poet and religious philosopher Samuel Taylor Coleridge. Unlike Schleiermacher, Coleridge associated the religious nature of humanity with the faculty of imagination, not with a particular modification of feeling as such. Despite this distinction, Dorrien set American liberalism squarely within the expressivist tradition and left it open to Karl Barth's charge that theology is abandoned in favor of anthropology and Feuerbach's insistence that all religion is reducible to human projection of one sort or another.

Dorrien chronicles the trajectory of American liberalism through its Unitarian beginnings with special attention to William Ellery Channing, its Transcendentalist development under the influence of Ralph Waldo Emerson and Theodore Parker, and its decisive representation in the thinking of Horace Bushnell, who emerges as the principle figure in the nineteenth century. Channing, the great Unitarian, normalized the reinterpretation of traditional doctrines among liberals as objective views of Christ's atonement were displaced by subjective ones, especially along the lines of moral influence theories of Christ's earthly ministry and crucifixion. Transcendentalist confidence in unmediated, intuited knowledge challenged the Lockean empiricist influence among liberals, paralleling the tension between rationalist and romanticist impulses which had characterized German liberalism.

Still, the resiliency of American Liberalism cannot be accounted for apart from its popularizing pulpiteers, with Henry Ward Beecher epitomizing the

hegemonic status the movement once enjoyed. Dorrien also engages the complicated grappling of progressivist American religion with science, evolution, Scottish Common Sense Realism, and personalism as well as its decisive intersections with various social causes such as abolitionism and Social Gospel movement. The narrative is advanced through deft, informed treatments of the main figures of the movement, bringing them to life, with all their tragedy and triumph, warts and all. At the same time Dorrien punctuates his account with provocative interpretive takes on the movement as a whole.

Evangelicals have much to gain and learn from Dorrien's effort. Those who settle for sloppy, uninformed caricatures of liberalism would do well to engage the task of definition more seriously as Dorrien has done, if for no other reason, to avoid the genuine dangers of true liberalism. Liberalism's condescending view of the Bible, weak view of sin, and idolatrous projection of gods and images of Jesus it finds relevant are all presented here boldly and without apology. The refreshing element is that Liberals tend to admit what they are doing while evangelicals may fall into strikingly similar modes of operation in preaching, evangelism, church growth and mission strategizing without the slightest twinge of guilt. The current popular spirituality being imbibed through new age literature, the influence of Oprah Winfrey and the spreading and strengthening of political correctness has its roots in certain formative convictions of progressivist religion generally and Protestant liberalism particularly. Aversion to doctrine, defining truth according to felt relevance, and the quest for self-fulfillment as life's highest value have penetrated ostensibly evangelical pulpits, marginalizing the Bible while giving place to the psychology of self-esteem and advice from the business world. Dorrien's work may open evangelical eyes to the liberal shape of their own ministries.

*The Making of American Liberalism* marks a significant advance in the comprehension of progressivist religion by taking us deeper into the nineteenth century development of Liberalism beyond the confines of its German exponents from Friedrich Schleiermacher to Adolf von Harnack. If subsequent volumes maintain the standard set by Dorrien in this first installment, the resulting trilogy will be the unrivaled standard in the field.

Mark DeVine  
Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary

*Beyond the Bounds: Open Theism and the Understanding of Biblical Christianity*. Edited by John Piper, Justin Taylor, and Paul Kjoss Helseth. Wheaton, Illinois: Crossway Books 2003, 416 pp., \$15.99 paper.

Two major controversies have commanded the attention of evangelicals over the last several years, namely the so-called "New Perspective" on Paul and the rise of "Free Will Theism," also known as the "Openness of God" position. *Beyond the Bounds* represents a recent contribution by evangelicals who view Free Will Theism as heretical. John Piper, Pastor of Bethlehem Baptist Church in Minneapolis, Justin Taylor, Director of Theological Resources and Education at Desiring God Ministries, and Paul Kjoss Helseth, Assistant Professor of Bible

and Philosophy at Northwestern College, share editorial duties in bringing together contributions from twelve evangelical scholars in this volume.

