

to consider the matter fully in context (68–72). Contrary to his argument, the context was the identity of Jesus, who had not only come to give relief from ailments, but offer eternal salvation from the consequences of sin. Also, ascribing all modern “healing” to Jesus seems to negate what Jesus himself had predicted about healing originating from other sources. All healing now cannot be attributed to Jesus’s authority, even when the healers would profess so.

A final hermeneutical challenge in González’s work is his interpretation of the “breaking of bread” in Luke 24:30; Acts 2:46–47; 27:36 (100–108). The first passage describes Jesus meeting with the two disciples at Emmaus; the second, the early church house fellowship meals; and the latter passage refers to Paul’s meal during a shipwreck. Jesus’s act of breaking bread and giving thanks does not transform the meal at Emmaus to a communion supper. In Acts 2, the breaking of bread may have included, but was not limited to, communion. In the same way, Paul’s breaking of bread in a disaster scene does not amount to communion. Further, the references to the first day of the week in Luke 24:1 and Acts 20:7 do not imply that this was the only day on which believers gathered to worship or break bread, as the author argues. Also, creating a theological link between the beginning of creation on the first day of the week to the resurrection of Jesus on the first day of the week in order to establish its importance above the Sabbath seems inconsistent with the biblical theology of the Sabbath as a day of rest and worship.

Though González’s *The Story Luke Tells* could be improved in some respects, it is a commendable introduction to the theology of Luke. Its presentation of reversal, gender, salvation, worship, and Holy Spirit themes in Luke are laudable.

Adventist University of Africa
Nairobi, Kenya

SAMPSON M. NWAOMAH

Greenwood, Kyle. *Scripture and Cosmology: Reading the Bible between the Ancient World and Modern Science*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2015. 251 pp. Softcover. USD 30.00.

Kyle Greenwood, PhD (Hebrew Union College) has written a significant book on interpreting the Bible in relation to the tensions between ancient and modern cosmologies. His rank as associate professor of Old Testament and Hebrew language at Colorado Christian University and his publication of several studies on the Old Testament and its ancient Near Eastern (ANE) environment (229) make him more than qualified for this project. I appreciate Greenwood’s confessional commitment to a “high view” (29) of the divine authorship of the Bible through many human authors (9). This leads him to a “humbled” posture in presenting fruits of his “two decades” of research on “the languages, history, geography and culture of ancient Israel and its neighbors” with the goal of “reading the Bible faithfully” (11) according to its pre-Enlightenment (29) sociological (18), literary (20), and scientific contexts (22).

The book begins with a preface, acknowledgements, list of abbreviations, and a chapter on “Scripture in Context” which introduce the major parts of the book. “Part One: Scripture and Cosmos in Cultural Context” presents a thesis on “the diverse ways” the ANE “concept of the three-tiered cosmos [heavens, earth, and seas] projects itself onto the biblical text” (29). This thesis is defended in chapters on “Ancient Near Eastern Cosmologies,” “Cosmology in Scripture,” and “Cosmology and Cosmogony in Scripture.” “Part Two: Cosmology and Scripture in Historical Context” describes how some interpreters of the Bible respond to tensions produced by scientific progress (*ibid.*). This history is surveyed in chapters on “Scripture and Aristotelian Cosmology,” and “Scripture and Copernican Cosmology.” “Part Three: Scripture and Science” presents Greenwood’s view of “an appropriate posture toward biblical interpretation in light of . . . science” (*ibid.*). This hermeneutic is presented in chapters on “Cosmology and the Authority of Scripture,” and “The Authority of Scripture and the Issue of Science.” The usefulness of the book is enhanced by a bibliography, an author and work index, a subject index, and a Scripture index (223–250).

Throughout his book, Greenwood wrestles with the thought-provoking tension that arises from his “high view” (29) of the Bible message as: “clear and unambiguous on matters pertinent to salvation,” but not on “all matters” (10). He effectively surveys many ways to affirm biblical statements on cosmology; however, he does not express confidence in any of these. For example, references to heavens, earth, and sea (25–26) may reflect an observational perspective without implying a commitment to ancient cosmology (102). However, the Bible’s use of ancient terminology and the initial Christian resistance to new scientific cosmologies (69) suggest to Greenwood that Bible writers presuppose the accuracy of ancient cosmologies (102). Similarly, while the biblical phrase “foundations of the world” is always “used idiomatically to refer to the beginning of creation” (138), Greenwood assumes that “behind the idiom . . . is the ancient notion that the earth had a literal foundation” (*ibid.*). In addition, while New Testament references to the light of the moon could be “figures of speech,” he cautions that we should not “jump to quickly to this conclusion” (145). Greenwood correctly points out that “the Bible never claims to be a scientific textbook” (202). However, he presents a debatable proposition that the Bible is “stuck between [the] two worlds” of ANE and Aristotelian cosmology (157–158).

