
Book Reviews

At the Master's Feet, by Sadhu Sundar Singh, Old Tappan, NJ: Fleming H. Revel, 1922, 90 pp. \$3.95.

Genuine Christian and Indian mysticism finds expression in this reprint of a deeply spiritual work. It is rare to find a book that takes the reader so quickly into the presence of God.

But the work is in bad need of editing. Correction ought to be made in many places (eg: pp. 19, 48, 53, 58 — the latter two needing elementary punctuation changes). Updating in language would prove highly beneficial for readers of a book so rich in meaning (eg. p. 53); sometimes language is just plain unclear.

Like *God Calling*, a devotional which projects God's voice in first person language, *At The Master's Feet* projects the same directness from place to place. The problem is inconsistency: sometimes God comes on in the first person, other times Singh speaks to us, and at still other times generalized expression takes over.

The Sadhu's flare for analogy is remarkable. Clearly he is gifted as a teacher and communicator of spiritual truth.

The work divides conveniently into chapters, sections and subsections for daily devotional exercise.

Perhaps the highest value of the book is that the author believes; he believes without equivocation. Herein is stalwart authority.

Donald E. Demaray

Granger E. and Anna A. Fisher Professor of Preaching

The Origins of New Testament Christology, by Howard Marshall, Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Christian Fellowship, 1976. 132 pp. Paperback.

This slender volume is the first in a series entitled, *Issues by Contemporary Theology*, edited by I. H. Marshall. This volume is designed as an introduction, and gives a panoramic view of recent scholarship concerning the doctrine of the person of Christ. Of necessity, as the author explains, the treatment is introductory and therefore cursory. It is limited to the synoptic gospels and thus does not take into adequate account the Johannine view or the Pauline view of Christology.

By way of survey, Marshall, a Methodist, is senior lecturer in New Testament exegesis at the University of Aberdeen. His introduction notes briefly the contributions made by H. P. Liddon who gave the Bampton Lectures in 1866. Critical scholarship in this area was initiated by W. Bousset of the "history of religion" school of thought. Bousset was a rationalist who sought to explain Christian theology apart from supernatural influence on the basis of tracing its origin to contemporary religious thought. This rationalistic view was countered by a conservative scholar, A. E. Rawlinson. Although using the historical-critical method, he came out in favor of the orthodox or conservative view. Vincent Taylor, using the redaction-critical approach, concluded that Jesus was conscious of His divine sonship. Oscar Cullmann, articulating "the salvation-history school" of interpretation, argued that for Jesus to do what He actually did, He had to be the Son of God and Savior. Thus, Christology arose out of meditation upon salvation-history. Marshall spends most of his time dealing with the work of the German scholar, Ferdinand Hahn, who followed the tradition of Bousset but "in a more refined manner." Hahn stresses the influence of Hellenistic Gentile influence on the church and its theology. The work of R. H. Fuller also preoccupies Marshall in his review. Fuller's method is different from that of Hahn but his conclusions are very similar.

Marshall's contribution is to review scholarly research on the subject as it deals with the titles given to Jesus. The titles which he dwells upon at greater length are: "Son of Man," "Christ," "Lord," and "Son of God." Titles that are not touched upon include: "Son of David" and "Servant of the Lord." In a brief conclusion or summary of his work, Marshall finds that the origin of the Christology is Jewish rather than pagan and that it is congenial to the soil of Palestine and Syria. In addition he stresses the historical Jesus and notes that behind the claims are the Person. In addition Marshall notes the importance of the resurrection in the formulation of early Christian Christology. Last, he discovers that the early church was not primarily interested in the manhood of Jesus, as is contemporary Christology, but rather in His work as the Son of God. Thus both the incarnation and the resurrection were the major influences in the formation of New Testament Christology.

The book reflects a major investment by the author in wading through the work of many New Testament theologians and critically assessing their work. His scholarship is thorough and therefore

responsible. He recognizes that this is only a beginning and hopes to make his own contribution after laying the groundwork in this survey. The thoroughness and the fairness with which this work is executed augers well for his forthcoming contribution. Meanwhile the reader will do well to find in this a valuable orientation to the doctrine of Christ's person.

George A. Turner
Professor of Biblical Literature

Genesis and Early Man, by Arthur C. Custance, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1975. \$8.95. Volume II of the ten volume "Doorway Papers."

