Check for updates

of Schleiermacher's reputation as an enlightened founder of modern theology was his insistence on sharply separating the Old Testament from the New, his judgment that Judaism and "heathenism" should be judged as equally distant from Christianity, and his conviction that the attempt "to find our Christian faith in the Old Testament has injured our practice of the exegetical art" (310). Particularly striking is the authors' demonstration that all the interpreters struggled with inerrancy and inner-biblical contradictions, though the ways in which these issues manifested themselves varied.

The volume is an excellent study, up to date, vigorously argued, richly supplied with quotes from the theologians themselves, and enlivened by constant comparison of the theologians treated. Ideally, one might wish for the inclusion of a woman, or a post-Reformation Catholic or Orthodox theologian as a contrast with the Protestant views, but the theologians selected have undeniably influenced modern theology and biblical studies. And it is good to see included the sometimes overlooked Pietists, Wesley, and Kierkegaard, and it is a bonus to find the pastorally engaged Bonhoeffer. The authors have indeed made a good case that that the Bible should *not* be read "like any other book," and that it demands a particular kind of reading, exemplified quite differently by each thinker. This survey of biblical interpreters is a welcome contribution to our understanding of the Bible in Christian theology. One lack, in the reviewer's judgment, is that the survey's persistent emphasis on the Bible as challenging readers with its faith claims overshadows an important feature of the Christian Bible—its depiction of a narrative stretching from creation in Genesis to new creation in Revelation. True, the authors acknowledge the importance of story in Matthew and Luke, but it is distinctly secondary to their insistence on immediate response. This story reassures. Not demanding an immediate faith response, it rather elicits wonder at God's hidden power and invites confidence in the divine action moving history forward in spite of human opposition. Christian art has developed this side of the Bible. Medieval cathedrals often depict biblical scenes from both the Old and New Testaments in a linear sequence. The Bible not only probes and challenges; it also tells a story to be prized and celebrated.

Richard J. Clifford, SJ
Boston College School of Theology and Ministry

The Enduring Authority of the Christian Scriptures. Edited by D. A. Carson. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2016. Pp. xvi + 1240. $65.

This work produced by thirty-seven evangelical scholars studies the authority of the Bible and issues connected with it. After a long introduction by the editor, the book takes up such historical topics as "'The Truth Above All Demonstration': Scripture in the Patristic Period to Augustine" (Charles E. Hill), "The Bible in the Reformation and Protestant Orthodoxy" (Robert Kolb), "The Answering Speech of Men: Karl Barth on Holy Scripture" (David Gibson), and "Roman Catholic Views of Biblical Authority from the Late Nineteenth Century to the Present" (Anthony N. S. Lane). The book

moves to such biblical and theological topics as "God and the Scripture Writers: The Question of Double Authorship" (Henri A. G. Blocher), "Biblical Authority and Diverse Literary Genres" (Barry G. Webb), "Reflections on Jesus' View of the Old Testament" (Craig L. Blomberg), and "May We Go Beyond What Is Written After All? The Pattern of Theological Authority and the Problem of Doctrinal Development" (Kevin J. Vanhoozer). The volume then takes up such philosophical and epistemological topics as "Contemporary Religious Epistemology: Some Key Aspects" (James Beilby), "Authority and Truth" (Michael C. Rea), "To Whom Does the Text Belong? Communities of Interpretation and the Interpretation of Communities" (Richard Lints), and "Science and Scripture" (Kirsten Birkett). A section on comparative religious topics includes such chapters as "Knowing the Bible is the Word of God Despite Competing Claims" (Te-Li Lau), "Can Hindu Scriptures Serve as a 'Tutor' to Christ?" (Timothy C. Tennent), and "Buddhist Sutras and Christian Revelation" (Harold Netland and Alex G. Smith). The work concludes with a chapter that sketches a life-giving reading of the Bible, "Take, Read" (Daniel M. Doriani) and with the editor's summary of the chapters in the form of "Frequently Asked Questions."

The value of this beautifully produced book is enhanced by an elegant list of abbreviations, appropriate indexes, and notes on contributors. Six contributors are located at different centers in the United Kingdom, three in Sydney (Australia), and two in Canada. One (Alex G. Smith) has taught in Asia and elsewhere for the Overseas Missionary Fellowship, while the remaining 25 have positions in the USA (with seven of these at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School in Illinois). Only two of the contributors are women. A deep love for the Scriptures and desire to lead biblical lives constantly shines through the chapters.

All Christians should agree that, thanks to the primary, divine Author, the Scriptures are authoritative and truthful—reliably guiding belief and action. The volume under review persistently shows evangelical emphases: for instance, a tendency to merge revelation, inspiration, and inerrancy; a preference for the language of "inerrancy" over that of "truth" (yet see 25); and a stress on biblical revelation (e.g., 956, 1166) that leaves little room for other means of divine self-revelation reaching human beings. Are the revelation and truth of God found "exclusively" in and through the Scriptures (975)? Or can/does God also reveal truth in other ways: for example through the "intelligent observation and thought with which he blesses the human race" (985)? If the Bible is the revelation of God (4), is it the only means for the revelation of God?

The contributors often tackle the question: Can the authoritative Scriptures themselves settle disputes about their meaning and vindicate the axiom of "Scripture being its own interpreter?" While appreciating a certain Western return to a sense of community and the relevance of the community as interpreter, Lints remarks, "we all want to belong to some group even if we also want to be careful about the group's hold on us. We want community without authority" (921). Many of the contributors acknowledge in different ways the (derived) authority of the Bible's human authors and the need to establish literal meaning or what those human authors intended to communicate—as Carson puts it, "the intentions of authors human and divine" (12; see 1167–68). But the divine authorship remains paramount; Scripture means "whatever God

has written it to mean" (985). Yet how can we establish what God intended to say, except by examining the (divinely inspired) intentions of the human authors? And what authoritative role should the church community and its tradition play in a biblical interpretation that begins with the literal meaning intended by the human authors?

Apropos of Catholic teaching, one could agree with Carson: "Catholicism has held that tradition has an authority comparable to that of Scripture" (1163; see 292). After all, Vatican II's Constitution on Divine Revelation insisted on Scripture and tradition being closely bound together: "they flow from the same divine well-spring [revelation], come together in some fashion to form one thing, and move toward the same goal" (*Dei Verbum* [*DV*] 9). Since the origin, function, and finality of Scripture and tradition are so intimately linked, one should agree that their authority is at least "comparable." Carson, however, presses on to claim in an unqualified fashion that in the Catholic view "the Magisterium, the teaching authority of the church, *alone* determines what Scripture and tradition mean" (1163; emphasis mine). Vatican II teaches rather that the "task of authentically [i.e. authoritatively] interpreting the Word of God, whether written or handed down, has been entrusted only to the living teaching office of the church" (*DV* 10). The Council then states that "interpreting Scripture is ultimately subject" to the judgment of the church [i.e. the magisterium] (*DV* 12). This corresponds to practice. On a day-to-day basis, the magisterium is far from determining *alone* what Scripture and tradition mean. It does so rarely, as the ultimate, authoritative interpreter of divine revelation. Earlier Carson rightly speaks about the "ultimate" teaching authority claimed for the Magisterium (24). Being "ultimate" is not the same as standing "alone."

A further statement by Carson about the "exclusive sufficiency" of Scriptures also calls for qualification (1163). Very many Catholics have accepted their "material" sufficiency, in that they convey the full truth of divine revelation, but not their "formal" sufficiency. The Scriptures need to be interpreted by tradition, church teachers, and Christian believers. Those who return to the language about the "sufficiency" of the Scriptures need to distinguish between "material" and "formal" sufficiency (see 294, 305–7).

All in all, this volume should be welcomed not only for its invitation to let the Scriptures guide Christian thinking and acting, but also for its repeated message that sinful human beings can evade or distort what the Holy Spirit wishes to say to us through the inspired Word of God.

Gerald O'Collins, SJ
University of Divinity (Melbourne) and Australian Catholic University

A Marginal Jew. Rethinking the Historical Jesus. By John P. Meier. Volume 5: Probing the Authenticity of the Parables. New Haven: Yale University, 2016. Pp. xiii + 441. $39.95.

This installment in Professor Meier's ongoing project, producing a historical-critical account of the first-century Jewish prophet, teacher, and healer Jesus of Nazareth will