

cast of topics is also extremely broad. A reader can find articles on such topics as the "Year 1000," the "Ghost Dance," "Cargo Cults," the "Branch Davidians," "Islam," and 150 others. The present reviewer was happy to find an insightful article on "Nazism" as a millennial movement, and one on the millennial implications of Marxism.

True to its actual content, the introduction to the *Encyclopedia of Fundamentalism* states that its focus is on Christian Protestantism, even though "some Fundamentalist-like assumptions can be found in most, if not all, religious traditions" (xv). As noted above, that statement seems to be more than a little weak. After all, a non-Christian fundamentalism is in many ways driving the ongoing difficulties in the Middle East on both the Jewish and Islamic sides. Thus while it is certainly a valid editorial choice to somewhat restrict the breadth of a reference work, some readers might wish for a broader treatment.

Within the criteria set forth for the volume, the selections relating to Protestant fundamentalism are helpful. Those selections center around six major categories: the religious context of fundamentalism; major events in the history of fundamentalism; primary beliefs and institutions, major bodies, movements, or churches; political and social perspectives; and individuals who were central to the rise of fundamentalism.

On the level of individual articles in the *Encyclopedia of Fundamentalism*, one wonders at times if the most qualified authors were selected. That question certainly arises in regard to the article on the Millerites, where, even though it is factually correct, it is strange that not one of the major research treatments of Millerism is found in the bibliography.

That weakness, however, is not endemic to the series as a whole. Most of the bibliographies are excellent. And as with most reference works, the good news is that these two volumes generally have insightful introductory essays to a wide variety of topics, as well as helpful bibliographies. Thus, they provide excellent starting places for studying a broad spectrum of issues related to fundamentalism and millennialism.

Andrews University

GEORGE R. KNIGHT

Brown, William P., and S. Dean McBride Jr., eds. *God Who Creates: Essays in Honor of W. Sibley Towner*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000. xx + 273 pp. Paper, \$24.00.

William P. Brown, Associate Professor of Old Testament at Union Theological Seminary and Presbyterian School of Christian Education (Richmond, VA), and S. Dean McBride Jr., Cyrus H. McCormick Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament at the same institutions, have edited this *Festschrift* in honor of their colleague W. Sibley Towner, Professor of Old Testament, also of the same institutions), who has written significant scholarly essays, curricula, and sermons on creation. The collection of seventeen essays by well-known scholars is divided into four parts: Pentateuch, Psalms and Job, the Prophets, and the NT.

As the editors indicate in the Preface, this volume "identifies a tectonic shift in emphasis that has taken place in the theological study of the Bible over the past several decades. . . . In a nutshell, this change marks nothing short of a paradigm shift from a once exclusive stress upon the mighty intervention of God in history to God's formative and sustaining ways in creation" (xi). Steering away from the half-century-long scholarly consensus in OT studies that creation occupied only a marginal status at best within the purview of biblical theology and was overshadowed by (and a mere foil for) God's mighty acts in salvation history (as per G. Ernest Wright and Gerhard von Rad), this volume moves in the direction of a radically different, recent emphasis (long argued particularly by H. H. Schmid) that regards creation as foundational to all other biblical dimensions of faith. According to the editors, the essays in this volume demonstrate that

“the Bible, in short, presents nature and redemption, history and creation, as a seamless whole, never to be rent asunder” (xv). Further, the placement of the creation account at the beginning of the canon indicates “the affirmation that God is creator is the starting point for defining Christian faith” (xv).

This volume is not only set apart by its paradigm shift from an emphasis upon salvation history to creation, but by a methodological paradigm shift as well. Instead of dealing with the ancient Near Eastern mythological background material or the relation of the biblical creation material to modern science or ecology, as in most other studies of creation, *God Who Creates* “explores the various perspectives of creation within their native theological contexts, including literary and historical” (xvi). With the exception of one or two essays, the contributions follow the new literary paradigm in OT studies that synchronically examines the final canonical form of the biblical text (without necessarily denying a precanonical history).

Instead of dealing in some detail with only a few of the scholarly essays, as I would normally do in reviewing a *Festschrift*, I am constrained to briefly mention the whole sweep of coverage represented by the contributors (omitting only the homily [on Psalm 8 by Dusty Fiedler]), since the cumulative canonical effect of the evidence presented is critical to the thesis of the book.