The authors are concerned that the heretical character of Openness is too little recognized among self-consciously evangelical communities. Does the Free Will Theism advanced by John Sanders, Greg Boyd, Clark Pinnock and others fall within the bounds of tolerable evangelical diversity as its proponents argue? *Beyond the Bounds* answers with a collective and resounding “No!” These authors agree with Timothy George who insists that in Openness of God teaching we are confronted with a sub-Christian deity who cannot be identified with the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. By denying God’s complete knowledge of the future in order to secure its own notion of responsible human willing and doing, *Beyond the Bounds* authors contend that both biblical and orthodox Christianity have been abandoned. Robbed of his sovereign ruling over history and bedecked with humanlike responsiveness and surpriseability, the deity of Openness has more in common with the sympathetic but finally pitiful God of Process Theology than with the universe creating, promise keeping God of the Bible.

Bruce Ware and John Frame, among others, have already produced major challenges to the orthodox status of Free Will theism but, in the estimation of the editors, the evolving nature of this movement demands further engagement of the issues raised. The nature and extent of the relationship of Openness to Molinism and Process Theology, as well as the precise nuances in the understanding of such decisive terms as “libertarian free will” and “middle knowledge” merit careful and ongoing attention at a time when the doctrinal bounds of fellowship among evangelicals are being tested.

The volume divides eleven chapters into five parts and provides a bibliography along with scripture, person, and subject indices. Parts 1 through 3 examine respectively, 1) the historical influences shaping the controversy, 2) philosophical presuppositions underlying the opposing positions, and 3) determinative biblical and hermeneutical questions. In Part 1, Russell Fuller denies Openness claims that Rabbinic views of divine providence parallel those of Free Will theists. Chad Brand defends classical theism against the old but now recycled charge that Greek philosophy has distorted the simple message of the Bible. Brand recognizes similarities between western philosophy and classical theism but denies any distorting dependence of the latter upon the former. On the other hand Brand charges Openness thought with captivity by an alien thought form, namely, that of Whiteheadian Process philosophy.

In Part 2, Mark Talbot and William Davis distinguish the compatibilist view of free will held out to saved sinners through Christ from the libertarian freedom demanded by Openness advocates. William Davis identifies historical and cultural factors favorable to Openness convictions. These include suspicion of authority, infatuation with liberty, and doctrinal latitudinarianism. Davis also considers the rise of extra-ecclesial spirituality fertile ground for the humanistic bent of Free Will Theism.

Unlike Process theologians, the new Openness thinkers claim that their views are more genuinely biblical than those of classical theists. In Part 3, A. B. Caneday challenges one of these claims by charging Free Will theists with the reification of biblical anthropomorphism. Against such interpretations Caneday

defends an orthodox reading wherein humanity's creation *imago Dei* implies not only similarity but also difference from the creator. Michael Horton revisits the charge that classical theists succumb to distortive Hellenization with particular reference to Reformed theological method. Horton finds Openness claims overdrawn and exaggerated.

The remainder of the book explores doctrinal and pastoral dangers of Free Will Theism. From the inerrancy of Scripture to the trustworthiness of God to the viability of the gospel message itself, the authors would sound an alarm in the wake of Openness thinking. The pastoral sensitivity of these authors is impressive and render this volume useful for hands-on ministers called upon to interpret the current theological crisis to lay Christians.

On the whole, it seems that the principle protagonists in the controversy are laboring both to articulate their own positions as clearly as possible and to understand their opponents without prejudice. This volume does advance this admirable quest for clarity. However, as clarity increases, so does the conviction that the defining assertions of Free Will Theism place it outside the bounds of evangelical, not to mention Christian orthodoxy.

Mark DeVine  
Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary

*The Imperative of Preaching: A Theology of Sacred Rhetoric*. By John Carrick. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 2002, 202 pp.

John Carrick's book begins with a quotation from Dr. J. Gresham Machen's *Christianity and Liberalism*: "Christianity begins with a triumphant indicative" (7). The truth of this statement is a leading premise of this "theology of sacred rhetoric." Carrick is Assistant Professor of Applied and Doctrinal Theology at Greenville Presbyterian Theological Seminary and is also one of its preaching instructors. He graduated from Oxford University and has had pastorates in the U. K. and in Greenville, North Carolina. This is his first book.