In response to this, Greenwood recommends Galileo’s view that “if God was responsible for both Scripture and the natural world, it was illogical to conceive a world in which the two would be in contradiction. Where there were apparent contradictions, the problem was that one of the two were being wrongly interpreted” (169). For Galileo, “the Book of nature could supersede the Book of Scripture” with regard to scientific investigation (170). In addition, Greenwood supports Aquinas’s view that “Scripture may not always comport with scientific investigation” or “correct cosmology” since “God stoops” to the “intellectual status” of the Bible writers (199). At the same time, Greenwood correctly recognizes that even “our vast study of deep space

with powerful telescopes and satellites” does not enable us to “know enough to comprehend a divine explication of the universe” (202). Therefore, while “some Christians” “feel threatened by advances in science,” this “is rather unfortunate” and “ought not be” (205). “If as Scripture asserts, God reveals himself in creation, then the more we learn about his wondrous works, the more we learn about the God who fashioned them” (ibid.). “The God who created the cosmos and spoke through Scripture . . . revels in revealing himself through both” (221).

Nevertheless, Greenwood concludes that the earth-centered cosmology (which he views as presented in the Bible) has been proven wrong by the sun-centered Copernican cosmology. Further, “where the battle once raged over whether the earth was the center of the cosmos, the conflict now revolves around the issue of human origins” (212). Therefore, Greenwood surveys five ways to respond to this conflict.

First, Charles Darwin “affirmed, if unconvincingly [from a biblical perspective], that the processes of evolution were guided by the hand of God” (214). However, the other proposals are from Bible scholars who respond to Darwin’s proposal with the aim of defending the fundamental message of Scripture. (See R. A. Torrey et al., eds., *The Fundamentals: The Famous Sourcebook of Fundamental Biblical Truths* [Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1990]). Second, Dyson Hague calls for “complete dismissal of Darwin’s theory.” Third, James Orr recommends that we “harmonize Scripture with the laws of nature” as understood by evolutionary science. Fourth, George Wright takes a mediating position, proposing that God created “several forms of plants and animals” that possess “a marvelous capacity for variation.” (217). Fifth, Benjamin Warfield proposed the concept of “mediate creation” which could be referred to as “*evolution*, . . . understood as God’s providential hand in the formation of new creatures” (219). I resonate with Greenwood’s concern that “we take care not to ignore” science “simply for the sake of standing on the inspiration of Scripture.” Instead, “we must be sensitive to all the ways God reveals himself to us, and to all the ways that Scripture and science inform each other” (ibid.). However, it would have been very helpful if he had provided more specific guidelines for evaluating these proposals.

There are many contemporary biblical scholars who propose additional biblical insights that are relevant for understanding the interaction between science and theology. For instance, biblical evidence has been presented for a two-stage creation that can harmonize with much of the current scientific understanding of the existence of the cosmos (stage one) at a time prior to the six day preparation of the habitats for life on planet earth (stage two) (Thomas P. Arnold, *Two Stage Biblical Creation* [Arlington Heights, IL: Thomas P. Arnold, 2007]). Also, there is biblical evidence that the genealogies of Genesis indicate a recent creation of habitats for life (Bernard White, “Schematized or Non-schematized: The Genealogies of Genesis 5 and 11,” *AUSS* 54.2 [2016], 205–235). The biblical record of a catastrophic flood is another way to resolve some of the tensions between biblical and scientific cosmology (Richard M. Davidson, “The Genesis Flood Narrative: Crucial

Issues in the Current Debate,” *AUSS* 42.1 [2004], 49–77). At the same time, it is important to note that many creationist scientists admit that they have not yet developed an adequate scientific flood model for integrating currently available data with the biblical record (Andy McIntosh, Steve Taylor, and Tom Edmondson, “Flood Models: The Need for an Integrated Approach,” *Creation* 14.1 [2000], 25–59).

Ultimately, the relations of biblical and scientific cosmology cannot be correctly understood unless we take seriously the message communicated through biblical cosmology. This is more than an outdated husk that can be removed in order to uncover the kernel of non-cosmological truth hidden beneath it. This insight is highlighted in three questions raised by L. Michael Morales in his review of Greenwood’s book.

