

thoughtful read for both musicians and clergy involved with the ministry of music.

Andrews University

THOMAS SHEPHERD

Erickson, Millard J. *Who's Tampering with the Trinity? An Assessment of the Subordination Debate*. Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2009. 272 pp. Paper, \$19.99.

Millard J. Erickson, one of the most widely published and respected North American evangelical theologians of the late twentieth and early twentieth centuries, has produced helpful history, analysis, and assessment of the so-called "Subordination Debate" in *Who's Tampering with the Trinity?* Erickson is a past president of the Evangelical Theological Society and has written widely on the doctrine of God (*God the Father Almighty: A Contemporary Exploration of the Divine Attributes*, 1998), and more specifically on the Trinity, including a chapter in his *Christian Theology* (1982, 2d ed., 1998), *God in Three Persons: A Contemporary Interpretation of the Trinity* (1995), and *Making Sense of the Trinity: Three Crucial Questions* (2000).

The "Subordination Debate" is a theological initiative that has erupted out of lengthy developments in the more recent history of American evangelicalism, who belong primarily to the Reformed tradition and are leading members of the Evangelical Theological Society. All of the major protagonists in the debate claim to be biblical and orthodox in their views of the Trinity. The key issue, however, that has become controversial is the question of Christ's "subordination" to the Father—was his subordination eternal or was it manifest only during Christ's earthly, incarnate experience? Erickson identified two key views in this debate: "Gradational-Authority" and "Equivalent-Authority."

All participants agree that Christ was subordinate to the Father during the earthly incarnation, but the controversy arises out of the claim of the "Gradationalists" that Christ has been eternally subordinate to the Father and that such eternal subordination sets a pattern for other spheres of authority: familial (husbands have intrinsic authority over wives) and ecclesiastical (only males, not females, should have ruling authority in the church). Key protagonists for the Gradational view include Bruce Ware, Wayne Grudem, and Robert Letham, while the leading advocates for the "Equivalent" view include Paul Jewett, Gilbert Bilezikian, Stanley Grenz (now deceased), and Kevin Giles.

Erickson's treatment reflects a valiant attempt to be both thorough and even-handed. He notes that he struggled to find terms of identification for each party in this debate, which is reflected in his attempts to avoid *ad hominem* attacks. His thoroughness is evident in his identification of the key protagonists and the flow of his chapters. After an informative Introduction, chapters 1 and 2 outline the respective views of each major party. Chapter 3 introduces "The Criteria for Evaluating Alternatives," followed by chapters 4-8, which analyze "The Biblical Evidence," "The Historical Considerations," "The Philosophical Issues," "The Theological Dimensions," and "The Practical Implications." The volume concludes with "*Summary and Conclusions*."

Erickson challenges one's thinking, especially in the sense that he provides so many factors important to sound theological reflection and clarity. Thankfully, he not only brings a great deal of eminence and fairness, evidenced by a thorough acquaintance with the writings of all of the major participants, to his analysis and critiques, but he has also invoked a wealth of experience with not only theology, but also philosophy, historical theology, biblical exegesis, and applied theology. This readable volume is not only must reading for those who are interested in Trinity and feminist issues from an evangelical perspective, but is also an outstanding exhibit of sound theological methodology.

While one may disagree with Erickson's conclusions (on every central issue in the debate he has concluded that the prevailing evidence supports the "Equivalent-Authority View"), any attentive reader should come away from reading this work with two important senses: they will know that they have been exposed to an enriching theological tutorial, and been empowered to be more ably analytical and theologically critical.

Berrien Springs, Michigan

Woodrow Whidden

Fladerer, Ludwig. *Augustinus als Exeget: Zu seinen Kommentaren des Galaterbriefes und der Genesis*. Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2010. 261 pp. Paper, \$80.00.

Augustine scholarship has at its disposal a multitude of volumes written from the perspective of historical theology and church history, typically addressing a specific theological concern. Ludwig Fladerer in *Augustinus als Exeget: Zu seinen Kommentaren des Galaterbriefes und der Genesis* presents a different approach. He endeavors to better understand the role of Augustine as biblical exegete, and does this from the perspective of a philologist with interest in semiotics. He is, therefore, interested in how Augustine uses words as signs, and in the meanings that can be mined from understanding the structures comprising his Bible commentaries.

The thrust of Fladerer's work is that the rhetorical and linguistic strategies used by Augustine to address practical concerns in his Bible commentaries indicate a Neoplatonic-friendly "semiotic step-model" (233), which would later come to fruition in his renowned discussion of things and signs in *De doctrina christiana*. He finds he can best demonstrate this by using Augustine's three Genesis commentaries (*De Genesi adversus Manichaeos*, *De Genesi ad litteram imperfectus liber*, and *De Genesi ad litteram*), in which the early church theologian discusses both the verbal layer of the text and the layer of meaning it is meant to signify. Thus it is only peripherally that Fladerer's concern is with Augustine's theology of creation. This becomes clear when he explains what Augustine's commentary on Galatians has to do with his commentary on Genesis: in terms of content, nothing; in terms of form and method, much.

Indeed, Fladerer feels that a comparative study is the best means to achieve his aim. The problem is that Augustine's contemporaries were generally