Clearing away confusion over abuses about the current connotation of the word "rhetoric," Carrick asserts that it is "the preacher's duty to *persuade*" (3). And, he is to do this "in absolute dependence upon the Spirit of God" (3). Yet, this does not preclude the use of means which God has ordained to move men. He claims that the *indicative-imperative* method was utilized in the Scriptures and is mandated as a pattern for preaching by God himself as a theological axiom. God has also used the *exclamative* and the *interrogative*, which are forms of the indicative that Carrick treats separately. The work of preaching, according to Carrick, is about these four grammatical or rhetorical categories.

Carrick defines the above terms, illustrates, and exemplifies them from the Bible, and then from the sermons of five well-known preachers: Jonathan Edwards, George Whitefield, Samuel Davies, Asahel Nettleton, and Martyn Lloyd-Jones (all highly effective "experimental Calvinists"). Finally Carrick considers "*the indicative-imperative structure of New Testament Christianity in relation to a particular genre of preaching within the Reformed tradition, namely, redemptive-historical preaching*" (5-6).

Machen, the author explains, differentiated between liberalism and true Christianity through the grammatical moods presented in their divergent preaching styles. He believed that “liberalism is altogether in the imperative mood” (7) rather than the indicative. “The liberal preacher offers us exhortation. . . . The Christian evangelist . . . offers . . . not exhortation but a gospel” (7). In other words, we are under obligation to get the order right because God’s message is about facts.

The indicative or declarative then is the foundational mood in the Scriptures. As R. L. Dabney offers, “I remark that every good sermon is instructive” (15). Carrick quotes Martyn Lloyd-Jones:

The Bible is not a book with just an appeal to us to do this, that, or the other—to accept certain ideas and put them into practice. It’s not a book teaching morality or ethics or anything else. I’ll tell you what it is—it’s not a book, I say, that asks us primarily to do anything—it’s a great announcement of what God has done! It’s God *acting!* (17).

The exclamatory and the interrogative mood are subsets, in a way, to the indicative. The exclamatory is the indicative in a highly emotional state. The Bible writers use such words as “how,” “what,” “Oh,” and “Woe” to express the indicative in vibrant emotive tones. A sermon is more than delivering a paper. Although the interrogative is part of the indicative, it “does not so much *assert* objective fact as *question* objective fact” (57). J. W. Alexander, Carrick reminds us, describes interrogation as “a sure method, when employed at the proper time and place, of startling the hearers, and agitating the heart” (68). Using C. S. Lewis’ metaphor, Carrick sees the interrogative as a means to “put man back in the dock” (81).

Two chapters are dedicated to the imperative in preaching. The first is an expansion of earlier comments, with special attention to both Scripture and the five preachers of his study. The second chapter is wrestles with the “redemptive-historical” method of preaching introduced in The Netherlands Reformed churches in the 1930s and 1940s. Carrick concludes that the redemptive-historical position “leads to objective sermons, mere explication, lectures on redemptive history, and sermons without tangible relevance” (113).

This work is not so much a novel look at homiletics as it is a succinct, reachable presentation analyzing the art of preaching from a theology that believes God has *done* something in redemptive history. We explain, and *then* we command (23). It is the indicative, “Christ died for our sins” (1 Cor 15:3), then the imperative, “Repent and believe in the gospel” (Mark 1:15). It is the indicative, “We . . . died to sin” (Rom 6:2), then the imperative, “Reckon yourselves to be dead indeed to sin” (Rom 6:11).

Carrick’s approach is didactic but not pedantic. It is not designed, interestingly, to *move* the reader; that is, it does not itself use the *imperative* (though he does illustrate it). His plan is *not* to inspire, give homespun counsel from a veteran, or provide steps to prepare a sermon. It is not to present the all-purpose workbook for preaching. He does force the reader to think of fact/application as something more than device. It is mandated by the activity of God in history and the word of God itself.

Though the book is not intended to stand alone as a comprehensive preaching text, it is a valuable supplemental study for discerning how sermons might be better aligned with orthodox Scriptural method and the patterns of some of the world's most effective preachers. And, it is presented clearly enough that any thinking pastor might find it useful. It could, for instance, be among those book choices for a pastor who wishes to take a special season, once a year or so, to evaluate his preaching—not a bad idea for most of us. The only chapter that might provide a challenge to the average pastor is the section on the opposing argument of the redemptive-historical school.

The book has the effect of balancing the preacher. The man who leans heavily, almost exclusively on the imperative will no doubt see both his theological and tactical error; and the man who is only an instructional preacher will understand that the Scripture authors and some of the world's finest preachers labored at the imperative for good reason. This is its best use.