Arthur Custance is a Canadian anthropologist who is in the process of republishing 60 papers in ten volumes. The papers were written over the course of his career, with the ones collected in this volume most closely relating to his special field of anthropology. The topics are the fossil remains of early man, the remains of early culture, the intelligence level of early man, the supposed evolution of the human skull, the fallacy of anthropological reconstructions, and the problem of the origin of language if evolution is accepted.

The perspective is that of the school of biblical interpretation that has come to be called "creationist," implying a series of special creations by fiat 6,000 to 10,000 years ago. Statement and defense of this position appears in the first two papers, but the rest are acceptable not only to creationists, but also to those who believe in God's creative activity over a longer span of time by a variety of means.

Since these were independently published papers, the volume lacks unity of theme, and has numerous, but not oppressive, repetitions. Unlike many creationists, Custance does not depend on the writings of other little known creationists, but is familiar with the literature of anthropology and cites most of the well-known authorities in that field. The use of the authorities is highly selective, drawing upon those opinions that support the point being made. Among the many points made are the following: cranial capacity is not related to intelligence; the greater the scarcity of remains, the more sweeping the generalizations that are made by anthropologists; degeneration of cultures is as likely as improvement; initially established geological and anthropological dates are consistently lowered by successive scholars; anthropological evidence still supports the

Book Reviews

Middle East as the origin of man; and anthropologists are increasingly rejecting cultural evolution, but not biological evolution.

Custance supports many more such assertions expertly, creatively and intelligently. The only caution is that the papers are a little dated, having been written over the last two decades, with little revision for this publication. There is also the typical creationist dependence on old sources, and the attempt to discredit evolution by noting the handful of frauds, but this is not the basic argument of the book so these are only minor flaws. With these reservations, the volume is well worth reading.

Ivan L. Zabilka
Former ATS Registrar, Ph.D. Candidate

A Symposium on Creation, V, Edited by Donald W. Patton, Baker Book House, 1975. 132 pages. \$2.95.

In reviewing this book I am going to “nitpick” for a minute. The word symposium is supposed to mean a conference for the exchange of ideas, or a collection of essays on a topic. Since the first implies differences of opinion, and the latter implies a unifying theme, the title of this nearly annual collection of essays is no longer appropriate. The “symposiums” have been increasingly dominated by the general perspective of the Creation Research Society with no real contribution from Christians with other perspectives. Secondly, the essays in this volume deal with science history as well as themes that more closely relate to “creation,” if you interpret that to mean primarily evolution. Finally, the cover advertising borders on the dishonest when it calls government statisticians and Indian school directors “men of science.” Only three of the seven authors have earned doctorates, and only one of these is in a science, a second in the philosophy of science, and a third in a technological area.

This is the thinnest book of this series, perhaps in quality as well as quantity. The one science Ph.D. writes out of his field in the history of science, the aeronautical technologist writes on biology, and only the philosopher stays in his field and produces the excellent piece. This book will please those who identify thoroughly with the Creation Research Society, although they may begin to feel like science fiction fans who buy anthologies and find they have read all the stories before.

The best essays include “The Gentile Names of God” by Gordon Holmes Fraser and “Galileo and the Church” by T. H. Leith. The

most interesting may be "Evolution: The Ocean Says No!" by Stuart E. Nevins, and the least valuable is the article on Gregor Mendel by Bolton Davidheiser which presents nothing new by way of interpretation and not very much by way of significance.

I believe that most readers will agree with me that this is the least satisfying of this series.

Ivan L. Zabilka
Former ATS Registrar, Ph.D. Candidate

Remember Thy Creator, by G. Richard Culp, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1975. 200 pp. Index. \$3.95. Paperback.

Evolution is the theme. As we would expect, a book from Baker Book House expresses a conservative view. In this case evolution is presented as an unphilosophical, non-scientific speculation of the scientists that has led to "close-minded dogmatism" on their part. Evolution is viewed as unsettling to young people and a threat to faith in the Word of God. This is the first of many points where the book misses the mark. Faith is to be exercised toward the person of Christ, and confidence exercised toward the Word which tells us of Him. As with many other books on this subject from Christian writers, this subtle change in perspective entirely distorts the threat of evolution to the Christian faith, by making this the central battle, rather than the divinity of Christ and the uniqueness of the Christian revelation as the really important battle that is currently being waged.