The title of S. Dean McBride’s lead essay, “Divine Protocol: Genesis 1:1–2:3 as Prologue to the Pentateuch,” already indicates his thesis that the opening creation account in the Torah “functions admirably as a cosmological prologue to the whole Pentateuch” (5). As a “protocol,” this passage “epitomizes divine procedure and purpose, setting an agenda that previews the Creator’s continuing relationship to an “ordered but still malleable cosmos” (7). McBride shows how the cosmos that God creates is presented as a Temple, in which he takes up residence on the first Sabbath, with the humans created in his image as “a terrestrial counterpart to God’s heavenly entourage” (16). The five covenants that frame the rest of the “received Pentateuch,” i.e., the Pentateuch in its final form, are simply “formal instruments by which supplementary decisions are integrated into the cosmic design of the God who creates” (19).

Marsha M. Wilfong’s essay, “Human Creation in Canonical Context: Genesis 1:26-31 and Beyond,” suggests that the opening creation account “stands at the beginning of Scripture and offers a vision of God’s intentions for creation—in particular, for human creation” (52). Humankind is presented as the “lynchpin of Creation” (46), and the emphasis is upon human relationships: with God, the human community, and the rest of creation. Human sin (Gen 3) is faithlessness in relationship with God, which is reflected in distorted relationships between human beings and with the rest of creation. Within the biblical canon, Jesus Christ, in the true image of God, came to restore broken relationships. This canon climaxes with Jesus making all things new as in the beginning (Rev 21:5).

E. Carson Brisson (“The Gates of Dawn: Reflections on Genesis 1:1-10; 2:1-4a”) argues that in Gen 1, once chaos is leashed in the beginning, creation “begins its formal move toward the Sabbath purpose for which it is brought into existence” (57). Brisson explores the dimensions of Sabbath rest as “repose in God offered to creation by the parts and sum of the reigning will of Israel’s Lord.” “Indeed,” Brisson exclaims, “were the entire created order to embrace sabbath, the world would in that moment become a hymn (Ps. 148:7-8)” (58).

James L. Mays (“Maker of Heaven and Earth: Creation in the Psalms”) summarizes the primary features of the way “creation” is treated in the Psalms and examines sample psalms that focus on creation of the “world” or “earth” (Pss 8, 24, 29, 98, and 104). From these psalms comes a rich and multifaceted perspective on the created world. Patrick D. Miller Jr. (“The Poetry of Creation: Psalm 104”) deals

particularly with Psalm 104, which he identifies as “the most extended explication of God’s work of creation outside Genesis” (87). Miller analyzes the structure and movement of the Psalm, uncovers eight theological themes, and places the Psalm in its literary and theological context within the canonical arrangement of the book of Psalms. By recognizing the linkage between Pss 103 and 104, Miller points out that the community joins both creation and history in their praise of God’s “works.”

In contrast with most studies of creation that deal with its cosmic contours, William P. Brown (“*Creatio Corporis* and the Rhetoric of Defense in Job 10 and Psalm 139”) narrows the focus to creation of the individual, *creatio corporis*, in Job 10 and Ps 139. He demonstrates that these two texts bridge between creation and covenant, and that, according to the latter passage, “in conception was established both the physical and moral constitution of a human being” (114). Karen Pidcock-Lester’s analysis of Job 38-41 (“Earth Has No Sorrow that Earth Cannot Heal: Job 38-41”) shows how God answers the question of human suffering by pointing to the creation, and how a focus upon God’s creation transforms rage to trust.

In the section of the book on the Prophets, Thomas W. Mann (“Stars, Sprouts, and Streams: The Creative Redeemer of Second Isaiah”) explores the “Creative Redeemer” theme, especially in Isa 40 and 43, laying bare the emphasis upon YHWH’s process of continuous (redemptive) creation. Walter Brueggemann (“Jeremiah: *Creatio in Extremis*”) sets forth the book of Jeremiah as a “clear test case and model for the shift in scholarly paradigms in Old Testament study” from history of traditions toward creation, and concludes that creation theology “pervades the book of Jeremiah, a pervasion mostly denied and kept invisible by the once dominant history-of-traditions perspective” (152-153). Brueggemann finds that creation themes are not only found “in many incidental ways” in the book, but are also “of structural importance to the theological accents of judgment and hope in the final form of the text” (166). Brueggemann also acknowledges that the creation theology of Jeremiah stands against the conventional Enlightenment concept of autonomy (and his own Marxist-leaning human mandate). Steven Tuell (“The Rivers of Paradise: Ezek 47:1-12 and Gen 2:10-14”) focuses upon the intertextual linkages between Ezek 47 and Gen 2, suggesting that Ezekiel envisions Zion as Eden, the home of God, and that this Zion is not the earthly one, but the mythic heavenly reality.