Jim Elliff

Christian Communicators Worldwide, Parkville, MO

*The How and Why of Love: An Introduction to Evangelical Ethics.* Michael Hill. Kingsford, Australia: Matthias Media, 2002, 278 pp., approx. \$18.00 soft cover.

*The How and Why of Love*, by Michael Hill, falls reassuringly in line with several evangelical summaries of Christian ethics (e.g., Stephen Davis' *Evangelical Ethics* (Revised edition, 1993) and Paul and John Feinberg's *Ethics for a Brave New World* (1993)). Hill defends no eccentric views here, which trend ought to be seen in a positive light. Few scholars can surprise us without also being wrong, and Hill gives us what we should have expected.

Hill begins his work by defining the central concepts of ethical discourse, including "morality," "descriptive ethics," "normative ethics," and "meta-ethics" (13-19). This is all done clearly, and what follows next is an argument for treating the data of biblical morality analytically (20-22). Some might argue, for example, that one could settle all questions merely by reading the Bible carefully; but Hill shows us that we need to go further.

If we do not access the underlying logic of our texts, discovering their fundamental principles, we shall understand the former incompletely. We may also expect, as in fact we now discover each day, that modern life confronts us with questions not directly answered by the Scriptures. In that case, having no theory of Christian morality on hand, we shall choose between two unacceptable alternatives: offer no counsel regarding these issues or pretend our texts say expressly what in fact they do not.

Chapter 2 of Hill's work describes three types of moral theory, each one of which has its defenders even today. These would be the deontological, teleological, and consequentialist approaches. The first is illustrated with reference to Immanuel Kant and the second with reference to Thomas Aquinas (23-31). Hill does not connect consequentialism with any particular name, though Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832) would have sufficed for his purposes.

Eventually, having found fault with each of these approaches as a free-standing system, Hill advocates an eclectic usage of them all, including theories of virtue. So, for example, we would regard morality of duty and that of virtue as complementary facets of the same overall system (39).

The trouble with this solution, however, is that it stands down from doing what a workable theory of morality ought to do, *viz.* establish priorities. One cannot delay forever answering the question, “In a moral dilemma, which counts for more: the formal characteristics of one’s actions or its consequences?” Likewise, a complementary relationship between theories of virtue and duty will succeed just to the extent that the former do not take the latter’s results as a starting point. But one suspects that they would, after all; and in that case their relationship is hierarchical rather than complementary.

Chapter 3 contains some useful remarks about the ethicist’s need to use the Bible in hermeneutically sound ways. We must attend closely to the various settings of our texts—ancient Israel versus the first century church—and also avoid highly subjective approaches to them. So, for example, Hill laments the model which “describe(s) God’s call to specific individuals like Moses or Elijah and infers that this pattern of relating to God is the pattern to be followed by all Christians” (45). Likewise, the natural law theorist is correctly faulted for assuming that pure reason, unaided by Scripture and the Spirit, can always see what the divine purpose of each object of moral action might be (48). Finally, Hill argues that the three disciplines which support evangelical ethics, *viz.* exegesis, biblical theology and systematic theology, must relate to one another interactively (49-54).

In chapter 4, Hill begins to describe his broadly teleological approach to Christian ethics, according to which the good for anything follows from its God-given nature and the final purpose or end that God has chosen for it. In chapter five, Hill argues that the final goal for human beings consists in having mutual love relationships, so that each person seeks the benefit of others first and expresses his love toward God in obedience to him. Chapter 6 then explores the relationship between social and personal ethics, concluding that theories of morality which see human beings as islands (individualism) or cogs (collectivism), grasp only half the truth about us. We exist as individuals in relationship, and our responsibilities arise within this framework (99-120).