As with most books written by those who write outside the field of their expertise (Culp is an osteopath with an M.S. in botany from the University of Michigan) the book is a rehash of the views of others and a synthesis of arguments against evolution which vary widely in value. The main weakness is a failure to understand what constitutes valid proof and disproof of theories in the sciences. While Culp does finger many of the places where the proof of evolution is inadequate, he fails utterly in his efforts at disproof. The most telling example of this is the assumption (made by numerous other books of this type) that the exposure of two or three hoaxes, and the demonstration that Louis S. B. Leakey dated most of his finds without any tests or human types are a fraud. This contention will never be proved by case building on exceptions.

The book is written for Christians, and often builds its case by exhortation and assertion without proof or example. The authorities

Book Reviews

used to support the case are obscure figures at minor schools, which may encourage the Christian, but will do little to shake the non-believer. A few statements desperately needing support are not footnoted. A final problem is that the author is still destroying evolutionary points no longer held or long since modified. The arguments are simply out of date at times. No adequate explanation of a biblical theory to replace the evolutionary is presented in many cases, thus, the book assumes a negative destructive tone without building anything in its place.

In general then, this is not the definitive critique of the theory of evolution that is so desperately needed by the Christian church and by scientists themselves. It can be of some help as a handbook to Christians. But it will not convince a scientist you want to win over to a biblical perspective nor will it make any impact upon the scientific community in the renewal of the evolutionary controversy.

Ivan L. Zabilka
Former ATS Registrar, Ph.D. Candidate

Science Textbook Controversies and the Politics of Equal Time, by Dorothy Nelkin, Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1977. \$16.95.

Seldom does a reviewer come across absolutely *must* reading, but this book is that for those interested in textbook controversies, the relations of science and religion, and the renewed controversy between proponents of evolution and biblical creationism. Dr. Nelkin has presented an essentially balanced and sympathetic analysis of the controversies in terms of the sociological aspects that are crucial. The conclusion is that textbook critics are enjoying a large measure of success because they blend three American traditions: science, religion and populist democracy.

The main controversy analyzed is that between evolution and creation and the presentation of the former in biology textbooks, but some attention is also given to social science curriculums developed by the National Science Foundation. The first two chapters give an historical survey of previous controversies and the source of revised science curriculums in the 1960s, followed by an analysis of the "textbook watchers," the patriotic, religious and technological groups formed to combat "scientific humanism." The third section of two chapters deals with the California and Texas biology text controversies and the MACOS social science curriculum. The final section relates to science and social resistance to it.

The views of the creationists are understood in large measure and accurately presented. The most telling critique (on p. 64) is in terms of the scatter gun range of creationist interests, the selectivity practiced in the use of factual information, the ignoring of masses of data that cannot be contained in the creationist perspective, and the failure of creationists to understand the function of theories, models, standards of evidence and the criteria of proof. Some of these criticisms relate to issues raised by this reviewer when evaluating other creationist writings in the *Seminarian*. Nelkin only occasionally is tinged with sensationalism, as when she reveals that the director of one prominent creation society has only an honorary doctorate from a phone book college with no campus, or when the element of “expose” is present in the listing of key creationists on secular campuses. There is one factual error in the placing of Bob Jones University in Arkansas. The reference is apparently to John Brown University, for Bob Jones is in South Carolina (p. 70). Evangelicals will also be disconcerted to find themselves lumped with Seventh Day Adventists and Christian Scientists as “fundamentalists.” This seems an inadmissible error for a sociologist who should have done her homework better at this point.

With respect to most other sociological points the analysis of problems for the scientist in American society is perceptive. The popular image of science as presenting certainty, while the internal image of tentativeness is the reality, generates communication problems. The selection of political action by the creationists, and the appeal for lay decision on the merits of scientific ideas, also generates problems for the scientific elite, which assumes that internal controls and evaluation are the appropriate methods. The textbook controversies are also placed in the larger context of protest against the apparently unpredicted and inhuman results of science that have come from a variety of sources in American society.

This book can prevent creationists from a distorted self concept in which they believe that all their controversies with evolutionists are religiously or scientifically, and not also culturally motivated. It may also serve the secular scientist as an antidote to the concept that all the controversy stems from obscurantism alone. The internal logic of the creationist construct is adequately displayed. Since the cost is prohibitive, get a copy of this book from a library and read it.

Ivan L. Zabilka
Former ATS Registrar, Ph.D. Candidate

Book Reviews

On Whom the Fire Fell, Testimonies of Holiness Giants, by Leroy Brown, Kansas City: Beacon Hill Press, 1977. 56 pp. \$1.25.

