

special revelation lends itself to a doctrine of natural theology; yet it is highly unlikely that Adventists would be inclined toward notions of natural theology of the sort forwarded by the majority of Gifford lecturers. On the other hand, if natural theology can be seen—as Hauerwas would like us to see it—as a form of witness to the God of creation, Adventists should enter the theological door which Barth and Hauerwas have opened in these Gifford Lectures.

How is natural theology a witness of this sort? I see two interconnected ways we might perceive (we should perceive) natural theology as an epistemological claim. The first point is to agree with Paul in Romans that the human who has not the benefit of the special revelation found in Scripture is capable, nonetheless, of coming to a knowledge (saving knowledge?) of God. Secondly, in order to argue a natural theology of this sort, one must hold a thoroughgoing theistic ontology that insists that God is the Creator and that Scripture is a revelation of him. I stand with Hauerwas, when he says “that natural theology makes Christian sense only as a part of the whole doctrine of God” (159). Or, as Barth would put it, all that is—including any conclusions about God by humans using human reason—is so by God’s grace.

There are additional reasons why Adventists should find Hauerwas’s work worth reading, and this is true of almost all of his publications: Adventists would do well to learn the art of storytelling in the deliberate manner in which Hauerwas proceeds in all his theological works. Our story is profound; it deserves to be told well, and when it is, it will serve as a witness to the God of creation. A question within the telling of our story that I would argue is yet to be resolved is whether or not our witness is found in the stream of Constantinian Christianity or its radical nonviolent counterpart.

And finally, like Hauerwas I take it that “the truthfulness of our theological convictions is inseparable from the questions of how we are to live” (22). When all is said and done, we do theology as if it matters! To engage in talk about God of the sort that natural theology insists upon “requires a transformation not only of speech itself but of the speaker” (176).

La Sierra University
Riverside, California

MARK CARR

Hengel, Martin, with Roland Deines. *The Septuagint as Christian Scripture: Its Prehistory and the Problem of Its Canon*, Old Testament Series, intro. Robert Hanhart, trans. Mark E. Biddle. New York: T. & T. Clark, 2002. xvi + 153 pp. Hardcover, \$49.95.

When addressing matters of the OT that arise when studying the NT, it is customary to reference the OT directly. However, a period of some four centuries passed between the end of Malachi and the events of the NT. Outside of scholarly circles it is not commonly known that Scripture for the NT period was not directly the Hebrew Bible (HB), but the LXX, the Greek translation made in Alexandria in Egypt between about 250 B.C.E. and 150 B.C.E. that also includes some books written originally in Greek. In this volume, Hengel studies the implications of this translation becoming the resource used by Christians to access the world of Hebrew thought, our OT.

Had the NT never referenced the LXX, the latter would be studied only for its own sake as a translation at a particular time and place, and for the witness it bears to the Hebrew *Vorlage*. As it is, the NT makes frequent reference to the OT Scriptures via the medium of the Greek Bible. However, the quotations are not uniformly from one standard text. Rather, it is the equivalent of an English author variously—and at times, almost randomly—quoting Scripture from different modern translations.

The first of the book’s five chapters is titled simply “A Difficult Subject” and

briefly outlines issues to be dealt with in the book. The subject is “difficult” because of the paucity of available data. Hengel includes extensive footnotes throughout the volume, often quoting Greek or Latin sources directly.

The second chapter views the LXX from the perspective of a collection of (Jewish) writings taken over by Christians. The term “Septuagint” (Latin: *septuaginta* = 70) first appears in our extant witnesses in Christian writings, not Jewish. However, it is not until the time of Justin in the mid-second century C.E. that the issues surrounding the LXX came to the fore. By this time, the Greek text passed through several recensions, or editions, and no one standard text was uniformly available. It was in contact with Jews of the time that matters came to a head. Some Christians, unaware of the history of their text, were quick to blame the Jews for the differences, claiming that predictions of significance for Christians were being suppressed from the Jewish writings. Not surprisingly, one of the texts most prominent in the debate was Isa 7:14, “virgin” vs. “young woman.”

Hengel is illuminating as he details the way in which the Christian church dealt with the growing concern over textual differences and traditions: Christians came to regard the LXX as inspired and inerrant, effectively putting the issues beyond debate. In the meantime, Jewish scholars such as Theodotus and Aquila (not the NT convert) retranslated the text in a more literal fashion for use by Jews.

The third chapter extends the discussion of the second chapter when it addresses the Christian OT canon in terms of what was to be included and what excluded. In the fourth and fifth centuries C.E., three great uncial manuscripts—Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, and Alexandrinus—were produced. While all of them contain Greek translations of the HB, there are differences in order and in terms of which books of the Apocrypha are included. All of the writings from the biblical period extant in the Rabbinic period were included in the HB, but not all of the surviving noncanonical Jewish books quoted or referenced in the NT were included in the LXX.