Eventually, Hill moves on to consider several dilemmas of modern life, the first of which is “Sex and Marriage” (139-154). Here he tries to illuminate the biblical stance on this topic by taking us through six stages of revelation drawn from chapter 4:

1. The Kingdom Pattern Established EDEN
2. The Fall ADAM’S SIN
3. The Kingdom Promised ABRAHAM
4. The Kingdom Foreshadowed DAVID-SOLOMON
5. The Kingdom at Hand JESUS CHRIST
6. The Kingdom Consummated THE RETURN OF CHRIST (59)

The epochs named above are useful, of course, but not always: at times, one has to admit, they seem merely to get in the way as constructs laid upon otherwise

clear texts. For example, under the heading “The Kingdom Foreshadowed DAVID-SOLOMON,” Hill refers mostly to texts of the Pentateuch and devotes a single paragraph to the Song of Songs. Stage 4 demanded more commentary, it seems, than the David/Solomon combination had to offer. In any case, his conclusions regarding the proper expression of sexuality falls in line with conservative evangelical approaches; and the same can be said of his answer to the dilemmas of divorce and remarriage, found in chapter 10: there are two exceptions, *viz.* adultery and abandonment by an unbelieving spouse (155-175).

Hill’s treatment of homosexuality is largely unremarkable—i.e. it is forbidden in Scripture—save for his apparent endorsement of the ‘homophobia’ diagnosis. He writes, “The persecution of homosexuals seems to have been caused, in the main, by a psychological condition found amongst heterosexuals, called homophobia” (177). But the credentials of this modern disease are suspect, given its vulnerability to theoretical bracket creep. Today we must get over our fear—as opposed to strong censure—of homosexual acts; tomorrow the same imperative will apply to pedophilia. One may be forgiven, it seems, if he supposes that “homophobia” is merely an attempt to subject properly felt moral disgust to patronizing psychological therapy. Likewise, Hill’s politeness crosses the line when he writes, “Nor should (Christians) punish people for their defective moral choices. Judgment belongs to God” (202-203; cf. 1 Corinthians 5 *passim*). Surely it is permissible, say, to discriminate against a confirmed drunkard, not hiring him to operate heavy machinery. But in that case, it must be defensible to reject confirmed homosexuals as Boy Scout leaders and child care workers.

Hill covers the issues of euthanasia and abortion competently, but he avoids tackling one of the major dilemmas of the pro-life stance (which he adopts), *viz.* do we require a raped woman to carry a child to term? Hill says, “There may be other cases where abortion would be justified. The example of pregnancy due to rape is often cited. But such cases are far from clear” (227). In fact, such cases are horrifyingly clear. We must do the painful thing, *viz.* urge a profoundly victimized woman to bear the child. The logic of the pro-life position leads to that conclusion and no other one.

In general, then, this is satisfying treatment of Christian ethics. It is clearly written, save for its awkward, gender inclusive language (everywhere that “he” goes, “she” is sure to follow), and charitably argued. Hill updates several arguments developed in the 1980s, and North American readers might also appreciate his frequent references to current events in Australia, perhaps a forgotten member among the English speaking nations.

Thorvald B. Madsen  
Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary

*Am I My Brother’s Keeper? The Ethical Frontiers of Biomedicine.* By Arthur L. Caplan. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997, 241 pp., \$29.95.

Arthur Caplan is one of the leading bioethicists in the United States today. As the chair of the Department of Medical Ethics and Director of the Center for

Bioethics at the University of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia, he is widely quoted in the popular media. *Am I My Brother's Keeper?* is a summary of Caplan's analysis on several contemporary issues in medical ethics. It also gives some idea of the worldview from which he operates.

While autonomy reigns supreme in many secular discussions of medical ethics, Caplan argues autonomy in and of itself is not a sufficient basis for a cohesive paradigm of medical ethics. Instead, Caplan advocates an approach which emphasizes the fact that medicine happens in a community. Critiquing American bioethics, he says, "Our collective obsession with autonomy has blinded us to the need to rely upon one another at moments of weakness, illness, and death" (xxiii).

Caplan places more emphasis on beneficence and trust than on autonomy. He also clarifies what autonomy itself does and does not mean when he says, "The freedom requisite for personal self-determination, freedom from interference, is not the same as the freedom to act on any preference or choice, to be entitled to any and all things which might be desired." (6). Evangelicals should note this differentiation when criticizing autonomy-based systems. Autonomy as *non-coercion* is an important part of any well-ordered approach to medical research and this is consistent with the biblical witness. In contrast, libertarian autonomy, the "freedom to act on any preference or choice," is not consistent with Scripture.

Caplan also affirms an evolutionary worldview. He says, "All organisms, including human beings, are the product of a long course of biological evolution" (162). He goes on to say that our organs are "designed by evolution" to perform certain functions and that health can be defined as the proper exercise of these intended functions (162). Caplan also says, "Survival and reproduction are the only goals that matter for evolution" (163). In response, one wonders how an impersonal mechanism can "design" anything or have any "goal." Thus, he appears to assign metaphysical properties to Darwinian natural selection.

