Eigen's research on the origin of genetic material and Ilya Prigogine's challenging reflections concerning the Second Law of Thermodynamics, but also a sensitive treatment of biblical literalism, in which Barbour allows that "creationists could rightly object if an atheistic philosophy, such as that of Dawkins, were taught in the biology classroom" (p. 179).

One cannot miss the deep earnestness, straightforwardness, and spirituality of the author. After considering all the possible alternatives for relating science and religion, Barbour ends his book with the affirmation that even though he believes that the process model, in combination with critical realism, may be the best approach, no method is complete or adequate, and only in worship can we acknowledge the mystery of God and the pretensions of any system of thought claiming to have mapped out God's ways (p. 270).

On the down side, Barbour could have strengthened a few of his presentations. In his discussion of Sir Fred Hoyle and Chandra Wickramasinghe, Barbour fails to mention one of their latest and most important collaborations: Why Neo-Darwinism Does Not Work (Cardiff, Wales, 1982), which is imperative reading in this area. Furthermore, I find no mention of either of the following key works or their authors, who are important critics of the "Modern Synthesis": Michael Denton, Evolution: A Theory in Crisis (London, 1985), and Gertrude Himmelfarb, Darwin and the Darwinian Revolution (Garden City, NY, 1959).

These few and relatively minor negative reflections are not intended to diminish the value of Barbour's book. On the contrary, Barbour has again placed the academic community in his debt by offering what seems to this reviewer to be a lastingly significant contemporary summarization and evaluation of the entire theological and philosophical task of responsibly addressing the relation of science and religion at all levels of discourse. In this respect the volume would serve well as either a collegiate or graduate text in a course on science and religion. Thus Barbour's work is a most beneficial contribution by which the concepts of anyone interested in this subject should be informed.

Andrews University

JOHN T. BALDWIN


Translations of the Bible continue to be published. The raison d'être for this translation is to share with others one man's attempt to clarify for himself the meaning of the NT. There are several things that make it more than just an ordinary translation. First, the translator was not a NT scholar
but a philosopher and classicist, a professor who had taught at Glasgow University and at Oxford for many years. (His famous father, Ernst, also had been a professor at Oxford.) Second, he had not read a word of the Bible before he was forty-nine years of age. Third, he came from a non-English-speaking family of liberal Jewish background that had fled Germany in 1934 during Hitler’s dictatorship. After discovering the Bible at the age of forty-nine, he was convinced of “God’s ultimate self-revelation in Jesus Christ” (p. x, Ronald Weitzman, “Introducing the Translation and Its Translator”), which led to his being baptized into the Anglican Church in 1955. One might be excused for being curious as to what kind of translation a person with such a background would produce.

The translation is based on a comparison of three Greek texts: Eberhard Nestle, Erwin Nestle, and G. D. Kilpatrick, Ἡ Καϊνὴ Διαθήκη (British and Foreign Bible Societies, 1952); Eberhard Nestle, Novum Testamentum Graece (Stuttgart, 1952); and K. Aland, et al., The Greek New Testament (United Bible Societies, 1966). Basically the text is a modern critical text.

One finds here the gamut of types of translations. There are some excellent passages, some not so good, and some which may appear a bit interpretive. The translation is not for the common people. The vocabulary is generally not the problem, but rather the way Cassirer phrases his sentences. He lived in an academic environment, and his translation indicates that fact, although as a whole it is clearly written.

The best way to get a bit of the flavor and nature of the translation is to provide some examples. The following are excellent:

Matt 23:24—“straining out the gnat yet gulping down the camel”
Luke 15:13—“there he frittered away what he had on a life of dissipation”
John 11:39—“the smell of death must be about him by this time”
Rom 5:15—“the gracious favour is out of all proportion to the trespass”
Heb 1:2—“in the person of one who is his son”
Heb 1:3—“precise counterpart.”

One would expect some fresh translations from a translator such as Cassirer. The following are examples of these:

Matt 5:3—“a blessing rests on those whose spirit makes them think but poorly of themselves”
Matt 5:6—“that right may be done”
Rom 2:13—“not those who merely listen”
1 Cor 8:7—“through the force of habit still clinging to them concerning the idol”
1 Cor 13:12—“at present our sight of things is one through a mirror which throws them into bewildering confusion”
1 John 2:21—“truth can never give birth to a lie”
Rev 13:18—“this is where ingenuity comes into play.”

There are passages that may appear a bit interpretive, such as the following:
Matt 7:6—“meat which has been consecrated”
Luke 11:24—“tarnished spirit”
John 1:1—“the Word was by the side of God, and the Word was the very same as God”
John 11:43—“Lazarus, come forth; here to my side!”
1 John 1:8—“truth being a stranger to us”
1 John 2:22—“arch-liar”
Rev 22:2—“down the middle of the city’s main street.”
Some translations appear awkward, and among these are the following:
Matt 5:40—“go to law with you with a view to obtaining your tunic”
Matt 7:12—“whenever there is something you wish other people would do for you, it is your duty that, acting in the same way, you should do it for them”
Rom 3:19—“so that everyone should be deprived of the power of opening his mouth by way of justifying himself”
Rom 14:1—“one whose faith shows a lack of vigour”
Eph 2:3—“deserving of God’s anger”
1 John 2:23—“has no grasp of the Father”
Rev 2:22—“as for those lending themselves to adulterous relations with her, I shall bring great distress upon them, unless they come to be repentant of practices such as she engages in.”
Some translations by one individual, such as those of Goodspeed, Moffatt, Knox, and Phillips, have caught on; but because of the academic nature of the language of this translation, one would not expect the same kind of acceptance. Cassirer’s translation, however, is still helpful, since he had a unique background. It is of interest and value to see how a Jewish Christian classicist and philosopher handles the NT text.

Chico, CA 95926

Sakae Kubo


The contributions published in this work were originally presented at a conference sponsored by the Starkoff Institute of Ethics and Contemporary Moral Issues, held at Hebrew Union College in November 1988.

The work is laid out in two distinct sections: (1) various historical, sociological, and political descriptions of “fundamentalism” from different perspectives, and (2) the liberal response. The contributors are eminent and predictably helpful, with the most important contributions being George Marsden’s “Defining American Fundamentalism”; his respondent, Clark Pinnock (“Defining American Fundamentalism: A Response”); and the