Robert R. Wilson (“Creation and New Creation: The Role of Creation Imagery in the Book of Daniel”) traces the role of creation imagery in the book of Daniel, specifically in Dan 7, with its intertextual linkages to Gen 1. He argues that instead of viewing the chapter as prophecy of future events, one should interpret it as the author’s view of reality. The composite beasts of the chapter are to be seen as mutants from the basic types of species indicated in Gen 1, as violations of God’s natural order, and therefore the kingdoms they represent are also violations of that order; “the world has reverted to its pre-creation state and is clearly in need of re-creation” (202). Daniel’s vision also indicates that God is able to restore order and bring the world back permanently to the way it was in the beginning.

David L. Petersen (“The World of Creation in the Book of the Twelve”) looks at creation themes in the Book of the Twelve, utilizing traditiohistorical analysis, and concludes that in the Book of the Twelve “Creation traditions provide a check against the cosmic instability in day of the Lord traditions. Together, these traditions emphasize the permanence but fragility of the created order” (214). A final essay on the Prophets by Gene M. Tucker (“The Peaceable Kingdom and a Covenant with the Wild Animals”) examines the prophetic statements about the eschatological transformation of creation in Isa 11:6-9 and Hos 2:18 [2:20], and concludes that these descriptions “stop short of

an apocalyptic transformation that presupposes the possibility of rejection of the world as created" and do not "promise a return to a primordial paradise." Rather, "they look either to the restoration of a prejudgment state of the relationship with creation or to an ideal world ruled by a divinely ordained king" (225).

The last two essays deal with creation themes in the NT. David L. Bartlett ("Creation Waits with Eager Longing") looks at the creation—a new creation theme in Paul's theology and the synoptic Gospels, uncovering the NT writers' interpretation of the Genesis creation story that contains an implicit narrative of four acts: "God creates the world as good," "sin mars God's good creation," "God acts in Jesus Christ to redeem the world," and "the lost good creation is [will be] restored—purer and brighter than before" (232). Finally, John T. Carroll's essay ("Creation and Apocalypse") reveals "the central and determinative role Revelation and other apocalyptic texts assign to God in the work of re-creation" (260).

Some specific arguments in the book appear to be on more solid ground than others, depending upon one's presuppositions and preferred methodology. I am not persuaded by Wilfong's and Brisson's interpretation of Gen 1:2 as "menacing" chaos (47) that has to be "leashed" (57); see the recent studies of this question in the three-part series in *AUSS* (vols. 36/2, 37/1, and 38/1) by Roberto Ouro. Nor am I convinced that the poetry of Ps 104 provides evidence against interpreting the creation accounts of Gen 1-2 literally, as intimated by Miller (96).

The intertextual priority of one passage over another and reconstruction of layers of tradition in a given passage, based upon assumed dating of materials as argued by several authors, is far from certain (see, e.g., 117, 122, 136, 158). Tuell's contention that the image of the tree of life in Rev 22 growing on both sides of the river is "literally nonsensical" (172-173) seems to overlook modern botanical parallels, e.g., the banyan tree, with multiple trunks spread over a wide geographical area, and also the power of God in recreation. His confident assertions that various images in the OT perforce derive from ancient Near Eastern mythology (176) are also debatable, as is his insistence that the geography of Gen 2 is clearly "symbolical, mythical" and not intended by the biblical writer as literal (180). Wilson's similar claims that Dan 7 is to be interpreted in view of Canaanite mythology (193) and that there is no real prophecy of the future in this chapter (194) also involve presuppositions regarding the nature of this apocalyptic literature that are not universally accepted. He also seems to falter in his interpretation of Gen 1:11, which he claims teaches that "there is no possibility of creating new species through mutation" (201); to the contrary, the Hebrew word *min* refers to a broader modern scientific classification than species and does not rule out mutation within these broader categories (see Gordon L. Lewis and Bruce A. Demerest, *Integrative Theology: Historical, Biblical, Systematic, Apologetic, Practical* [Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996], 2:40). I am not convinced by Tucker's arguments that the new-creation passages of Isa 11 and Hos 2 are limited and not cosmic; the arguments of Hans Walther Wolff, Francis I. Andersen, and David Noel Freedman seem more persuasive that here we have a virtual cosmic return to a primeval time (219-220).