What is the major crisis for health care in the near future? According to Caplan, "the crucial moral challenge to those providing health care for the rest of this century and well into the next is how best to preserve professional integrity while trying to achieve greater efficiencies in the delivery of services in order to contain costs" (142). Essentially, he is addressing the challenge posed by the allocation of scarce resources among competing demands. Thus, it is vital that health care professionals, insurance companies, and others cultivate trust. The fact is that many patients have legitimate concerns "about the compatibility of business ethics with health care ethics when those at the bedside are forced to make hard choices about the allocation of resources" (143). Evangelicals should take note of Caplan's analysis at this point.

Conservative Christians engaged in medical ethics have focused their energy on affirming the sanctity of human life, and rightly so. Yet, evangelical engagement on the allocation of scarce resources has largely been limited to opposition of both socialized medicine and the proposed Clinton reforms of the mid-1990s. More work needs to be done to apply the biblical principle of justice to the allocation of medical resources among various constituencies. As one example of the type of issues involved with the allocation of medical resources, Caplan offers some trenchant insight into artificial heart research and asks a

penetrating question: “The costs of doing the first [totally artificial heart] implants ran into the many hundreds of thousands of dollars. Does it make more sense to pursue other options for the treatment of heart disease or even the prevention of heart disease?” (39)

Among the many other issues that Caplan touches on in this work is the use of the “Nazi” analogy in medical ethics, fetal tissue experimentation, and human cloning. Concerning the “Nazi” analogy, Caplan suggests that it may indeed be useful, but that most people who use the analogy today fail to do so with “even a minimum of precision” (78). Concerning fetal tissue research, he argues that pro-life opposition uses faulty argumentation. At the same time, he also says that advocates of fetal tissue research have “hyped” promises about the value of such research (45). Research cloning may be acceptable, but reproductive cloning is more questionable.

*Am I My Brother’s Keeper?* is a good example a secular approach to medical ethics based on general principles of trust and beneficence as opposed to autonomy. Evangelicals will find themselves agreeing with some aspects of Caplan’s analysis while rejecting his worldview.

J. Alan Branch  
Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary

*The Reproduction Revolution: A Christian Appraisal of Sexuality, Reproductive Technologies, and the Family.* Edited by John F. Kilner, Paige C. Cunningham, and W. David Hager. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2000, xvi + 290 pp., \$20.00 paper.

In popular discourse, the issues of artificial reproductive technology, human cloning, and human sexuality are often compartmentalized as people attempt to deal with each of these issues in isolation. *The Reproductive Revolution* is a credible attempt to demonstrate that these issues really are all part of a seamless garment and must be addressed as such. A compilation of twenty-six different contributions from ethicists, medical professionals, theologians, and lawyers, the book is divided into an introduction and five major sections.

The introduction gives different perspectives on reproductive difficulties. Section one addresses foundational issues concerning meta-questions related to the ethics of the new reproductive technologies. Section two examines specific technologies. Section three addresses two difficult cases: Surrogacy and the morality of oral contraceptives. Section four is a response to the sexual revolution while section five is more oriented towards public policy issues.

Pastors can be overwhelmed by the vast changes taking place in bioethics. Perhaps the most significant point made by this collection is that the issues of human sexuality and reproductive freedom cannot be separated, a point every Christian minister must grasp. In his article titled “Separating Sex and Reproduction,” eminent evangelical ethicist Nigel Cameron makes this point explicitly clear. He returns to a theme that he has emphasized in other venues and points out that the cursory debate that occurred twenty years ago among evangelicals about in vitro fertilization has led to a situation in which

“Christians have failed to engage in a theological critique of contemporary challenges to the notion of human value and the significance of technology” (32).

Gilbert Meilaender’s article addresses some of the question begging that occurs in popular debate about reproductive technology. Pastors should pay close attention to Meilaender’s comments because many people in our churches avail themselves to artificial reproductive technologies without thinking through the morality of these procedures. In light of this, Meilaender emphasizes that an intimate connection exists between the act of sexual intercourse and a proper view of children. He says, “Many of the new reproductive technologies will involve the use of third parties. In so doing they break the connection between love-giving and life-giving in marriage” (44).