This well-written booklet can be read in an evening (or morning) as a manual of devotion. The author, professor of speech at Point Loma College, provides a graphic portrayal of seven preachers in the modern holiness movement in America — all of them exponents of the grace of entire sanctification. In capsular form the reader is given a vivid picture of these seven “giants” who with their human qualities were vehicles of divine grace. All of them were evangelists yet with diverse ministries: Amanda Smith, the black woman with a worldwide ministry, and “founding fathers” (H. C. Morrison and P. F. Bresee). In common they experienced and proclaimed that “perfect love which casts out fear” — the experience of divine grace never more needed and relevant than today. Author and publisher deserve our gratitude for bringing them and their witness to our attention again today.

George A. Turner
Professor of Biblical Literature

Redating the New Testament, by John A. T. Robinson, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1976, 169 pp. \$15.

This is another sensational book by the bishop who stirred up the public with his book entitled *Honest to God*. Robinson has done considerable study in the books of the New Testament and he is by no means adverse to upsetting established theories. His book *Honest to God* disturbed conservatives; his *Redating the New Testament* especially disturbs liberals. His basic premise is that one of the most important events in the first century, from the standpoint of the Christian religion and the Jewish faith, was the destruction of Jerusalem and its temple in Jerusalem in A.D. 70. The point of departure is that no book of the New Testament gives any recognition of this event. He wonders how it is possible for any New Testament book written after A.D. 70 to remain silent on this very significant event in history. Consequently, he goes through each book of the New Testament and finds it possible if not probable to date each one prior to A.D. 70.

Accordingly, he takes a new look at the Pauline epistles and decides they all could have been written before A.D. 58 prior or during Paul's imprisonment in Caesarea. Even the pastoral letters, which by many liberals are regarded as non-Pauline, he accepts as

genuine and argues that they bear striking resemblances to other letters that are admittedly Pauline and are fairly early in the apostle's career. He also finds unconvincing the arguments that the language of the pastorals reflects a later period in church history when a monarchical government was accepted and that "the faith" was a body of doctrine rather than trust in Christ as Savior. Second Timothy, usually considered to be Paul's last letter from his Roman imprisonment, is linked to the time of the Philippian letter.

Robinson is unconvinced by his liberal contemporaries that Acts is not historical. Instead he believes it as serious and trustworthy history. Among other things he notes that Matthew was concerned more than the other evangelists with the relation of Christianity to the Temple, the priesthood and the sacrifices (Mt. 12:5-7). He points out it would be rather strange if Matthew was written after the temple no longer existed. He takes issue with critics who see in Matthew the reflections of the issues current in the latter part of the first century.

The book of James he considers very early, prior to A.D. 48. Second Peter he considers to be apostolic and prior to A.D. 70. He bases this upon the date of Jude. Convinced that readers of the first century were very concerned about pseudonymous authorship, he argues that readers would be unwilling to accept a deception. He concludes that Jude and Second Peter were written to Jewish Christian congregations about A.D. 61 or 62 before Peter set out for Rome.

Robinson finds it incredible that the epistle of Hebrews was written after A.D. 70 when a reference to the fall of Jerusalem and the cessation of sacrifices would have added so much to this author's argument. Revelation he dates in the 60s and the persecution by Nero rather than the last decade of the first century under the persecution by Domitian. The gospel and epistles of John he dates prior to A.D. 70 quite largely because the discoveries of the Dead Sea Scrolls have shown that the language and concepts could well have originated in Palestine during this first seven decades of the first century, and there is no need to date them late from an origin in the Diaspora. The author concludes that the apostle John was the author of the gospel that bears his name, and that it reflects a period of 40 years in maturation.

Converted from the position of late date of authorship, he now adheres to the early date and hence is left with the problem of what was written after A.D. 70. This leads him to reassess the dating of

Book Reviews

the apostolic fathers to an early date following A.D. 70 and the end of the century.

The volume is carefully documented with extensive footnotes. The author is abreast of contemporary scholarship and also takes into account older scholarship. As much as any author known to this reviewer, Robinson is in command of New Testament scholarship for the past century. His boldness to break with tradition and to experiment with new theories frees him from some of his previous conceptions and from the acceptance of the so-called results of critical studies. The volume is to be taken seriously because it is carefully documented and well reasoned. It is more than a wild hypothesis or merely an audacious challenge. It is already causing considerable ferment among New Testament scholars.

George Allen Turner
Professor of Biblical Literature