In NT studies, Bartlett's antinomian view of Paul's new-creation theology (237, 245, 250) and his suggestion that Paul at times implies universal redemption for the human race (243) are controverted by a large corpus of recent Pauline exegesis. Finally, regarding Carroll's essay, I do not find the Genesis narrative implying that "the fruit of the 'tree of life' went uneaten in the primeval paradise" (254), as Carroll states, but only that after the Fall the human pair were barred from continuing to eat the fruit of this tree. As with Wilson's view of apocalyptic in Daniel, I am hard-pressed to see that the final form of Revelation does not present precise prediction of future events, as Carroll

seems to indicate (260). This appears to be the modern reader's presupposition showing through, not the message of the canonical text.

While one might quibble with the contributors regarding this or that minor point, as I have done above, the cumulative impact of the various essays in this *Festschrift* is powerful and inescapable: Creation suffuses the biblical canon and can no longer be marginalized as peripheral or only ancillary to salvation history. Creation is foundational to biblical faith and inextricably linked with salvation history in the final form of both OT and NT.

I found the methodological approach in most of the essays to be refreshing, consisting of a synchronic reading of the "received text" in its final canonical form, by contrast with so many atomizing studies of creation (and other themes) in the past that have never come to grips with the biblical theology of the text as it now presents itself to us. James Barr's essay, "Remembrances of 'Historical Criticism': Speiser's Genesis Commentary and Its History of Reception," was omitted in the survey above, since it seemed out of place in this work. This essay characterizes David Gunn and Danna N. Fewell's critique of Speiser's work as "a massive misunderstanding and misrepresentation." I found Barr's definition of "historical criticism," which for him means only source criticism and excludes form criticism, tradition criticism, and other critical methodologies, to be extremely narrow.

This book not only identifies a "tectonic shift" in biblical studies toward the significance of creation theology, but contributes significantly toward substantiating the validity of this shift. Furthermore, it gives evidence of the power and theological richness of the recent methodological trend in biblical studies toward holistically presenting the theology of the Bible in its final canonical form. While different perspectives and insights into creation theology appear in different books and blocks of the biblical canon, there emerges an overarching unity, rooted in the Genesis creation accounts, that forms the "divine protocol" and "prologue" not only of the Pentateuch, but of the entire Bible.

Andrews University

RICHARD M. DAVIDSON

Davis, Jimmy H., and Harry L. Poe. *Designer Universe: Intelligent Design and the Existence of God*. Nashville, TN: Broadman and Holman, 2002. 252 pp. Paperback, \$12.99.

Jimmy Davis and Harry Poe have *almost* written a great book. *Designer Universe* has been positively reviewed by Charles Colson (BreakPoint with Charles Colson, June 27, 2002. Considering the Evidence: Intelligent Design in the Twenty-first Century), and *Christianity Today* bestowed an Award of Merit in Apologetics/Evangelism on it in their 2003 Book Awards (Union News & Information, News Release May 23, 2003. "Union's Poe and Davis Take *Christianity Today* Award"). Both authors hold teaching positions at Union University in Jackson, Tennessee: Davis in chemistry and Poe in the area of faith and culture. Integrating the perspectives of a scientist and a theologian in one book had the potential to result in a seminal interdisciplinary work on the question of design in nature. *Designer Universe* could have been, but is not, the great book that should have resulted from this collaboration.

Before discussing failures that remove *Designer Universe* from among the best books on faith and science, we need to note a wonderful contribution made by this book. The first three chapters make an excellent presentation of different ways in which philosophers and theologians from Christian and non-Christian religions have approached the question of design in nature. These three chapters would make profitable reading for anyone interested in the argument for God from design. This is particularly true for those who believe that the study of nature naturally leads to discovery of the Christian Creator God. This is denied not only by scientists committed to the philosophy of materialism, but by the reality within which all people of faith live.