The articles related to the morality of the oral contraceptive pill (OCP) are especially helpful. Randy Alcorn and Walter Larimore assert that the OCP is morally unacceptable because it functions as an abortifacient. While I disagree with Alcorn’s position, I believe this article is a “must-read” for pastors because many evangelicals have adopted a position similar to Alcorn’s. Basically, Alcorn argues that use of the OCP reduces the endometrial thickness. Therefore, on the occasions when a woman using an OCP conceives, the endometrium is not thick enough for the conceptus to implant. Thus, Alcorn argues, the OCP not only prevents pregnancy, but acts as an abortifacient in the case of pregnancy.

In contrast, the article, “Using Hormone Contraceptives Is a Decision Involving Science, Scripture, and Conscience,” by Crockett, DeCook, Harrison, and Hersh provides a strong argument that use of the OCP is morally acceptable. Crockett, *et al.* point out that Alcorn’s theory is just that, a theory. The supposed abortifacient action has never been observed. The authors state, “The abortifacient theory is *not* a fact . . . The concept of a ‘hostile endometrium’ is contrary to the known physiological effect of ovulatory estrogen and progesterone on the uterine lining.” (193). The authors go on to ask the right question when they say, “If there are righteous reasons to contracept, then are there righteous *means* to contracept” (198)?

This debate about use of the OCP is actually a smaller part of a huge debate within Christendom: Can and should the unitive and procreative aspects of intercourse ever be separated? With this in mind, I suspect that some of the most strident opponents of the OCP are actually driven by a deeper opposition to contraception in principle. That said, both articles are respectful of differing opinions and are a good starting point for discussion. Christian leaders who want to be informed about the debate surrounding the OCP can use these articles as a good starting point for developing their own conclusion on the issue.

These strengths noted, *The Reproduction Revolution* could have been stronger at a few points. Gracie Hsu Yu’s article “Making Laws and Changing Hearts” is very irenic. However, Yu may give too much credit to the compassionate motives of pro-choice advocates. She does not address the radical notion of autonomy that drives much of pro-choice thinking (A connection alluded to in Kilner’s article on pages 132-136). Joe McIlhaney’s article, “Sex in America,” has many fine points, but I feel he blurs some important worldview distinctions between Buddhism and Christianity when he

says without qualification, “Buddhism has five major precepts, one of which is sexual purity. The Dalai Lama . . . writes very clearly of marriage being the place for sex” (219). It should be made clear that Buddhism’s approach towards sex is closely related with the desire to break free from the cycle of reincarnation. He also indicates that Darwin was influenced by Malthus in 1864 (220). In reality, Malthus’ influence on Darwin goes back much earlier. As a final thought for possible improvement, it would have been helpful if one article brought the many themes of the book together in a conclusion.

*Reproductive Revolution* is a needed contribution to current debate among Christians about the morality of different reproductive technologies. As Cameron notes, in vitro fertilization does not occur in a moral vacuum. There are many assumptions about the new technologies which Christians have not examined with a critical mind. This work brings together various issues into one forum and for that it should be commended.

J. Alan Branch  
Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary

*Hymns We Love to Sing*. Edited by Jane Parker Huber. Louisville: Geneva Press, 2001, 218 pp., \$12.95.

On the supposed tail end of the worship wars over choruses and hymns comes a volume such as this: a hymnary of favorites for personal enjoyment. It was clear from the foreword that the primary purpose of this small hymnal was to collect some old hymns with special meaning. The editor, respected Presbyterian hymnist, Jane Parker Huber, was joined by selectors Martha Gillis, the Reverend Paul Detterman, and Debbie Dierks in determining the content. The publisher, Geneva Press, is an imprint of the Presbyterian Publishing Corporation, Presbyterian Church (U. S. A.).

Available in both in hardback or a spiral bound paper cover, this book will more probably be found on someone’s piano at home than in the pews of a church. It is more expensive than the average pew edition of a hymnal and looks backward more than forward. Indeed, this volume is in contrast to the recent denominational hymnal, *The Presbyterian Hymnal: Hymns, Psalms, and Spiritual Songs*, edited by LindaJo McKim (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1990). Ms. Huber was part of the editorial committee for that hymnal. The task of that committee was to select diverse hymnody and to work toward more inclusive language. It was by design a largely forward-looking hymnal. *Hymns We Love to Sing* is apparently an after thought from the process of putting together the larger hymnal. Many of the songs included in *Hymns We Love* were also considered for inclusion in the 1990 denominational hymnal (7). These two collections have seventy-seven hymns in common.

