

Religion in a Pluralistic Age concludes with three chapters, originally delivered as lectures in India in the winter of 1983-1984, examining the problem of evil as a practical challenge for Christianity, Buddhism, and Hinduism.

These chapters are valuable for several reasons. They appropriately highlight the "street level" *pastoral* task of theology. They emphasize the interweaving of the personal and social dimensions of sin and salvation: Hebblethwaite's qualified appreciation of social movements as diverse as those of Gandhi and the liberation theologians reflects his sense that a faithful response to God must have a social dimension; at the same time, he is perpetually aware of the temptation to convert faith into ideology. They offer an introduction to the complexities of Buddhist and Hindu ethics and metaphysics, the work of a sympathetic and informed observer who can discern the work of God's Spirit outside the borders of the church while remaining confidently Christian. And they highlight the important differences among the three traditions under review—an important prerequisite to both mission and dialogue, and a useful antidote to a facile pluralism that ignores the differences or regards them as unimportant.

These essays are clearly written and simply organized, and each is short enough to be readily digestible. Hebblethwaite's reflections on divine action in the world, divine goodness, the nature of Christian ethics, and Christianity's place among the world religions will provoke and stimulate many readers. Readers may wish to disagree on more than one point. But they will finish the book having engaged with an attractive vision of Christian faith as grounded in a patient divine love, a vision that suggests a number of useful directions for further investigation.

La Sierra University
Riverside, CA 92515

GARY CHARTIER

Hick, John, Clark H. Pinnock, Alister E. McGrath, R. Douglas Geivett, and W. Gary Phillips. *More than One Way? Four Views on Salvation in a Pluralistic World.*, Dennis L. Okholm and Timothy R. Phillips, eds. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1995. 283 pp. \$16.99.

While questions about the fate of the unevangelized have always existed in the evangelical community, the last ten years have seen an unprecedented eruption of interest and discussion on this topic and related issues. This book is not an attempt to answer the questions, but to make clear the issues. Is Jesus the sole source of salvation? Must there be conscious faith in him to reap the benefits of his death? How are other religions to be understood? Is God fair and/or loving in his actions? Not one but four responses to these and related questions are presented in this volume. Following a brief, introductory chapter tracing the issues in the debate by Wheaton College editors, Dennis Okholm and Timothy Phillips, the book follows a standard format. Each of the four authors (or in the case of Douglas Geivett and Gary Phillips, a pair of authors) presents their basic case in about thirty pages. That is followed by a response by each of the other three presenters. Each section then concludes with a final reply from the original writer.

The first two authors present no surprises. The well-known pluralist John Hick summarizes his position that all major ethical religions lead to God and

possible salvation. Jesus does *not* offer a unique path of deliverance. Clark Pinnock's inclusivist position has been clear since his book *A Wideness in God's Mercy: The Finality of Jesus Christ in a World of Religions* (Zondervan, 1992). All salvation, he argues, is based on Jesus, but one need not consciously know or have faith in Christ to receive it. The Bible, as he sees it, emphasizes that God will save *many*.

The last two sections of the book do present new terminology and perhaps some different ideas, as well. What has usually been called exclusivism or restrictivism is now termed a "particularist view" and divided into two approaches. McGrath's approach is termed "post enlightenment," while that of Geivett and Phillips is called "evidentialist." In short, McGrath argues against what he sees as an enlightenment, pluralist, homogenizing approach to religion. He unashamedly argues for the particularity, yes, even uniqueness, of Christianity, Jesus, and the Christian way of salvation. On the other hand, he is unsure, even agnostic about the fate of those who have not heard the Christian message. The evidentialist approach of Geivett and Phillips ends up essentially where the traditional evangelicals do—unless one specifically hears and responds to the gospel, one is lost. The path they use to get there has some unique twists and turns. A large part of their chapter argues on the basis of philosophy (natural revelation!) that their position is a logical one.