“Firstly, how does one discern the line between language that is deliberately analogical and phenomenological on the one hand, and language that exemplifies a faulty science about the physical universe on the other hand?” (L. Michael Morales, review of *Scripture and Cosmology: Reading the Bible between the Ancient World and Modern Science*, by Kyle Greenwood, *Themelios* 41.2 [2016]: 303–304). Instead of a naive affirmation of ancient cosmologies, the Bible may be describing God’s creation as it appears to the human senses—which is compatible with ancient and contemporary cosmologies.

Secondly, “to what degree is [biblical] accommodation [to ancient cosmological language] a matter of navigating the tension between an audience’s limited understanding *versus* their misunderstanding?” (*ibid.*, 304). If we reject the cosmological language of Scripture because we have an alternate scientific cosmology, we may be rejecting cosmological truths that God is communicating in the language of an ancient cosmology.

Thirdly, “is it possible that the three-tiered cosmos is used purposefully in a theological, mythic, or cultic sense—and, if so, what gets lost when biblical cosmology is dismissed?” (*ibid.*). When we reject the cosmological language of Scripture we are in danger of also rejecting non-cosmological truths that are communicated through that language. While the biblical authors did not write “treatises against the scientifically naive viewpoints of their . . . neighbors” (102), Greenwood underestimates the extent to which they “engaged in a systematic correction of the pagan worldviews” (*ibid.*). (See Gerhard F. Hasel and Michael G. Hasel, “The Unique Cosmology of Genesis 1 Against Ancient Near Eastern and Egyptian Parallels,” in *The Genesis Creation Account and Its Reverberations in the Old Testament*, ed. Gerald A. Klingbeil [Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 2015], 9–29).

Greenwood’s *Scripture and Cosmology* provides an excellent survey of ancient cosmology, biblical cosmological language, and how interpreters of the Bible adjust to tensions produced by changes in scientific cosmology. He affirms that God speaks harmoniously through Scripture and nature when they are rightly interpreted by theology and science. Greenwood has not surveyed all of the available relevant research; this is probably because of the scope of what he aims to accomplish in his book, and because of the multitude of materials that are continually being published. Nevertheless, while written

in a way that can be digested by the general reader, this book also deserves careful attention by scholars who study the relationships between theology and science.

Andrews University

MARTIN F. HANNA

Greidanus, Sidney. *Preaching Christ from Psalms: Foundations for Expository Sermons in the Christian Year*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016. xx + 595 pp. Softcover. USD 33.25.

This book is the last volume of Sidney Greidanus's series on preaching Christ from the Old Testament, published by Eerdmans. The series reflects Greidanus's academic expertise, high regard for Scripture, and Reformed (Calvinist) background. Other books from this series include *Preaching Christ from the Old Testament* (1999), *Preaching Christ from Genesis* (2007), *Preaching Christ from Ecclesiastes* (2010), and *Preaching Christ from Daniel* (2012). The Old Testament is often neglected in Christian preaching due to its widely, but unjustly assumed, inferiority to the New Testament when it comes to Christian theology and practice. Some people struggle to see how the Old Testament relates to the person and work of Christ. In his series, Greidanus seeks to demonstrate that Christ, as God's self-revelation and salvation, is the very center of the Old Testament, and so should be of every sermon from the Old Testament.

In his book, *Preaching Christ from the Old Testament*, Greidanus provides seven sound hermeneutical-homiletical approaches from the Old Testament text to Christ in the New Testament. These methods are followed in this book, and are: redemptive-historical progression, promise-fulfillment, typology, analogy, longitudinal themes, New Testament references, and contrast (34–37). As the author observes, these approaches sometimes overlap, but the issue is “not so much to identify the precise classification as it is to find a legitimate bridge from the Old Testament text to Christ in the New Testament” (34n113). The goal of this book is to encourage preachers to preach Christ from all the Psalms (Christocentric approach), and not just to use a select few of the Psalms as preaching texts. For Greidanus, preaching Christ means “preaching sermons which authentically integrate the message of the text with the climax of God's revelation with the person, work, and/or teaching of Jesus Christ as revealed in the New Testament” (5). In other words, the author seeks to understand a psalm not only in its original historical context and the literary context of the Old Testament, but also in the context of the New Testament. The author seeks to demonstrate that there are ways to preach Christ from every psalm, and not only from the Messianic or royal psalms.

In addition to being Old Testament texts, the Psalms are viewed by some as inappropriate for preaching because they are biblical prayers, and so supposedly have originated as human words addressed to God. Greidanus addresses this and other common objections to preaching the Psalms, and provides a biblical-theological rationale for preaching Christ from the Psalms (ch. 1). He thus joins some recent trends that seek to restore the Psalms to