The fourth chapter addresses what would be the first or one of the first topics discussed when writing from the viewpoint of an OT or LXX scholar: the origins of the LXX. Here Hengel deals with whether the Letter of Aristeas, a basically apocryphal document written to promote the fledgling Greek translation, made it worthy of consideration in place of the HB for Greek-speaking diaspora Jews. The letter does yield the information that the initial translation was only of the Pentateuch and was based on Palestinian manuscripts (e.g., as opposed to those from Babylon).

The final chapter addresses how the Christian church ended up with the forty-nine books (plus the additions to the book of Daniel) found in the LXX today. As Hengel points out, the issues are ultimately insolvable, since much critical information is no longer available. In light of this, Hengel concludes with an important question: “Does the church still need a clearly demarcated, strictly closed Old Testament canon, since the New Testament is, after all, the ‘conclusion’, the goal and the fulfillment of the Old?” For him, the answer is found in the words of Jesus: “The Law and the Prophets are until John,” about which he observes, “We simply cannot go any further back” (126), i.e., the Christian OT canon should at least include all the documents quoted in the NT.

Included in the volume is an Introduction to the history of the LXX text, written by LXX scholar Robert Hanhart. I have left mentioning it until now even though it comes first in the book, since most readers will find it provides too much information too soon. Reading it is much like arriving several weeks late for a graduate seminar in an unfamiliar area of study.

Given the high level of scholarship manifest, I am surprised to see the author repeatedly accepting uncritically the role of the so-called Council of Jamnia as a step in

establishing the canon of the HB. It is over two decades now since this construct was critically evaluated and found wanting.

This volume deserves careful consideration by both NT and LXX scholars: by the former, because all too often the LXX is overlooked as a link in the chain between the NT and the OT; by the latter, since the quotations in the NT are an important, even complex, witness to the ongoing development of the LXX text. Also students of both disciplines as well as students of early church history will find the book beneficial. I leave the (informed) layperson last, because it is not easy reading but offers much in terms of understanding how the question of canon was addressed, should one have the patience to persist.

Loma Linda, California

BERNARD TAYLOR

Hunter, Cornelius G. *Darwin's God: Evolution and the Problem of Evil*. Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2001. 192 pp. Hardcover, \$17.99.

Cornelius G. Hunter is a recent graduate of the University of Illinois Center for Biophysics and Computational Biology. He is also the author of *Darwin's Proof: The Triumph of Religion over Science* (Brazos, 2003). As an advocate of the Intelligent Design movement, Hunter joins ranks with Phillip Johnson, Michael Behe, and William Dembski.

Hunter proposes that evolution is a reaction against a particular view of God. Thus evolution is a metaphysical, rather than a scientific, argument. He demonstrates this contention by discussing the main points of Darwin's argument for evolution, then shows how each of these points hinges on metaphysical arguments (chaps. 2-4). Thus, for him, "evolution is neither atheism in disguise nor is it merely science at work" (8).

Hunter proposes in chapter 1 that Darwin was influenced by Milton's characterization of God in *Paradise Lost*. Milton dealt with the problem of moral evil by distancing God from his creation. Darwin, Hunter contends, carried this separation of God further by making God unnecessary to his creation. God could not be responsible for either moral or natural evil because he was not directly responsible for the process of creation. Rather, natural laws governed the development of life and, in fact, were the source of evil.

In chapters 2 through 4, Hunter examines the three primary evidences for Darwin's evolutionary theory: comparative anatomy, small-scale evolution, and the fossil record. He then examines problems with this evidence and concludes each chapter with the metaphysical attributes inherent in Darwin's arguments. He demonstrates that Darwin's theories were centered around the problem of God and providence. For instance, he notes that two metaphysical arguments are embedded in Darwin's understanding of comparative anatomy. First, God would never repeat a pattern in his creation of the species, and second, evolution is proved to be true by the process of elimination. God would not create a world where evil exists and where there are many quandaries present among organisms; thus evolution is proven true on the basis of negative theology. Hunter believes that the use of such negative theology underlies all of evolutionary theory.

In his discussion of Darwin's understanding of small-scale evolution, Hunter finds three metaphysical arguments. First, Darwin brought about the downfall of Linnaeus's fixity and essentiality of the species by legitimatizing the notion that new species are regularly created by unguided natural forces. A second metaphysical problem that emerged out of Darwin's small-scale evolutionary theory was that God is not a micromanager. It was impossible to believe that God would bother to create such a menagerie of different species. The third metaphysical problem that Hunter deals with in chapter 3 is that the "evidence for evolution incorporates religious ideas" (63). He points out that evolutionists from Darwin to the present use their arguments directly against the doctrine of divine creation. Thus "evolutionists' rebuttals to