I find the plan and structure of the book helpful. Rather than having to go to several books or articles to discover the major positions on this issue or reading about the various views from an author who does not believe in them, in this one convenient volume you can get a fair overview. One has the sense of being part of a dialogue/debate that is real.

The two-fold presentation of the traditional evangelical position is interesting. Readers can see clearly that not all evangelicals agree on the details of their position. While both agree that Jesus and his salvation are unique, and that middle knowledge is valid, they disagree on how that knowledge is used. Middle knowledge, which affirms that God can make judgments based on what people would have decided if they had been given the chance to believe, is used by McGrath to say that people not hearing about and receiving Jesus can perhaps be saved. God saves them because he knows they would have responded if they had been evangelized. On the other hand, Geivett and Phillips use the same concept to say that the fact people have never been reached with the gospel shows that God knows that they would *not* have responded, had they been given the opportunity. What a wonderful illustration of how a single concept can be used to very different ends!

The biggest question the book raises for me is, have all the main options been dealt with? Is there more than one way to view exclusivism or pluralism? What about universalism? Important Christians from Origen to John A. T. Robinson have espoused that viewpoint. Should other voices be heard besides these four? Could we not rather see five or six views on salvation? I also question the use of the term "particularist" for the traditional evangelical position. Where does it come from and why is it used? Such a new term should be carefully defined and its use defended before it plays a major role in such a discussion.

In spite of these caveats, I plan to use the book in a seminary class I teach in Christianity and the World Religions. While there are a diversity of authors, the book fits together and flows smoothly. The editors have done their job well. If you want a good, one-book introduction to this issue, read this volume. The editors are right in saying that the debate on this topic in the evangelical community is "intense and fierce," dominating all other discussions (12). This book gives you a ringside seat to this theological boxing match and may even serve as an invitation to climb into the ring yourself.

Andrews University

JON L. DYBDAHL

Horsley, Richard H. *Galilee: History, Politics, People*. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1995. vii + 357 pp. Cloth, \$30.00.

In his book, *Galilee: History, Politics, People*, Richard Horsley tackles a long-neglected subject concerning the people inhabiting the region north of Israel, i.e., Galilee. Divided into three parts, the book presents the plight of the Galileans in terms of their relationship with Rome and with the capital of Israel, Jerusalem. Horsley draws upon both epigraphical and archaeological evidence to lend evidence to his analysis. Unfortunately, the biased writings of Josephus and literature from the early rabbinic period are the most "reliable" primary sources and archaeological evidence is scarce or is only currently becoming available through excavations.

Part 1, History, briefly outlines the major events which shaped the history of the territory of Galilee during the last centuries B.C. and first centuries A.D. This historical outline is subdivided into three parts: Monarchy, Jerusalem rule, and the Roman reconquests. During the period of the monarchy and the construction of the first temple, Galilee was subordinate to Jerusalem and the building enterprises of King Solomon. This subordination, however, was not greeted with open arms by the Galileans, who sought independence and separation from the "tyranny" which came from the holy city to the south.

With the conquest of the Near East by Roman armies, Galilee remained under Jerusalem rule during early Roman times. The rise and expansion of the Hasmonean family in Jerusalem did little to relieve the hardships in Galilee as taxes and other infringements caused much hardship. Because Galilee was under the rule of Jerusalem did not mean that the Galileans considered themselves part of Israel, as many differences existed between the Israelites who inhabited Jerusalem and those who lived and worked in Galilee.

With the death of Herod in 4 B.C., the territories of Galilee, Perea, and Judea revolted. Rome responded by putting down the rebellion in typical Roman manner, dividing the territory, and terrorizing the local population.

Part 2, The Rulers of Galilee in Roman Times, discusses the situation of Galilee under Roman rule and under the Temple and priesthood of Jerusalem. After the initial conquest, Rome consolidated direct control over Palestine through self-governing cities (governed by client-rulers) by which peace in the countryside could be maintained. Besides this Roman oppression, the governing body of the temple-state located in Jerusalem also laid claim to Galilee. The