Drawn from work composed from 1920 to 1950, *Hymns We Love* contains almost no material, either traditional or contemporary, which represents the second half of the twentieth century. Only two songs were composed later than 1960. A significant number of spirituals are included in the collection (an influence from the larger hymnal project). Being more of a book for the layman

than the professional worship planner, *Hymns We Love* contains only an index of first lines and common titles at the back of the book. A number of blank pages follow, perhaps for making personal notes. The titles of some familiar hymns are altered, such as “I Hear the Savior Say” instead of “Jesus Paid It All” or “Precious Name” instead of “Take the Name of Jesus with You.” This may prove confusing for some.

The table of contents is somewhat topical, being divided into two large categories: the Christian Year and Topical. Of the individual sections found under each category, three stand out in size. “Any Occasion” (the last category under “Topical”) contains 47 of the songbook’s 162 hymns. A distant second and third are “Life in Christ” (34 hymns) and “God” (22).

Baptist worshippers will find a number of familiar favorites but perhaps less gospels hymns than desired. For example, only the classic “Amazing Grace” speaks directly to the subject of God’s grace in salvation. There are few hymns about the blood of Christ, the Resurrection, and evangelism.

Although Presbyterians are known for working closely with the liturgical calendar in worship (and this is reflected in the contents page), there are actually few hymns listed under the Christian Year (only 18 in all). Being more of a personal devotional hymnal than one for corporate worship, there are also few invitation hymns, and most of those are hymns of personal response rather than pleas to the lost.

Musically, *Hymns We Love to Sing* is unremarkable. It contains no difficult rhythmic figures, asymmetrical time signatures, extreme vocal ranges, or startling harmonies. Most of the songs are scored in the traditional hymnic format. Several hymns have descants which provide a musical lift. There are occasional references to alternate tunes and keys which can be found in *The Presbyterian Hymnal* (1990). “Morning Has Broken” includes guitar chords. A couple of hymns have alternate harmonizations. “Here I Am, Lord” (based on a choral anthem by Daniel Schutte) is more a unison anthem with accompaniment.

The only other musical feature worthy of note is the inclusion of refrain fermatas in some of the gospel songs (see #83, #126, #149, #158, and #159). Interestingly, this folksy feature which captures the habit and practice among many Southern Baptist congregations was last found in the twentieth century Baptist hymnbook, *The Broadman Hymnal* published by Broadman Press in 1941 and edited by B. B. McKinney. *The Broadman Hymnal* was the first hymnal widely accepted by many Southern Baptist churches and was the precursor to the hymnals published by the denomination in 1956, 1975, and 1991.

One unique feature borrowed from the 1990 Presbyterian hymnal project is the translation of other languages alongside the English text. Three hymns have translations in Korean and one, “Amazing Grace” (#24), contains phonetic transcriptions of five different Native American Indian dialects. Due to the way the music and text are laid out, it is difficult to tell whether the five dialects are of one particular stanza or of all five stanzas in order.

With regard to the English language itself, most of the archaic metaphors and poetic texts are left undisturbed. However, three hymns do give a nod to the gender inclusiveness which is raging through modern hymnody. Although the original texts are not changed, footnotes provide options to replace the title

“Father” in each of the three. The footnote in #22 “Great Is Thy Faithfulness” suggests that “O God, my Father” could be changed to “O God, Creator.” Hymn #57 “Dear Lord and Father of Mankind” recommends changing the title line to “Dear Lord, Creator good and kind” (a double-whammy, taking out gender language for both God and man); and #89 “Blest Be the Tie That Binds” suggests “Father” in stanza two instead of “Maker.

*Hymns We Love to Sing* accomplishes its purpose. Most evangelicals of the previous generation will find much to love and sing. Contemporary music lovers must go elsewhere for source material. Despite the glance in the rear view mirror this hymnal provides, the editor does look at the road ahead. “I hope our collective faith is also expressed in the language of our day because our God is a God of yesterday, today, and tomorrow, going on before us giving light and music to all our journeys” (8).

A. L. “Pete” Butler and Lee Hinson  
Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary