AFRICANUS JOURNAL

Vol. 11 No. 2 | November 2019

AFRICANUS JOURNAL
VOL. 11, NO. 2 NOVEMBER 2019

Contents

Goals of the *Africanus Journal*

The *Africanus Journal* is an award-winning interdisciplinary biblical, theological, and practical journal of the Center for Urban Ministerial Education (CUME). Its goals are to promote:

a. the mission and work of the members and mentors of the Africanus Guild Ph.D. Research Program of Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, Boston;

b. the principles of the Africanus Guild (evangelical orthodox Christian men and women who are multicultural, multiracial, urban-oriented, studying a Bible without error in a cooperative way);

c. Christian scholarship that reflects an evangelical perspective, as an affiliate of GCTS-Boston. This is an interdisciplinary journal that publishes high quality articles in areas such as biblical studies, theology, church history, religious research, case studies, and studies related to practical issues in urban ministry. Special issues are organized according to themes or topics that take seriously the contextual nature of ministry situated in the cultural, political, social, economic, and spiritual realities in the urban context.

Scholarly papers may be submitted normally by those who have or are in (or are reviewed by a professor in) a Th.M., D.Min., Ed.D., Th.D., ST.D., Ph.D., or equivalent degree program.

Two issues normally are published per year. http://www.gordonconwell.edu/resources/AfricanusJournal.cfm

Life of Julius Africanus

Julius Africanus was probably born in Jerusalem, many scholars think around A.D. 200. Africanus was considered by the ancients as a man of consummate learning and sharpest judgment (*Ante-Nicene Fathers* 6:128). He was a pupil of Heracles, distinguished for philosophy and other Greek learning, in Alexandria, Egypt around A.D. 231–233. In A.D. 220/226, he performed some duty in behalf of Nicopolis (formerly Emmaus) in Palestine. Later he likely became bishop of Emmaus (Eusebius, *History*, VI.xxxi.2). Origen calls him "a beloved brother in God the Father, through Jesus Christ, His holy Child" (*Letter from Origen to Africanus* 1). Fellow historian Eusebius distinguishes him as "no ordinary historian" (*History,* I. vi.2). Eusebius describes the five books of *Chronologies* as a "monument of labor and accuracy" and cites extensively from his harmony of the evangelists' genealogies (*History,* VI. xxxi. 1–3). Africanus was a careful historian who sought to defend the truth of the Bible. He is an ancient example of meticulous, detailed scholarship which is historical, biblical, truthful, and devout.

Even though Eusebius describes Africanus as the author of the *Kestoi*, Jerome makes no mention of this (*ANF* 6:124). The author of *Kestoi* is surnamed Sextus, probably a Libyan philosopher who arranged a library in the Pantheon at Rome for the Emperor. The *Kestoi* was probably written toward the end of the 200s. It was not written by a Christian since it contains magical incantations (*Oxyrhynchus Papyri* III.412).

The Greek text of Africanus' writings may be found in Martinus Josephus Routh, *Reliquiae sacrae* II (New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 1974 [1846]), 225–309, and Martin Wallraff, Umberto Roberto, Karl Pinggéra, eds., William Adler, trans., *Iulius Africanus Chronographiae: The Extant Fragments*, *Die Griechischen Christlichen Schrifsteller* 15 (New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2007).

The extant writings of Julius Africanus may be found in vol. 1, no 1, April 2009 edition of the *Africanus Journal*.

Other Front Matter

Resources:

Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary faculty publications only and hard copies of this journal may be ordered by emailing cumebookstore@gordonconwell.edu, books@gordonconwell.edu, or telephoning the CUME library at 617-427-7293.

Summary of Content:

This issue is a tribute from Gordon-Conwell/Boston campus to the 50 years' celebration of the combined Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary. It includes an exegetical biblical article from a graduate, a sociological study from a former dean, and a book review article from a theology professor, as well as book reviews from a variety of contributors on the arts, New and Old Testament studies, and preaching.

THE AFRICANUS GUILD

L to R: Quonekuia Day, Mark Chuanhang Shan, Jennifer Creamer

"If not for the Africanus Guild, I would not even think of getting a Ph.D. and would not have had the chance to teach my own course at Gordon-Conwell, and be trained to be a Bible teacher, and for this I am most grateful." –Benjamin Fung

Benjamin Fung's Ph.D. was received from North-West University in South Africa 2017
Quonekuia Day and Mark Shan are Ph.D. candidates with London School of Theology.
Jennifer Creamer received her Ph.D. from North-West University in 2016.

The Africanus Guild is a support program set up to assist selective, underrepresented constituencies to pursue research Ph.D.s from North-West University and London School of Theology. The Guild is especially oriented to the multicultural, multiracial urban scene. Accepted students are mentored by a Gordon-Conwell faculty member. Candidates may complete the Th.M. at the Boston campus and then apply to the Guild.

David and the Bread of the Presence[1]

Tim Lanigan

Introduction

David was held in contempt by King Saul when he visited Ahimelech the priest at Nob in I Samuel 21. As an outcast of the royal court, David had received help from his wife Michal, from Samuel, and from Jonathan. When he reached Ahimelech, David and some of his men were in need of sustenance. David asked for showbread or the "bread of the presence." This incident is mentioned by Jesus in each of the synoptic gospels, as Jesus confronts the Pharisees regarding the Sabbath. Is this incident of minor consequence, or is there a deeper meaning seen in the use of bread in symbolic relation to the holiness of the Lord? This article contends that David's partaking of the bread of the Presence indicates David's symbolic authority over the priesthood. Jesus would endorse the judgment of Ahimelech in putting mercy before ceremonial law in Matthew 12:3-4, when he gave the holy bread to David. Symbolically the bread foreshadowed the bread of communion, offered to the disciples at the Last Supper in Matthew 26:26, which is now our bread of the Presence. After a careful exegesis of I Samuel 21:4-7, the historical context, form, structure, and literary context shall be considered. The biblical context and theology of the use of bread and the broader concept of holiness in this account of Scripture shall be examined. Ultimately, the goal is to shed light on theological insights about the nature of our Lord—the very reason we look to Scripture in the first place.

I. Translation of I Samuel 21:4-7

4. Now therefore [a],[2] what do you have [b]on hand[b]? Give me [c]five loaves of bread[c] [d]in my hand[d], or [e]whatever can be found[e]. 5. And the priest answered David and said, there is no [a]common bread[a3] on hand; but there is [b]holy bread [b],[4] if the young men have [c]at least[c] [d]kept themselves from women[d]. 6. And David answered the priest, and said to him, "Honestly, women have been restrained from us [a]for the past three days, since I came forth[a].[5] And [b]the vessels of the young men are holy[b],[6] [c]even

1 This article developed from a paper submitted to Jim Critchlow, Ph.D., for the course OT645: Exegesis of I and II Samuel, Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, Boston, originally written November, 2008, re-edited November, 2018.

2 The last sentence of ch. 20 (v. 42) in the English translations is 21:1 in the Masoretic Text (MT). The verse numbers for this text correspond to those seen in the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (BHS).

The term שיה instead of שי (with the subtraction ofמה) is seen in medieval manuscripts and confers with Greek codices of the Septuagint (LXX), the Latin replica codex Legionensis of Rome, 1864 (L^{93}), and the Vulgate (V). The meaning here is shifted from the inquiry "what is there under your hand?" to the declarative "there is under your hand…" The term מה (what?) could have been idiomatic as an interjection in early Hebrew culture. In English, we have a similar expression. When explaining something, or telling an anecdote, we can interject, "There were, *what?* four men there." During translation, there is more likely to be a shortening or smoothing of terms (stated by Professors Quonekuia Day and James Critchlow of GCTS, 2008). There could of course be a copyist error which was duplicated in subsequent versions (Ellis R. Brotzman, *Old Testament Textual Criticism: A Practical Introduction* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994), pg. 108).

3 The preposition לא is absent in the LXX, L^{93}, L^{94} (Venice, 1478), V, and the Syriac (S) versions. This is also referenced in the $4QSam^b$ (from cave 4 of the Dead Sea Scrolls at Qumran according to Brotzman, *Old Testament Textual Criticism*, pg. 91). The double preposition "to under" or "toward the underneath" appears to be unnecessary. The loss of this preposition certainly does not diminish any context or meaning. Indeed, the additional word in the Masoretic Text could be a corrupt dittograph (Ralph W. Klein, *Word Biblical Commentary*, Vol. 10, I Samuel (Waco, TX: Word, 1983), pg. 211).

4 The Qumran manuscript $4QSam^b$ adds ונממ תתלכאו . The LXX adds καὶ φάγεται to the end of this verse (*The Septuagint with Apocrypha*, pg. 385). The Hebrew extension means "and you eat (masculine plural) from their portion." The Greek extension means, "(and, or then) they shall eat them," indicating the loaves of bread. This addition is intriguing, especially the Hebrew of the Qumran text. The holiness of the bread demanded holiness of David and his men, and David was to eat from the priests' portion (manna). This is the same root meaning as the manna in the wilderness, used in context with "holy bread."

5 The particle conjunction אם ("if," or "rather") is absent from a few Hebraic manuscript codices. This could be a possible copyist error, although it does not diminish context or meaning. Its absence allows for clearer interpretation.

6 Some Hebraic codices change the prefix preposition from בְּ to מ, as well as the LXX, S, Targums (T), and V. It means,

though the journey is a common one. How much more then today will the vessels be holy[c]? 7. So the priest gave him holy bread, because there was no bread there but [a]the bread of the presence[a][7] which had been taken away from before the Lord, in order to put hot bread in its place on the day it was taken away.

Translation Notes

4.[a] There is no term in the Hebrew for "therefore," but the use of the Hebrew term התעו ("and now.") advances the narrative from what David has just said to Ahimelech the priest in the prior verse. The NIV and the RSV use "now then." The NKJV and the NAS read, "Now therefore."

4.[b –b] The Hebrew דדי תחת means "under your hand." The idiom "on hand" is both American and British. "At hand," is used by the RSV, while the NIV, the NAS and the NKJV agree with the above translation.

4.[c-c] The Hebrew חמשה לחם means "five bread." The term "loaves" is added to strengthen the context. I was tempted to use the phrase "a few loaves," instead of the number five. Robert Alter points out that "The number five is sometimes used idiomatically in biblical Hebrew to mean a few."[8] The current translation is preferred because there is the aim to be as literal as meaningfully possible. The four English-translation Bibles utilized thus far are in agreement.

4.[d-d] The Hebrew term בידי means "in my hand," and is present in the text. The phrase is not absolutely essential to the meaning, since it is inferred by the demand "give me." Again, the aim in this translation is be literal wherever it is the most helpful. "In my hand" is dropped out of the NIV, the RSV, the NAS, but not the NKJV.

4.[e-e] The Hebrew term אצמנה, a niphal participle means "that which is found." "Whatever can be found" is not too far a stretch from the literal. The NIV uses "whatever you can find," the RSV uses "whatever is here," and the NAS and NKJV agree with this translation.

5.[a-a] Now we come to לחם חל, literally, "the profane bread" in Hebrew, referred to as "ordinary" in the NIV and the NAS, "common" in the RSV and NKJV. "Common" is used for this translation. A softer term was chosen than "profane" because there is entirely too much profanity surrounding us and this term has lost its ancient meaning. All terms surrounding reference to the use in this passage of the term "bread" are important for the focus of this article.

5.[b-b] Here we see לחם קדש or "bread of holiness, apartness or sacredness" in the Hebrew. The phrase "holy bread" is used in this translation, as seen in the RSV and the NKJV. "Consecrated bread" is used in the NIV, the NAS, and The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible (English translation- hereafter referred to as DSSB).[9]

5.[c-c] The particle adverb רק means "surely" in Hebrew and can have the connotation "only" in the restrictive sense. It is in this sense that "at least" has been used in this translation, which

---

"my men," which is inferred in the phrases "to us," and "the young men," elsewhere in the verse. These translations are perhaps "putting words in David's mouth," but the meaning and context maintain their integrity.

7 The Qumran text changes the hophal participle verb המורסמים "the ones being taken away" with the masculine plural ending to simply רסומה , or "that which was being taken away." "The ones" would be the loaves of bread. The meaning is seemingly identical, except that there is a glimmer of dynamic equivalence in applying a general concept over a less general expression. Individual loaves are like individual men. The bread of the Presence was traditionally arranged as a set two rows of six loaves each, for a total of twelve (Keith R. Crin and George A. Buttrick, eds., *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible,* Vol. I (Nashville: Abingdon, 1962), pg. 464). There is symbolism in this arrangement, representing the sons/ tribes of Jacob/ Israel and the disciples of Jesus.

8 Robert Alter, *The David Story: A Translation with Commentary of 1 and 2 Samuel* (New York: Norton, 1999), pg.131.

9 Martin G. Abegg, Peter Flint, and Eugene Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible: The Oldest Known Bible Translated for the First Time into English (*San Francisco: HarperOne, 2002).

agrees with the NKJV. "If only" is seen in the RSV and the NAS. This "if" clause utilizes the term "provided" in the NIV.

5.[d-d] The niphal perfect verb ורמשנ means "to be kept or guarded." The third person common plural use refers to "the young men." The current translation "kept themselves from women" agrees with all five English translations referred to thus far.

6.[a-a] The Hebrew phrase יתאצב משלש לומתכ literally means "as yesterday three days in my going forth." "As yesterday" can also mean "as in the past." The NIV takes a different view than the current translation "for the past three days, since I came forth." It is "as usual, whenever I set out" in the NIV, which exemplifies dynamic equivalence (concept courtesy of Professor Jim Critchlow). This is applying the general sense over the specific circumstance. The RSV states, "as always when I go on an expedition." Again, the general application is preferred, with some license evident in the use of the term "expedition." The NAS and the DSSB read, "as previously when (or whenever) I set out." The NKJV states, "about three days since I came out."

6.[b-b] "The vessels of the young men are holy" is preferred mainly because of the term ילכ־מירענה, which in Hebrew means "the vessels of the men." This appears to be an euphemism for the men's sexual organs, or even their entire bodies. The significance of this euphemism shall be further examined in the Lexical Data section. The NIV skirts the issue (or makes it worse) by saying, "the men's things are holy."

6.[c-c] This section of the verse has choppy wording and a most unusual NKJV translation. The Hebrew words לח דרד אוהו can mean "and he, it, itself… (the) way, journey, manner… or common." The NKJV sees the term אוהו in the concept of "it" or "itself" as meaning "the bread," which is assumed, but not directly mentioned. This takes on an additional clause in the verse which steps aside from the issue of the state of holiness of the men. The NKJV renders this section as, "and the bread is in effect common, even though it was sanctified in the vessel this day." This utilizes a different use of the term "vessel." It could perhaps be alluding to the basket (a vessel for unleavened bread) referred to in Leviticus 8:26 or to the oven which baked the unleavened bread. While the two terms referring to a vessel could be intriguing by contrast, the current translation is established on the theory that David is amplifying the original concept of the term "vessel" in reference to his men. The RSV, NIV, NAS and DSSB all agree with the gist of the above translation.

7.[a-a] This phrase is at the heart of this study. מינפה מחל means "the bread of the presences" (plural, as in מיהלא). This translation uses "the bread of the Presence," agreed to in the NIV, the RSV, the NAS, and the DSSB versions. The NKJV refers to it as "the showbread." This phrase will be unpacked further in the Historical Context and Theology sections.

II. Historical Context

The books of Samuel were once a single book in the Talmud.[10] The original book was divided in two, along with the books of Kings and Chronicles, in order to accommodate the Greek use of consonants and vowels and the length of papyrus scrolls.[11] The time-frame includes from no earlier than the year 1110 BC to no later than the year 970 BC, just before Solomon became King over Israel. Saul reigned 40 years over Israel,[12] and Samuel died in the latter part of the reign of Saul. First Samuel describes the close of the period of judges. The tabernacle is at Shiloh, and "the major powers of the ancient Near East- Assyria, Babylon, Hatti and Egypt- were all in decline, and posed no real threat to Israel."[13] Yet, Israel's neighbors have always represented potential danger (as they do today). The Philistines, who had settled along the coastline of Judea, were problematic enemies, causing the people to desire a king.[14]

10 Alter, *The David Story,* pg. x.
11 Brotzman, *Old Testament Textual Criticism,* pg. 39-40.
12 Time-graph. Charles C. Ryrie, *The Ryrie Study Bible. NKJV* (Chicago: Moody, 1985).
13 Bill T. Arnold and Bryan E. Beyer, *Encountering the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1999), pg. 196.
14 Ibid.

Samuel was the last judge of a period which had lasted about 350 years.[15] I Samuel is the bridge between Israel's history of the time of judges to the time of kings. And Samuel was to be the anointer of the first two kings: first Saul, then David. The years involving judges in Israel were characterized by a cycle of disobedience, chastisement (by the Lord), repentance, and restoration. "People did what was right in their own eyes" (Judg 21:25 NKJV[16]). This statement, repeated in other passages, exemplifies the wayward state of the people of Israel. Samuel is described as a circuit-rider judge and priest, having civil, religious, and military responsibilities.[17] And the elders of Israel came to Samuel despite the victories they were experiencing over the Philistines and said, "Now make for us a king to judge us like all the nations" (I Sam 8:5). The rise of a monarchy "also marked the end of the theocracy."[18] Saul was anointed king by Samuel and Israel was granted victory over the Ammonites, but Saul was disobedient to God's commands. And God said, "I have provided Myself a king…" (I Sam 16:1). There is foreshadowing at work in I Samuel regarding the coming of Israel's true King,[19] as seen in I Samuel 2:10 ("He will give strength to His king and exalt the horn of His anointed"). This theme is also seen in Numbers 24:17-19 ("A Star shall come out of Jacob, a Scepter shall rise out of Israel…"). Then David, son of Jesse, was anointed by Samuel. This was before David stood against Goliath to defeat him and to become part of Saul's court. But Saul became jealous of David's battle victories and soon David was fearful for his life.

The passage in question involves David on the run from Saul's court and being aided and protected by Ahimelech the priest (I Sam 21:4-7). As noted, David had previously experienced a series of protections: by Jonathan, by Michal- his wife (and Saul's daughter), by Samuel, and again by Jonathan, before he came to Ahimelech at Nob, slightly Northeast of Jerusalem.[20]

Doeg, the Edomite, was present at Nob in I Samuel 21:7 (English versions). He was "detained before the Lord." This would have perhaps been because of a vow or the need for cleansing.[21] He is described as "the chief of the herdsmen who belonged to Saul," and "set over the servants of Saul" (I Sam 22:9). Doeg tells King Saul of David's visit and provisioning at the sanctuary of Nob. Saul reacts by sending for Ahimelech and the priests who were with him. Saul commanded Doeg to kill them, and Doeg "killed on that day eighty-five men who wore a linen ephod" (I Sam 22:18). The people of Nob were also struck down with the sword (v. 19). The only survivor among the priests was Ahimelech's son, Abiathar, who fled to David (v. 20). He was to continue the priestly line, but this did not diminish the dastardliness of Saul's having the priests of the Lord killed.

The pericope under examination includes a reference to "the bread of the Presence," or the showbread. There is historical significance in the preexisting custom or ritual of laying out cakes of bread before the Lord in front of the Ark and Mercy Seat. Exodus 25:30 reads, "And you shall set the showbread on the table before Me always." These cakes, or loaves, were set out in two rows or stacks of six each, "symbolizing the twelve tribes of Israel."[22] "Fresh loaves were brought into the sanctuary each Sabbath, and the old loaves were eaten by the priests in the holy place (Lev 24: 5-9).[23]

In the pericope, we have David and his men observing the minimum of ritual cleanness, or abstinence from women. David has previously been anointed by Samuel (I Sam 16:13). Does the partaking of the bread of the Presence indicate David's symbolic authority over the priesthood?[24] In the continuation of the account, David asks for "a spear or a sword" (I Sam 21:8). Ahimelech gives

15 *Ryrie Study Bible*.
16 All Scripture verses for this paper are from the NKJV.
17 Op. Cit.
18 Arnold and Beyer, *Encountering,* pg.197.
19 Merrill F. Unger, *The New Unger's Bible Handbook* (Chicago: Moody, 1998), pg.143.
20 *Ryrie Study Bible*.
21 Íbid.
22 Katherine Doob Sakenfeld, ed., *The New Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible,* Vol. 1 (Nashville: Abingdon, 1962), pg. 499.
23 *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible,* Vol. 1, pg. 464.
24 James L. Mays, ed., *Harper's Bible Commentary* (New York: Harper and Row, 1988), pg. 282.

David the very sword of Goliath. Does this indicate authority over the military?[25] This authority indeed extended from his besting of Goliath. It is interesting that, in just a couple of verses further on, we hear Achish, the king of Gath, say, "Is this not David the king of the land?" (I Sam 21:11).

The nature of David's "flight" or "expedition" at this point in the narrative could possibly be in the context of holy war. David reports that "their vessels" are holy. "By 'vessels' male sexual organs are meant here."[26] Robert Alter interprets this phrase as "the lads' *gear* [instead of vessels] was consecrated." He explains, "The term for "gear," the serve-all *kelim*, could equally refer to weapons, clothing and vessels for containing food."[27] But the majority view of the meaning of "vessels" denotes sexual organs, inferring sexual abstention. There is sexual abstention also seen in the account of Uriah the Hittite (II Sam 11:6-13).[28] In classroom discussion, I recall Professor Critchlow posing the query, "Who was behaving more like a king?" (Uriah or David), in considering this account. Holy war discipline was based on "united and total commitment to the cause of the Lord, in whose name the battle was being fought."[29]

III. Form

The pericope under consideration is part of an historical narrative, told in the third person ("Then David answered the priest…"). It is a three-verse dialogue, followed by a single verse report of the priest giving the bread of the Presence to David. The broader scope of the narrative involves transition; that is, the transition of the prior anointed King Saul over against the rise of the newly anointed David as future king. I Samuel 21 is part of what has been called the "History of David's Rise."[30] David is indeed on the run during the account, but he has already been anointed by the prophet of the Lord (I Sam 16:13). Included in this four-verse pericope are thematic overtones of priest and king, strong themes throughout Scripture. Another evident theme within the framework of historical narrative is the concept of holiness versus carnality. The nature of David's "flight" or "expedition" at this point in the narrative could possibly be in the context of holy war.

The form of the pericope is immediately repeated in I Samuel 21:8-9. David is literally being provisioned for war. David's terminology is a similar pattern: "What do you have on hand?" "Give" from 21:4 is repeated as "here on hand" in 21:9, and "give" in 21:10 . The form in both instances has the same two speakers, the same location, and the same time frame. Verses 8 and 9 see David armed with the very sword of Goliath. The inclusion of verse 7 mentions Doeg, who will foreshadow the events of Saul's angry and tragic response in 22:11-19.

This pericope, as a narrative account, is referred to by Jesus in the New Testament (Matt 12:3-4; Mark 2:25-26; Luke 6:3-4). Gnana Robinson writes, "In the conduct here of David and his young men Jesus perceived a parallel to (H)is mission with (H)is disciples."[31] There shall be more consideration of this passage in the upcoming "Biblical Context" section. But the form of this account of David and his men is paralleled by Jesus and His men.

The form of this account also features the theme of "fleeing for sanctuary." As Samuel Smith explains, "Nob was a sanctuary, as is evident from the continuation of this account."[32] "Fleeing" is mirrored in the accounts of Moses, Elijah, the apostle Paul, and others. Jesus Himself passed through a crowd which had wanted to throw Him over a cliff (Luke 4:29-30). His times of sanctuary involved His climbing mountains to be alone with the Father. David flees a second time

25 James L. Mays, ed., *Harper's Bible Commentary* (New York: Harper and Row, 1988), pg. 282.

26 Gnana Robinson, *I and II Samuel: Let Us Be Like the Nations* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), pg. 116.

27 Alter, *The David Story*, pg. 132.

28 Ibid.

29 Joyce G. Baldwin, *I and II Samuel: An Introduction and Commentary* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1988), pg. 138.

30 Robert Gordon, "David," *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis* (NIDOTTE) IV (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997): 505-512.

31 Robinson, *I and II Samuel*, pg.116.

32 Samuel Smith, *Samuel I and II,* The International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1904), pg. 197.

from Saul to Gath (I Sam 27:2-4). There is a broad-scope parallel with this form seen in the fleeing of the nation of Israel from out of Egypt. Their sanctuary was to become the Tabernacle in the Wilderness.

The historical biography of Samuel, Saul, and David in I and II Samuel is a narrative distinct from contemporary Assyrian, Egyptian, and Hittite documents.[33] These biblical accounts are not merely a recording of events in a time line. Merrill F. Unger writes "The events themselves are stressed, and the moral and spiritual repercussions of these books have eminent ethical and didactic value."[34]

In Jewish canonical terms, I and II Samuel are traditionally part of "the Former Prophets."[35] This underscores an additional consideration of the historical narrative form of which the passage in question is a part. There is also the added layer of prophecy. Robert Gordon states, "Throughout these books the word of God mediated through prophecy exercises a determinative influence upon historical events and the interpretation of them."[36]

IV. Structure

This pericope is a three verse dialogue, followed by a single verse report. In simple outline we see that:

Verse 4-- David asks for bread;

Verse 5-- The priest says that there is no common bread, only holy bread, and asks if the men have been kept from women;

Verse 6-- David says women have been restrained from them since they left, the men are in a holy state, even though the journey is common;

Verse 7-- So the priest gave David the bread of the Presence, which had been replaced with hot bread.

There is, admittedly, the barest possibility of an *inclusio* pattern in this pericope. Bread is mentioned in the first and last verse. There is an interesting juxtaposition of the terms *men, holy*, and *bread*. "Give me… bread… no common bread… there is holy bread…" Are the men holy (inferred)? "(The vessels of) the young men are holy…" "So the priest gave him holy bread…" Symbolically, the commonness or holiness of the men, the commonness or holiness of the expedition, and the commonness or holiness of the bread are each intertwined. This pericope provides a pattern of intertextual contrast.

Ironically, in the verse immediately preceding this pericope, David states, "The King has ordered me on some business…" (I Sam 21:3). Is David virtually lying in the sanctuary even as he declares the holiness of his men? Or has David's prior anointing by Samuel (I Sam 16:13) and the support of Jonathan, Michal and Samuel convinced David he must save the current king by taking his (Saul's) enemy out of striking range? Was David speaking of not king Saul but king David?

Is the expedition "a common one," or are David and his men observing "holy war" as some have proposed? What is "holy" about running? This question is of course rhetorical, given the pattern of the use of the term שׁדק (holy) in these passages. We are examining structure, and the structure of this pericope points to holiness. Holiness is the prevailing theme. The concept is repetitive. It is the primary pattern. David even declares "the vessels of the young men" to be holy. Can we be holy in parts of our anatomy? Was David operating under a cover of holiness due to having been anointed by Samuel? Does David symbolize "the-newly-removed-from-the-presence-of-the-Lord-bread"? These quandaries will be considered in the upcoming Theology segment. But it is worthy of note that the structure of these passages stirs up these thoughts.

33 Unger, *The New Unger's Bible Handbook*, pg. 143.
34 Ibid.
35 Robert Gordon, *"Theology of Samuel,"* NIDOTTE IV: 1168-77.
36 Ibid.

Chapters 21 and 22 of I Samuel "comprise a literary unit of three sections arranged in chiastic order."[37] The pericope under consideration is part of I Samuel 21:1-9, which is book-ended by 22:6-23, both of which "are concerned for the priestly compound at Nob…"[38] The central section is 21:10-22:5, which highlights David's flight to Philistia, Judah, and Moab.[39] The presence of Doeg, a servant of Saul, in the verse immediately after our pericope, brings death to the priests of Nob when Doeg tells Saul that David and his men were fed (and given the sword of Goliath), and King Saul reacts violently. The chiastic order identified by The Expositor's Bible Commentary is conceivable, but a bit of a stretch. What does appear clearly is the cause and effect, the point/counterpoint of the account in our pericope over against the resulting revenge of Saul in chapter 22.

There is a mini-chiasm at work, however, in the final verse of the pericope:

No **bread** there
But the **bread of the Presence**
In order to put **hot bread** in its place.[40]

There is a vivid pattern outlined in the Ryrie Study Bible. Under the broad heading of "The rejection of David by Saul, chapter 19:1-26:25" in the following:

David protected by Jonathan, 19:1-10
David protected by Michal, 19:11-17
David protected by Samuel, 19:18-24
David protected by Jonathan, 20:1-42
David protected by Ahimelech, 21:1-9
David protected by Achish, 21:10-15.[41]

Protection for David is a broad theme in I Samuel and remains evident in the passage under consideration. Thematically, there is the component of holiness within the covering of protection. Again, theological concepts are revealed through the structure of these verses. One can hear the source of all that is theological is speaking through them.

V. Literary Context

Joyce Baldwin observes that "the books of Samuel are the product of highly developed literary art…"[42] And the literary is woven throughout a very vivid historical narrative. Baldwin also writes, "An appreciation of literary qualities in the Bible in no way conflicts with a theological understanding of its message."[43] This writer agrees with the tone and spirit in which Baldwin holds Scripture in such regard. Robert Alter refers to "the complexity of vision of this extraordinary writer."[44] Alter introduces an interesting literary concept: "the dialectic complication of national ideology."[45] The term "dialectic" is defined as "a method of logical argument in which contradictory facts or ideas are systematically examined or debated for the purpose of resolving the contradictions between them and arriving at some truth."[46] A close examination of the text of I and II Samuel does reveal much that is complicated and contradictory in the actions of Samuel, Saul, David, and Absalom. What are we to learn about the justice of the Lord as "Samuel hacked Agag

37 Frank E. Gaebelein, ed., *The Expositor's Bible Commentary (NIV)* Vol. 3 (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992), pg. 727.
38 Ibid.
39 Ibid.
40 This was discovered while considering Lexical Data. The bread of the Presence, in its holiness, is a prevailing theme and there are applications in every category of approach.
41 Introduction to I Samuel. *The Ryrie Study Bible*.
42 Baldwin, *1 and 2 Samuel*, pg. 16.
43 Ibid.
44 Alter, *The David Story,* pg. xv.
45 Ibid, pg. xiv.
46 Fernando de Mello Vianna, ed., *The American Heritage Desk Dictionary* (Boston: Houghton and Mifflin, 1981).

in pieces before the Lord in Gilgal" (I Sam 15:33)? But what of the national ideology of the nation of Israel to which Alter alludes? Ideology is too small a word. The dealings of the people of Israel certainly involve ideology on some level, but there is a vastly grander scale at work in the events of I and II Samuel. David's "story," and his relationship to the Lord, is no mere matter of ideology.[47]

David makes several requests for help in I and II Samuel, providing a literary context for the current pericope. Indeed, protection for David is a strong theme in I Samuel (see Form section). Jonathan protects David by warning him of danger in I Samuel 19. David's wife, Michal, protects David by letting him escape through a window, also in chapter 19. Later in this same chapter, Samuel, together with the Lord, protects David through the delay of having the pursuers prophesy. David asks Jonathan for help and protection from Saul's reaction to David's absence from court in I Samuel 20. Receiving help from Ahimelech in chapter 21 was part of a series of helps and protections. David asked for food during a feast day for him and his men from Nabal in chapter 25. David asked for a place to live from Achish of the Philistines in chapter 27 (at Ziklag). In II Samuel 2, David thanked the men of Jabesh Gilead for burying Saul and invites them to be included in his kingdom. This was a request for loyalty to his throne over the rival Ishbosheth, Saul's son.

VI. Biblical Context

The account of David's provisioning at Nob by Ahimelech is directly referred to by Jesus and recorded in each of the synoptic Gospels (Matt 12:3-4; Mark 2:25-26; Luke 6:3-4).

Matthew: "Have you not read what David did when he was hungry, he and those who were with him; how he entered the house of God and ate the showbread which was not lawful for him to eat, nor for those who were with him, but only for the priests?"

Mark: "Have you never read what David did when he was in need and hungry, he and those with him: how he went into the house of God in the days of Abiathar the high priest, and ate the showbread, which was not lawful to eat, except for the priests, and also gave some to those who were with him?"

Luke: "Have you not even read this, what David did when he was hungry, he and those who were with him: how he went into the house of God, took and ate the showbread, and also gave some to those who were with him, which is not lawful for any but the priests to eat?"[48]

The focus for this comparison shall remain the biblical context of David's provisioning at Nob. The one glaring distinction among the synoptic accounts is the mention of Abiathar in Mark 2:26. Abiathar was Ahimelech's son (I Sam 22:20) and had fled from the scene of the multiple murders of the priests by Doeg under Saul's command in I Samuel 22 and would be removed from being priest to the Lord during the time of Solomon's reign (I Kings 2:26) because he sided with Adonijah's attempt to take over the throne (I Kings 1:6-7). Abiathar was there at Nob when David and his men ate the bread of the Presence. Charles Ryrie footnotes I Samuel 22:20: "Abiathar… evidently served

---

47 The looming question for religious skeptics is whether I and II Samuel are a work (or works) of literature (i.e., fiction) or historical accounts. Alter states, "Gerhard von Rad in the 1940's and others after him have seen the David story as the beginning of history writing in the Western tradition" (*The David Story*, pg. xvii). Of course, those who believe in the divine authorship of Scripture, understanding it to be God's Word, concur at the very least with von Rad, and recognize the "Western tradition" of history to be the junior concern.

As to authorship, we read in I Samuel 10:25 that Samuel "wrote it in a book." He is credited by many as one of the authors of I Samuel. Nathan and Gad are likely contributors. I Chron 29:29 reads, "Now the acts of King David, first and last, indeed they are written in the book of Samuel the seer, in the book of Nathan the prophet, and in the book of Gad the seer" (NKJV). It is surmised that "the court history of David" (Baldwin, *I and II Samuel,* pg. 22) was written by someone who "knew at first hand life at David's court" (Ibid). First Samuel 27:6 states, "Ziklag has belonged to the kings of Judah to this day." This could suggest that "some time had elapsed since the division of the kingdom around 930 BC" (Arnold and Beyer, *Encountering the Old Testament,* pg. 196). Whether the writer or writers existed prior to or during the reigns of Saul, David, or that of Solomon, "many of the stories read like eyewitness accounts" (Ibid).

48 These quotations are from a single version, the NKJV. The NIV, the RSV, and the NAS are in reasonable harmony with the above wording.

as coadjutor with his father Ahimilech."[49] *The Expositor's Bible Commentary* credits John W. Wenham with "perhaps… the best solution. [Wenham] observes that *epi tou batou* ('in the account of the bush,' Mark 12:26) may be paralleled in the phrase *epi Abiathar archiereos* in Mark 2:26, which should be translated 'in the account of Abiathar the high priest'."[50] Could Abiathar have written an account? Of course, and as an eyewitness he would be credible.

Another important agreement in the English and Greek versions was the phrase "not lawful" (οὐκ ἔξεστιν). This point is the hinge on which Jesus is making the point to the Pharisees who accused Jesus and His hungry disciples of doing that which was unlawful on the Sabbath. Jesus said, "But if you had known what this means, '*I desire mercy and not sacrifice*,' you would not have condemned the guiltless. For the Son of Man is Lord even of the Sabbath" (Matt 12:7-8). Jesus was quoting Hosea 6:6: "For I desire mercy and not sacrifice, and the knowledge of God more than burnt offerings." In I Samuel 15:22, Samuel says, "Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice…" This is the mind of the same Lord revealing Himself through both the New and Old Testaments. Samuel was reprimanding King Saul just as Jesus was reprimanding the Pharisees, and for the same reason! Joyce Baldwin writes, "Jesus was to endorse the judgment of Ahimelech in putting mercy before ceremonial law."[51]

The biblical context of this pericope has been the many helps and protections David received in I Samuel. The parallel accounts yield patterns for David's survival and ultimate kingship. There is an account which leads to the eternal Davidic covenant. In I Samuel chapter 7, David was at rest from his enemies and had the desire to build a house for the ark of God, literally, a home for the bread of the Presence and all the utensils and furnishings of the tabernacle. David wanted to provide provision for the Provider (!) The Lord says through Nathan, the prophet, *"I have been with you wherever you have gone"* (II Sam 7:9). This statement is confirmation of all the help, protectors, and provisions David had received! David had the Presence of the bread of the Presence, the Presence of the Lord of hosts. And it is the Lord of hosts who established "the throne of his kingdom forever" (II Sam 7:13).

Books have been written about The Bread of life. Jesus calls Himself this in John 6:35. The bread of the Presence has had many parallels throughout Scripture. In John chapter 6, Jesus multiplied five barley loaves (again the number five). This was a mirroring event of the time Elisha fed many from a few barley loaves with some left over "according to the word of the Lord" in 2 Kings 42-44. And Jesus refers back to "the bread from heaven," meaning the manna in the wilderness in John 6:32, described in Exodus 16:14-15. The last example for this section is the bread of communion, offered to the disciples at the "last supper" in Matthew 26:26. Is this not now our bread of the Presence?

VII. Theology

Theology begins and ends with the Lord. The study of Scripture has maximum value when we see the hand of the Lord at work in the world, moving men and women and moving among them; when we can see and hear the voice of the Spirit of the Lord through its pages and in our hearts. But, how can we see with our mind's eyes and hear with our hearts? Is this not figurative nonsense? No. Those of us who have faith in the Lord God readily identify with hearing in our hearts and listening for the Lord when we read Scripture. Jesus said, "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me" (John 10:27). Jesus also said, "I am the good Shepherd. The good Shepherd gives His life for the sheep" (John 10:11). When we first encounter David, he is a shepherd "keeping the sheep" (I Sam 16:11). Our Lord established the throne of this shepherd, David, forever (II Sam 7:13). What would the Lord have us "hear" through a study of the events of

49 *Ryrie Study Bible*. *The American Heritage Desk Dictionary* defines 'coadjutor' as: 1. A coworker; assistant. 2. The assistant to a bishop (pg. 198).

50 Gaebelein, *The Expositor's Bible Commentary (NIV) Vol. 3*, pg. 728.

51 Baldwin, *I and II Samuel*, pg. 138.

I and II Samuel? The chosen pericope is properly analyzed only when we perceive the voice of the Lord, when we can recognize His presence, and when we realize what our response to that presence should be.

The underlying theme of our pericope is the holiness of the Lord, His שׁדק, which is inseparable from His presence. John Davis explains, "God is holy, for He is separated from all other beings by His infinite perfections, by His being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness, and truth, the glory of which fills the earth (Isa 6:3). Even holy angels ascribe holiness to Him (Isa 6:3; Rev 4:8; 16:5)."[52]

When David brought his men to Nob, he was seeking provision from the very location of holiness, the sanctuary where the "Shilonite line"[53] of priests were conducting ceremonial duties. Immediately, there is contrast evident between the holiness versus the profaneness of the bread, the men, the men's vessels, and their expedition. Was their journey holy or unholy? Were their vessels holy or unholy? Was the bread holy or unholy? In the book of Leviticus, the requirements for priestly service are described. At one point, drinking wine or intoxicating drink is forbidden, "that you may distinguish between holy and unholy, and between unclean and clean" (Lev 10:10). Isaiah 6:3 proclaims, "Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of hosts; the whole earth is full of His glory!" This is spoken by one of the seraphim. Isaiah reacts by saying, "Woe is me, for I am undone! Because I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips…" So how can these unclean lips partake of the bread of the Presence?

What is it about the bread? Why did God say, "You shall set the showbread on the table before Me always" (Exod 25:30)? There was also frankincense on the table, which is described as a memorial and was later burned on the altar as an offering (Lev 24:7)[54] Josephus describes the loaves as being arranged in two rows of six (*Antiquities* III. Vi. 6; x. 17).[55] The bread is referred to as תכרעמה מחל, or "the arranged bread" in I Chronicles 9:32, and דימתה מחל, or "the continual bread" in Numbers 4:7.[56] L. Juliana M. Claassens provides the following description: "The bread of the Presence should be understood with the rituals of the golden, seven-branched lampstand that was set alight every evening, as well as the incense that was burned on a golden incense burner on the Sabbath at the changing of the bread of Presence (Lev 24:1-9; Exod 25:23-39; 30:1-10). These rituals, together with the tabernacle, symbolically created the sacred space for God to dwell among God's people. Placing the bread, light, and incense in the presence of God sanctified these ordinary substances."[57] This description is the beginning of an answer to some of the questions posed in our quest for theological insight. *Given that "the changing of the bread of Presence" was a Sabbath ritual, did the events of the pericope, David's requests for provisioning, happen on the Sabbath?* "So the priest gave him consecrated bread; for there was no bread there but the bread of the Presence which was removed from before the LORD, in order to put hot bread in its place *when* it was taken away" (1 Sam 21:6 NAS). Other versions read, "on the day it was taken away."[58] The Hebrew phrase מויב can mean "on the day," or "at the time." It could have been the Sabbath, which would add impetus to Jesus' reference to this passage as previously mentioned. In Matthew 12, Jesus completes His answer to the Pharisees by stating, "For the Son of Man is Lord even of the Sabbath" (Matt 12:8).

Since the time of Adam and Eve, our Father has always longed to be in fellowship with us. The Lord's ways are inscrutable, sure, in totality. But can we understand ways in which the Lord does relate to us? Of course! The question has been posed, "What is it about the bread?" The

52 John D. Davis, *A Dictionary of the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1954), pg. 320.
53 Klein, *World Biblical Commentary* Vol. 10, *I Samuel*, pg. 212.
54 Crim and Buttrick, eds., *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* Vol. 1, pg. 464.
55 Ibid.
56 Sakenfeld, ed., *The New Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible,* Vol. 1, pg. 499.
57 Ibid.
58 NIV, ISV, RSV, ASV.

Catholic Church has a declaration just before communion time. The priest says, "Blessed are you, Lord, God of all creation. Through your goodness we have this bread to offer, which earth has given and human hands have made. It will become for us the bread of life."[59] The bread is given by our Creator through the produce of the earth and *made by human hands*. This is a *process of cooperation*. It is working in partnership. The Lord is Holy. But His holiness is most evident when people acknowledge the Lord's Lordship and "see" themselves (even in their hearts) as servants, and when their hands, their "vessels," or bodies, their very lives, are living and doing *for* the Lord. We who do call ourselves servants can pray together with David as he prayed, "For your word's sake, and according to Your own heart, You have done all these great things, to make Your servant know them… So let Your name be magnified forever…" (II Sam 7:21, 26).

One last note of theological importance comes from Jesus Himself. He confirms for us that God prefers mercy over ceremonial law. This is why Jesus condoned the eating of the bread of the Presence by David and his men. This is why we can have communion with our unclean lips. It demonstrates God's mercy which was revealed at the Cross.

VIII. Application

David's visit to Nob to ask for food (and a weapon) was one account among several where David was escaping the jealousy of King Saul. In the pericope under consideration, David was seeking sanctuary at *the* sanctuary of that time. So how does this one visit in a series of helps and protections that David received speak to a reader of Scripture, or Christians looking for encouragement in their faith today? We are blessed to have the entirety of the Old and New Testaments, and, in this instance, we have insight from our Lord: Jesus Himself.

There are a few times when Jesus explains a parable He has told. In the case of David and his men visiting Ahimelech at Nob, we have the highest and best perspective given by Jesus. Jesus uses the facts of this historical narrative to point out an important lesson. David is declared "guiltless" for eating the bread of the Presence. The holiness of the Lord was not diminished or violated. And we are reinforced in our learning by the driving home of a scriptural theme. The Lord says, "*I desire mercy and not sacrifice*" (Matt 12:7). We have seen the corresponding Scripture verses in I Samuel 15:22 and Hosea 6:6.

What are some of the life issues pointed out in this pericope? We must each approach the Lord in a sanctified state. Our life should be in a process of sanctification. We should humble ourselves before the Lord. We should seek the Lord's Presence. We should go to the Lord for sustenance. It is the bread of the Lord which will sustain us. Jesus is the Bread of Life, so we pray, "Give us this day our daily bread." The Lord's bread is nourishing. Scripture itself is edifying as bread for our souls. The Lord desires mercy and not sacrifice. We do not just pray and worship. We need to do something for the Lord, to be merciful just as our Father is merciful; to go to the Lord when we are in trouble; to go to the Lord when someone else is in trouble; to know that the Lord is with us; to seek to be holy, for the Lord is holy; to seek to be like Jesus.

First Samuel 21:4-7 helps us to consider the sincerity of our behavior before the Lord, in His holiness. The mercy of the Lord is demonstrated with reverence for the truly holy status of God. Holiness is strongly pronounced in this pericope. And we, the readers/ studiers of God's Word, should approach the Lord with full respect and regard for the extent of His holiness.

So, what about the statement by the Lord, *"I have been with you wherever you have gone?"* Does this hold true for all of us non-David's today? At the end of the book of Matthew, Jesus says, "I am with you always" (28:20). Who are the "you" He is talking about, but the "disciples of all the nations?" (28:19). The Lord tells us through Paul in I Corinthians 3:16-17, "Do you not know that you are the temple of God and that the Spirit of God dwells in you? If anyone defiles the temple of God, God will destroy him. For the temple of God is holy, which temple you are." Wait a minute, now… The Lord's Presence is with me as a believer? The Lord's holiness resides in me through the

59 The (Canadian) Catholic Register website: https://www.catholicregister.org.

Holy Spirit? I can share in Jesus' salvation symbolically through the sharing of His broken body in the bread of communion? And God desires mercy from me? Then I must humbly give of the mercy of God however and wherever I can, so that our Holy Lord will be glorified.

Rev. Dr. Tim Lanigan has completed a Doctor of Ministry program at Regent University. He has a Master of Divinity from Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary and is a member of the Phi Alpha Chi Honor Society. He currently serves as associate pastor of 1269 Café, an outreach to the homeless; is chaplain of Helping Hands Outreach, which provides transitional housing; and has a transformational life coaching ministry at the Calumet Halfway House in Manchester, NH.

Identifying Patterns of Religious Faith in Social Service Programs

Mark G. Harden

Not all Christian social service programs are created equal. Yet, it is not easy to distinguish the difference between religious and non-religious social service programs. This sociological analysis contributes to an unsettled argument that identifying the theological presuppositions that a social service program represents is a difficult task without an adequate understanding of the patterns of religious faith. In the public sphere, the implicit or explicit patterns of theological presuppositions were often self-evident and inexplicable. In some cases, religious faith was found to be either ignored, overlooked, or used as a basis to discriminate between faith-based social service programs seeking support. While some behaviors in social service programs are religious, it also seems prudent to acknowledge those aspects of religious social programs that appear entirely "secular" on the surface but have implicitly religious and subjective dimensions of religious faith. A cursory look at Christian social service programs provides some evidence that there is a need for a descriptive model for understanding the role of religious faith and in assessing the value of such programs. At the same time, there are practical questions that need to be answered. For instance, should social service programs that do not include explicit religious activities be considered religious programs? What constitutes a religious social service program? Some who study faith-based programs suggest that many policy makers, community leaders, and researchers may currently be operating under a number of false assumptions or have very little criteria for determining what constitutes a faith-based social program (Harden, 2006). The need for understanding these issues is related to the goal of this study.

This study sought to develop an empirically-derived conceptual framework that represents normative dimensions of religious faith in social service programs based on faith-based program theory (FBPT) approaches whose theoretical components were derived from in-depth interview data (Unruh and Sider, 1999; Harden, 2006). FBPT is defined as "a meta-program theory" which is a social program style that includes particular implicit and explicit religious activities and outcomes in its program design (Harden, 2006, pp. 486-87). In this case, FBPT refers to varied implicit and explicit patterns of religious faith in social service organizations and programs acknowledged as an essential trait of faith-based social service programs. The study tested the validity of theoretically derived styles with their particular dimensions and traits of religious faith in Christian social service programs.

To date, there have been few widely accepted conceptual frameworks that resolve the dilemma surrounding the "secular" versus "spiritual" nature of Christian social service programs. In fact, there remains a dearth of research data on constructs that adequately represent the range of social service programs offered by religious organizations and or churches. As a consequence, there is very little useful empirical evidence to help practitioners determine and self-assess the value of the various approaches for social change using a meaningful religious paradigm. In another study, an attempt was made to produce theoretical models using descriptive data based on two conceptual elements that indicate the degree of intentionality and spontaneity of religious faith that was either implicitly or explicitly communicated in a faith-based social service program according to religious leaders in the Christian tradition (Unruh and Sider, 1999). The problem articulated was that there is more information needed to understand and explain the theological presuppositions that undergirded Christian social service programs to guide policymakers and program evaluators in assessing the value of faith-based programs (Harden, 2006).

For the purposes of assessing the value of religious faith in social service programs, this study sought to address the need for conceptual models that clarify the nature of religious faith and the tendency of its theological presuppositions to influence social service programs as previously

described in an article on "Faith-based Program Theory" (Harden, 2006). It evaluated the validity of Faith-based Program Theory (FBPT) styles as four theoretical constructs as are found to exist in social service programs associated with distinctive theological presuppositions by measuring the underlying patterns of religious faith in the survey responses of Christian leaders.

Analysis suggests that it is possible to develop theoretical constructs that capture obvious and latent religious phenomena or the normative logic in religious social programs that could potentially help community service workers, policy makers, foundation officers, and program evaluators solve the practical dilemmas associated with defining religious social service programs. Some researchers (e.g., Ebaugh et al. 2003) have distinguished the difference between secular and religious social service agencies by analyzing organizational structures. In light of the debate over what constitutes a Christian social service program, their study suggests that faith-based organizations differed because of religious "add-ons" (Ebaugh, p. 423). As pointed out, others have attempted to develop various criteria such as a continuum of religiosity, faith-relatedness categorizations, and a set of traits to distinguish between religious and secular social service agencies (Ebaugh, p. 413). Nonetheless, the quest for sociological concepts that could explain religious phenomena in social program interventions in a useful way remains elusive.

This article is about exploring the validity of implicit and explicit theoretical patterns of religious faith in Christian social service programs towards the goal of formulating ways to describe and understand the effects of religious faith on the outcomes of social service programs. Research data were re-examined to explain further the role of faith in social service programs offered by religious organizations. A challenge in identifying the elements of religious faith in a social service program is that it is not apparent that the activities are religious in some programs and services. This study builds on theoretical patterns of religious faith that help us articulate the inner-workings of a faith-based social service program regarding spiritual quality as expressed in what it is and what it does.

Using Factor Analysis Procedures

It was determined that using a factor analysis to investigate the nature of the relationships between variables associated with social service program activities and religious faith was the best approach. Factor analysis is a procedure used by social scientists to study relationships between variables and to identify underlying patterns that help them understand a social phenomenon. In the process, variables emerge as factors in which the strength of the relationships between and within a group of factors are indicated with statistical values. A factor can be defined as a statistic associated with a response to a survey item that helps clarify and simplify patterns to understand a social phenomenon (also defined as factor loadings). Therefore, factors in this study were generated to clarify and simplify the phenomenon of FBPT styles or patterns of religious faith. The expectation in this study was that a factor analysis will produce factors that identify patterns of religious faith that correspond to four FBPT styles commonly found in Christian social service programs.

Faith-Based Program Theory Styles

Faith-based Program Theory (FBPT) styles provide us with a starting place for studying religious faith in social service programs. As a conceptual framework, FBPT proposes four theoretical styles of communicating religious faith or approaches to social service action (Harden, 2006). Four FBPT styles can be summarized as follows. First, the Charismatic Style refers to a social service program that primarily uses explicit religious activities to invoke or initiate change while offering social service activities that are inherently subordinate to religious activities (Harden, pp. 498-499). Second, the Enhancement Style refers to a combination of religious and nonreligious program activities where both serve a supportive and necessary function in the program's fundamental design (Harden, p. 499). Third, the Modern Style which is described as social service

programs with implicit religious behaviors and understated religious activities to support a form of "spiritual" change as apparent in what is often viewed as social-service-only approaches. Finally, there is the Traditional Style which refers to religious and social service activities that are equally important but separate and serve distinctly different purposes (Harden, pp. 499-500). These styles are implicitly and explicitly characteristic of social service programs based on similar traits. The styles were derived after studying data from similar analyses of religious social service organizations and programs (Unruh and Sider, 1999: 482). A fundamental assumption of FBPT styles as an approach is that Christian social service programs can be characterized as being based on theological presuppositions that can be understood, interpreted, and explained (Harden, p. 482 and p. 490).

TABLE 1

DIMENSIONS	PATTERNS OF RELIGIOUS FAITH	
Instrumental Religious Faith	**Implicit Trait**	**Explicit Trait**
Locus of Faith-based Activity	View of social service activities as a conduit or medium for facilitating spiritual transformation.	View of added spiritual activities as a conduit or medium for facilitating spiritual transformation.
	Modern style	*Enhancement style.*
Degrees of Faith Integration	Making faith matters implicit in the program intervention rather than explicit. Assumes that there is a spiritual dimension to non-religious social action.	Social service activities are to be inclusive or complementary to explicit spiritual components or religious activities.
	Modern style	*Enhancement style*
Constitutive Religious Faith	**Implicit Trait**	**Explicit Trait**
Extent of Faith Agenda	Keeping faith matters separate or in the background in relationship to addressing the participant's social service needs. Both spiritual and social service activities are important and have their respective function and purpose.	Making faith matters central in relationship to the subject in addressing social service needs. Identification and communication of religious role is a priority for the believer or religious organization. The purpose for helping others is to primarily address spiritual needs.
	Traditional style	*Charismatic styles.*
Nature of Competence	Social service skills are essential or emphasized for engaging in social action independent of spiritual activities.	Religious knowledge and skills are viewed as competence and important for implementing social service programs.
	Traditional style.	*Charismatic style.*

Dimensions of Instrumental and Constitutive Religious Faith

Implicit and explicit traits of the styles make up the dimensions of patterns of religious faith in social service programs. In a previous study, normative religious patterns of faith were identified as having underlying dimensions of religious faith (Harden, 2006). However, the nature of the dimensions remained unclear. In this study, it was predicted that these dimensions as hypothetical constructs would be validated in survey response items developed to measure the FBPT styles and their traits in a factor analysis. It was also predicted that the styles correlate in such a way

to illuminate the complex nature of the underlying dimensions of religious faith in social service programs. Therefore, the dimensions were redefined to simplify and clarify the nature of the dimensions.

The most significant finding expected was that the relations between the factors indicated two distinct dimensions of religious faith. The study suggests that the FBPT styles and their traits within these two dimensions indicate patterns of religious faith whose traits may either be implicit or explicit in nature. In this study, the dimensions are referred to as *instrumental* and *constitutive* religious faith.

The first dimension originally conceptualized as "structural separability" (Harden, 2006) is redefined in this study as *instrumental religious faith*. Instrumental religious faith indicates the extent to which social service program resources and activities serve a facilitative function for change. The assumption is that instrumental religious faith determines how religious beliefs influence change in a social service program context (Harden, pp. 490-491). This study validates that beliefs are a necessary condition central to the effects of the social service programs. Religious faith is also instrumental when it serves an integrative or complementary role to achieve change. The assumption is that theological presuppositons are intrinsic components of the social service program. Previous findings suggest that a program component can be initially characterized as distinctly "secular" within a program scheme and yet be based on theological presuppositions and religious beliefs (Harden, p. 491). It was confirmed that nonreligious activities, that are symbolic in nature, are essential for change and serve in a complementary role as instrumental religious faith. These 'instrumental' elements in a dimension of social service programs indicate the presence of theological presuppositions associated with resources and activities designed to fulfill a practical need.

There were several cases where activities were characterized as nonreligious but had religious meaning and purpose. Unruh and Sider (1999, pp. 8-10) found cross participation and resource sharing in religious activities and secular activities to influence the participants and outcomes in the program. Instrumental religious faith, whether religious or nonreligious, may or may not converge as a condition to affect a social service program. Program structures may serve as spiritualized mechanisms to have a role in bringing about change based on its theological presuppositions.

Therefore, in cases of instrumental religious faith, results were expected in relationship to at least two FBPT styles. For instance, it was expected that the Enhancement style would indicate the manner in which resources and activities were integrated and utilized in social service programs to influence change. It was also expected that the Modern style would indicate that nonreligious social service activities would have religious value and symbolize and embody theological presuppositions as religious in nature. It was also assumed that items which described social service activities as having implicit religious meaning would be indicative of the Modern style, and possibly faciliate achieving a spiritual enrichment goal. Hence, patterns of religious faith that can be described as implicit and explicit were expected to appear in the same dimension defined as instrumental. Therefore, instrumental patterns of religious faith in the Enhancement and Modern styles was expected.

Constitutive religious faith is the second dimension. The concept of "functionality" from the previous study was also unclear and less descriptive of the dimension (Harden, 2006). It was re-examined for this study, and this dimension is now redefined as constitutive religious faith in social service programs. Constitutive religious faith is the dimension that refers to how faith-based social service programs define themselves with theological presuppositions that reflect an agenda for engaging in social service programs. That is, overtly religious and non-religious program components are purposeful according to their respective theological presuppositions. A religious faith in a program is also constitutive when its execution places greater dependence on levels of competence in either religious faith or in social service activities. It includes ideas about

what competencies are needed to implement the program well. This means that there are essential skills that are ranked higher in importance to ahieve desired program outcomes respective of a theological presupposition about social service programs.

In the context of faith-based social service programs, the goal is to validate and affirm theological presuppositions with the underlying purpose for engagement and competence in social service ministry whether it is religious or non-religious in nature (Harden, p. 493). Some capacities may be supportive or integral to the apparent nature of the social service program (Harden, pp. 493-95). For instance, Unruh and Sider (p. 13) observed cases in which religious activities (e.g., Bible study) were directly connected with the impact of a non-religious component (e.g., job skills training) designed for socio-economic empowerment. For instance, a theological presupposition often asserted was that troubled youth will apply themselves in a tutoring program because the Gospel gives them hope in a seemingly hopeless life situation. The focus is on providing youth with the hope of the Gospel. This also implies that the ability to share the hope of the Gospel is an integral component. In other instances, self-evident religious components become integrated parts of "a whole" toward achieving program goals.

In summary, it was expected that instrumental and constitutive patterns of religious faith would be indicated in at least one of the FBPT styles. It was also expected that the Traditional and the Charismatic styles would indicate that religious activities are the primary factor for change as "spiritual transformation," and religious and nonreligious activities would be treated as inherently different and serving different purposes. In addition, the Charismatic and Enhancement styles were expected to indicate religious activities serving a supportive role in defining the social service program. The Enhancement style was expected to indicate a preference for integrating implicit and explicit religious and nonreligious activities. The Traditional style was expected to indicate the implicit and symbolic character of social service activities in correlation with the Modern style. Accordingly, the study was expected to show the following correlations as constitutive patterns of religious faith.

In addition, there were styles that correlated across the dimensions. For instance, the Traditional and the Charismatic styles were expected to correlate on a dimension as constitutive patterns of religious faith. Without knowing the correlation between the styles, one would expect the Modern and the Enhancement style to correlate in the instrumental religious faith dimension. This was the case. However, because the Charismatic and Enhancement styles were expected to correlate as explicit traits, the expectation was that these styles situated in different dimensions would also correlate (see Table 1).

As stated above, constitutive religious faith also refers to instances where one form of activity seems to serve a less important purpose than another. For instance, nonreligious program activities may be considered subordinate to religious activities. In addition, achieving religious outcomes rather than nonreligious outcomes may be a primary purpose of the Charismatic style (Harden, 2006, p. 495). It was expected that survey response items corresponding with the Charismatic style tend to be subordinate nonreligious activities to religious activities in a social service program.

Based on the results of this study, these definitions of FBPT dimensions of religious faith provide clarification for describing the nature of religious faith in social service programs. An analysis and reexamination of the patterns showed distinct differences between the FBPT styles. It was found that the traditional and the charismatic model correlated, and the charismatic and enhancement models correlated based on differing conclusions about the nature of these model constructs according to the normative patterns. The correlations made sense once the dimensions were taken into account.

This study was also expected to build on the hypotheses theoretically grounded by previous research (Unruh and Sider, 1999; Harden, 2006) by further observing the extent to which the

theoretical styles are valid constructs for examining religious faith in social service programs. In summary, the main objectives of the study were to determine: (1) the extent to which the FBPT styles are valid constructs; (2) the extent to which patterns of religious faith are indicated by survey response items; (3) whether there is a relationship between the factors and the FBPT style constructs; and (4) the nature of the underlying dimensions and models of religious faith in social service programs. The methods of the study provide a detailed validation of the patterns of religious faith that support the dimensions and traits of the FBPT styles as characteristic of social service programs.

Methods of the Study

The challenge of studying aspects of a social phenomenon is measuring what you cannot directly observe. Factor analysis is a procedure social scientists use to measure variables that cannot be directly observed. It allows researchers to reduce data to a manageable set size while retaining as much of the original information as possible while revealing the underlying structure of phenomena. The patterns of religious faith are the variables a factor analysis is designed to measure. This study explored the extent to which patterns of religious faith and other variables correlate as underlying factors in a Christian social service program. Correlation is a technical term that indicates the extent to which variables influence each other. Correlations may indicate that the variables are positively or negatively related. In the case of relatedness, the variables in either case relate in the same direction or different directions, respectively. The theoretical dimensions and the styles articulated above are expected to cluster as factor loadings with values that indicate the strength of those relationships.

Factor loadings is a statistical term in factor analysis that references the co-ordinates of variables along a classification axis depicting a cluster of related factors based on their statistical correlation values. The approach to studying these factor loadings is referred to as principal factor analysis, and it provides descriptive information about their positions along a classification axis. For purposes of simplicity and clarity, the term "factor" is used instead of factor loadings and principal components. In the tables and summary of results below, statistical terms in factor analysis methodology are used to illustrate a story of the study and results. Together with the narrative story about the results, the factor analysis is interpreted for mean using each style and its simplified structure as patterns of religious faith with greater clarity. Therefore, factors are common underlying dimensions and interrelated variables in a religious phenomenon. These variables are reduced to a set of factors to achieve parsimony and understanding about the patterns of religious faith.

Participants. Two kinds of participants were identified to complete this study. First, an expert panel of men and women who were expected to contribute to the study based on their religious knowledge and experience. The expert panel reviewed a list of items, and a survey was conducted with members of various Christian denominations to provide data to test the validity of the FBPT style constructs and their underlying dimensions. It was expected that a factor analysis would produce several factors representing the constructs in this study. It was also expected the factors would correlate. The panel was used to ensure the best possible items for data collection and factor analysis. In statistical terms the number of participants or respondents is expressed as "N". For instance, the participants were comprised of seven men and women (N = 7): (1) two females and one male seminary professor; (2), one male and one female clergy; and (3) two lay persons (one male and a female). Second, a survey sample of 251 (N=251) respondents was comprised of church men and women from a variety of religious church, denomination, and faith backgrounds to help generalize the results of the study. The survey sample was composed of Protestants and some Catholic seminary instructors, students, and staff from California, Maryland, New York, Philadelphia, and Minnesota.

TABLE 2

Demographic Characteristics of the Sample (*N*=251)

Variable	*N*	Percent
Gender		
Adult Men	149	59.4
Adult Women	102	40.6
Theological Training		
Yes	221	88.0
No	30	12.0
License/Ordained		
Yes	79	31.5
No	72	68.5
Denomination/Affiliation		
Baptist	76	30.0
Evangelical	31	12.0
Lutheran	17	7.0
Presbyterian	8	3.0
Assembly of God	9	3.0
United Church of Christ	9	3.0
Roman Catholic	2	.01
Quaker	1	.00
Episcopal	10	4.0
Mennonite	1	.00
Christian Mission Alliance	10	4.0
Pentecostal	2	.01
United Methodist	2	.01
Church of God in Christ	1	.00
Christian Reformed	2	.01
Church of the Nazarene	3	.01
Wesleyan	1	.00
Church of God	2	.01

As indicated in Table 2, there were 251 adult men (N=149) and adult women (N=102), 59.4 percent and 40.6 percent respectively. There were 221 (88 percent) that reported having theological training. There were 79 (31.5 percent) that reported being licensed and/or ordained for ministry. Men and women who participated in the survey were from 19 different Christian denominations which included the following: Baptist (N=76); Evangelical (N=31); Lutheran (N=17); Presbyterian (N=8); Assemblies of God (N=9); United Church of Christ (N=9); Roman Catholic (N=2); Quaker (N=1); Episcopal (N=10); Mennonite (N=1); Christian and Missionary Alliance (N=10); Pentecostal (N=2); United Methodist (N=2); Church of God in Christ (N=1); Christian Reformed (N=2); Church of the Nazarene (N=3); Wesleyan (N=1); and Church of God (N=2).

Materials. The four theoretical style constructs (Charismatic, Enhancement, Modern, and Traditional) were represented with 54 survey items. There were 13 survey items generated for the Charismatic Style (a), 14 survey items generated for the Modern Style (b), 16 survey items generated for the Enhancement Style (c), and 11 survey items generated for the Traditional Style (d). See Table 3a to 3e for the survey items and the results of the expert panel review.

TABLE 3A

Item	**Factor 1 Charismatic Style**	Loading
45	Social service activities are important, however, spiritual activities that introduce people to the faith are more important.	.795
2	The church's primary responsibility is to share the faith, rather than to provide social services	.790
8	Social service activities do not have priority over faith sharing activities	.518
22	The focus of the church is to help people receive salvation, not to address social justic issues.	.717
23	Meeting spiritual and human needs are equally important but meeting spiritual needs is a higher priority.	.677
11	Spur-of-the-moment or unplanned spiritual activities can be more effective for improving individual situations than planned social service activities.	.429
53	Attending to spiritual needs is often more important than attending to non-emergency social needs.	.656

Item	**Factor 4 Charismatic Style**	Loading
48	Teaching people to be spiritually strong is more valuable for their social life than helping them through social programs.	.652
57	The best way to help people with their social problems is to introduce them to God.	.584
44	Only spiritual direction provided through religious teaching can help people to live normal lives.	.691

Cronbach's Alpha .814
Themes: Charismatic
Factor #1 supports the theme of # 2 (items 45, 23, 53) and #3 (item 2) with very strong and excellent loadings (.63 and .71 or higher respectively). Factor #4 supports the theme of #1 with two very strong loadings (.63 or higher).
Item #23, as traditional, can be reinterpreted as Charismatic.

TABLE 3B

Item	**Factor 2 Enhancement Style**	Loading
18	It is important to teach about your religious faith while providing social servcies.	.633
16	It is always appropriate to proselytize individuals who participate in a social service program.	.378
55	Staff should provide social services and share their faith while addressing social and spiritual needs.	.755
15	When seeking to address social needs, it is a good idea to also include some spiritual activities	.655

41	A primary reason for a church to engage in social service ministry is to address spiritual needs.	.453
9	Social service programs are important because they can help you to establish trust so that you can share your faith.	.568
13	It is better to have a non-religious organization provide needed social services even when a local church can easily provide the same services.	-.470 (reverse)

TABLE 3C

Item	Factor 6 Enhancement Style	Loading
37	The mission of the local church includes using spiritual and social service activities to address social problems.	.612
49	Evangelistic ministry designed to address important aspect of a person's life, includes the use of social services activities.	.539
1	It is important for churches in low-income communities to address human social needs as a part of their evangelism strategy.	.491
42	When the church spends a lot of time helping people to develop skills for gainful employment, it compromises the church's mission.	-.495

Cronbach's Alpha .717
Themes: Enhancement
Factor #2 is supports the theme of #1 in scale items # 55, 18, 15 with excellence and very strong loadings. Other elements, #13R and #41, that are fairly supported in factor #2 include the following themes: (1) That churches that do social ministry should also address spiritual needs (and are "insufficient" with a single-focus); (2) Churches have a better chance at being effective in providing social services than non-religious social service organizations.

TABLE 3D

Item	Factor 3 Modern Style	Loading
10	A nonreligious social service program by itself can initiate a process of spiritual transformation in the life of an individual participant.	.805
36	Individuals can experience spiritual transformation as a result of receiving social services.	.764
26	When a church is providing social services it is doing evangelism.	.553
29	Offering social services to help others may be all that is needed to bring them to the faith.	.613
3	Individuals seeking to experience spiritual transformation in a social service program do not need to participate in spiritual program activities to experience it.	.686
40	People who have received social services may accept the faith on their own without being proselytized (converted) by a religious person.	.601
51	Demonstrating obedience to the "Will of God" by addressing social needs may be all that is needed to inspire people to accept faith.	.532

Cronbach's Alpha .807
Themes: Modern
Factor#3 supports theme #1 (items 10, 36, 3) with excellent loadings, and item #3 with very strong loadings. All other loadings support theme #2 with a range from fair to strong in their loadings.
This also indicates that Modern and traditional models should be in reverse with Modern being polarized with Charismatic model.

TABLE 3E

Item	Factor 5 Modern Style	Loading
52	It is important that church-supported social service work be performed by competent staff apart from their religious work.	.750
14	Demonstrating one's faith by providing needed social services is an indirect way of effectively sharing one's faith.	.627
38	It is a good idea to have a "no proselytizing" policy for social service staff of a religious organization.	.434
5	It is important to offer social services programs and spiritual enrichment activities separately because they have different purposes or goals.	.465
20	It is appropriate to avoid overt attempts at evangelism while providing services in a religious social service organization.	.546
50	Unspoken religious faith demonstrated through social service outreach can have a powerful life changing effect on unbelievers.	.467

Cronbach's Alpha .648
Themes: Traditional
Factor #5 supports theme #1 (item 52) with an excellent loadings, and theme #3 (items 14, 5, and 20) with a strong and fair loadings, respectively. The strongest item (52 as excellent) for theme #1 indicated model D (traditional) as initially hypothesized. Items #52 and #5 were hypothesized as traditional model attributes. Elements of model B, and C can be reinterpreted in light of strong indicators of the traditional model items (D), #52 and #5.

Procedures

Expert Panel. Ten individuals were selected and asked to volunteer as experts to establish construct validity. Construct validity has to do with validating that concepts are generally understood to imply the same meaning. This study took the step of ensuring consistency in meaning using an expert panel. The item selection process involved reading item statements and selecting the best match with the hypothetical style construct. The category choices included *Style A for Charismatic, B for Modern, C for Enhancement, and D for Traditional,* or *Unclear*. The decision guide was predetermined that, in order for an item to be selected for the study, there had to be at least 80 percent agreement that each item matched a model. Fifty-four items received at least 80 percent agreement from the expert review panel. A breakdown of the items that were included in the analysis are indicated in Tables 3a to 3e.

Survey. The items selected based on the expert panel were used to develop a survey instrument. The survey was implemented with respondents who were invited by email and who were directly or indirectly associated with a seminary over a two-week period. A website was used to administer a test via the internet using a computer program called Flashlight Online 1.0 to which respondents were asked via email to volunteer to participate in the survey for this study. There were 251 respondents that completed the survey. Demographic data such as denominational affiliation, gender, theological education, and whether or not one is licensed or ordained for ministry was included in this study (See Table 2). There were initially 58 items in total. Because of the factoring of the variables functioned as scales based on dimensions items were statements with a Likert-type scale format with arbitrary values and no true zero point as interval levels of measurement applied to the responses. Therefore, the instrument was a 1 to 6-point scale of values with *strongly agree* (6-point) as the highest possible value. S*trongly disagree* (1-point) as the lowest possible value per item.

TABLE 4

	Initial Eigenvalues			*Extracted Sums of Squares Loadings*		
Factor	*Total*	*% Variance*	*Cumulative %*	*Total*	*% Variance*	*Cumulative %*
I	8.40	16.80	16.80	7.85	15.70	5.09
II	5.94	11.89	28.69	5.33	10.67	4.68
III	3.02	6.05	34.75	2.48	4.96	4.80
IV	1.96	3.93	38.69	1.40	2.80	3.33
V	1.79	3.58	42.27	1.18	2.36	4.33
VI	1.72	3.44	45.72	1.11	2.23	3.22

Factor Analysis Procedures

After the survey response scores were calculated, a common or principal factor analysis test was performed using statistical software. Statistical factor analysis procedures require decisions to be made after each procedure in the process based on test results. The following are the procedures that were followed. After sample adequacy using the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) method was indicated, and a sphericity test (Kaiser 1974) indicated that the factor model was appropriate, given the correlation matrix, a factor analysis extraction method called principal axis analysis (PFA) was utilized (Gorsuch 1983). The PFA is a common factor analysis approach that allows the researcher to extract the factors successfully to treat them as uncorrelated to one another in order to obtain the common variance of each factor until the number needed is extracted at the end of the process. While producing low to moderate communalities, this method prevents inflated values of variance from being produced (Gorsuch 1990) by only analyzing shared variance. PFA was also considered because the data was not considered to be from a normally-distributed sample (Fabrigar 1999).

Upon extraction, a scree test showed the presence of 6 factors including the Charismatic, Modern, Traditional, and Enhancement factors which were retained for rotation after extraction (Velicer 1990). A direct oblimin method (Jennrich 1966) with delta at 0 to control for extremely high correlations in an oblique rotation was used for obtaining a simple structure. A minimum factor loading was set at .30 for selecting the items for each of the factors identified (Tabachnick 2001).

Results of Factor Loadings

There were six factors that emerged based on a factor analysis that supported the claim that four distinct FBPT styles exist as patterns of religious faith in social service programs. There were two dimensions with explicit and implicit traits that supported two general model categories of patterns of religious faith represented in the four FBPT styles. Most of the items identified were validated and provided greater clarity about the nature of the dimensions and traits of religious faith in Christian social service programs.

Correlation Matrix

A positive-definite correlation matrix that was factorable resulted (the correlation matrix that includes the means and standard deviations was too cumbersome to include in this article). The range of the means in the correlation matrix was 1.6 to 5.4 on a 6-point scale. Examination of the correlation matrix also indicated that all of the items correlated $\geq |.30|$ across at least three other items in the matrix. There were no inter-item correlations that exceeded $r = .65$, therefore, indicating no problem with multicollinearity. A Bartlett test for sphericity indicated that the correlation matrix was not an identity matrix. The Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant with

a chi-square at 4985.00 (df = 1225), a probability of .001, based on a sample of 251. The KMO statistic of the magnitude of the observed correlation coefficients in the matrix was meritorious at .828 for sampling adequacy (N=251) (Kaiser 1974: 35). [See Table 4]

Extraction

Procedures for a common factor analysis using the PFA method showed the presence of 6 factors after 7 iterations. The decision to extract 6 factors was based on the scree plot and eigenvalues greater than 1.5. Extracted communalities were low to moderate as expected using the PFA method ranging from .138 to .656. As indicated in Table 3, eigenvalues for the 6 factors ranged from 1.72 to 8.40 and a cumulative percentage of shared variance at 45.7 percent.

TABLE 5

Factor Loadings from Rotated Factor Pattern Matrix:
Principal Axis Factoring With Oblimin Rotation

	Factors					
Items	1	2	3	4	5	6
Charismatic						
45	**.64**	.28	-.17	-.10	-.20	.08
2	**.63**	.03	-.03	-.05	-.26	.03
8	**.35**	.29	-.07	-.19	-.21	-.09
22	**.50**	.03	-.07	.00	.25	.09
23	**.52**	.02	-.20	.06	.03	.08
11	**.42**	.15	.21	.12	-.08	-.02
53	**.61**	.07	-.18	.17	.14	.03
57	**.49**	.08	.11	.33	.26	-.18
25	**.24**	.14	.05	.21	-.30	-.13
6	**.35**	-.14	.08	.25	.02	-.03
Enhanced						
18	.20	**.57**	-.04	.10	.16	-.13
15	.16	**.59**	.02	-.16	-.04	-.11
46	.13	**.56**	-.19	.19	.04	-.06
55	.06	**.54**	-.07	-.15	.19	-.11
24	.18	**.49**	-.20	.11	.17	-.19
16	-.05	**.55**	-.03	.28	-.18	-.10
41	.26	**.37**	.06	-.00	.05	-.05
9	-.01	**.43**	.00	-.09	.19	.17
43	.18	**.30**	-.06	.13	.15	-.13
47	.19	**.42**	.05	-.16	.24	.24
Modern						
10	-.02	-.01	**.83**	.10	-.11	-.00
36	-.04	.06	**.76**	-.-2	-.01	-.06
26	-.38	.26	**.51**	-.03	.11	.16

29	-.06	.11	**.53**	-.05	-.03	.16
3	-.03	-.27	**.62**	.16	.05	-.18
40	.15	-.21	**.46**	-.13	.00	.05
51	.07	.10	**.34**	-.26	.26	.32
50	.14	.00	**.42**	-.30	.14	.39

Note: Underlined values indicate a double loading on two factors. Loadings highlighted in bold indicate the factor on which the item was placed.

TABLE 5 CONTINUED

Factor Loadings from Rotated Factor Pattern Matrix:
Principal Axis Factoring With Oblimin Rotation

	Factors					
Items	1	2	3	4	5	6
Charismatic						
48	.09	.13	-.03	**.59**	-.08	.17
44	.19	.14	-.01	**.35**	.10	-.11
54	.18	.03	-.08	**.22**	-.15	-.05
39	.01	-.05	.01	**.44**	-.07	.27
30	.09	.13	-.03	**.30**	-.27	.32
13	.00	-.12	-.09	**.39**	-.21	.35
Modern						
37	-.06	-.10	.04	.08	**.64**	-.00
49	-.01	.12	-.10	-.05	**.52**	.00
1	-.17	.06	-.04	.02	**.46**	-.01
42	.18	-.06	-.02	.09	**.42**	-.02
35	.01	.19	.14	-.01	**.30**	-.13
58	.12	.03	.03	-.06	**.34**	-.03
28	-.33	.10	.23	.05	**.29**	.06
21	-.02	.27	.26	-.37	**.16**	.09
Traditional						
52	.01	-.03	.02	.10	.09	**.56**
5	.16	-.09	-.07	.04	-.15	**.41**
20	-.12	-.22	.11	-.06	.06	**.34**
38	-.06	-.33	.05	.24	.05	**.32**
13	.00	-.12	-.09	.39	-.21	**.35**
56	.08	-.00	-.20	.13	-.41	**.30**
14	-.16	-.00	.26	-.07	-.12	**.47**

Note: Underlined values indicate a double loading on two factors. Loadings highlighted in bold indicate the factor on which the item was placed.

TABLE 6

Factor Loadings from Rotated Factor Structure Matrix:
Principal Axis Factoring With Oblimin Rotation

	Factors					
Items	1	2	3	4	5	6
Charismatic						
45	**.73**	.29	-.35	.14	-.34	-.02
2	**.69**	.11	-.22	.17	-.39	.01
8	**.42**	.35	-.20	-.04	-.19	-.18
22	**.57**	.06	-.23	.20	-.38	.07
23	**.57**	.12	-.20	.22	-.15	.00
11	**.46**	.21	.06	.21	-.12	-.05
53	**.68**	.22	-.30	.32	-.07	-.08
57	**.53**	.27	-.00	.37	.14	-.26
25	**.38**	.17	-.14	.34	-.35	-.15
6	**.36**	-.06	-.02	.31	-.10	-.01
Enhanced						
18	.32	**.68**	-.11	.12	.19	-.34
15	.25	**.64**	-.04	-.11	.08	-.29
46	.33	**.63**	-.29	.25	.01	-.28
55	.11	**.63**	-.05	-.17	.31	-.32
24	.33	**.63**	-.28	.16	.15	-.40
16	.18	**.54**	-.17	.32	-.14	-.25
41	.31	**.44**	-.00	.03	.08	-.17
9	-.01	**.41**	.08	-.15	.27	.02
43	.26	**.40**	-.12	.15	.12	-.26
47	-.01	**.41**	.18	-.19	.16	.33
Modern						
10	-.15	-.09	**.79**	-.03	.10	.14
36	-.18	.02	**.75**	-.16	.23	.04
26	-.47	.12	**.63**	-.25	.37	.18
29	-.72	.06	**.56**	-.15	.13	.22
3	-.18	-.26	**.60**	.02	.17	-.01
40	-.01	-.23	**.47**	-.17	.08	.18
51	-.12	.04	**.49**	-.38	.39	.31
50	-.08	-.08	**.55**	-.39	.26	.43

Note: Underlined values indicate a double loading on two factors. Loadings highlighted in bold indicate the factor on which the item was placed.

TABLE 6 CONTINUED

Factor Loadings from Rotated Factor Structure Matrix:
Principal Axis Factoring With Oblimin Rotation

	Factors					
Items	1	2	3	4	5	6
Charismatic						
48	.28	.09	-.16	**.64**	-.26	.12
44	.30	.23	-.11	**.38**	.00	-.19
54	.30	.07	-.22	**.33**	-.26	-.07
39	.10	-.14	-.04	**.45**	-.22	.29
30	.24	.00	-.14	**.40**	-.40	.29
13	.11	-.26	-.16	**.46**	-.40	.39
Modern						
37	-.21	-.01	.23	-.10	**.63**	-.04
49	-.09	.21	.04	-.17	**.52**	-.11
1	-.25	.11	.11	-.13	**.50**	-.08
42	.28	-.09	-.19	.25	**.50**	.02
35	-.04	.28	.20	-.11	**.39**	-.20
58	.04	.12	.10	-.12	**.35**	-.08
28	-.41	.05	.38	-.14	**.42**	.05
21	-.16	.25	.38	-.46	**.37**	.04
Traditional						
52	-.03	-.19	.12	.06	.08	**.56**
5	.17	-.20	-.08	.13	-.29	**.44**
20	-.24	-.35	.24	-.14	.05	**.43**
38	-.10	-.43	.10	.20	-.07	**.42**
13	.11	-.26	-.16	.46	-.40	**.39**
56	.22	-.13	-.31	.29	-.56	**.31**
14	-.24	-.21	.35	-.14	-.05	**.54**

Note: Underlined values indicate a double loading on two factors. Loadings highlighted in bold indicate the factor on which the item was placed.

Direct Oblimin Rotation

A direct oblimin with Kaiser normalization rotation method resulted in a simple oblique solution (delta = 0). As indicated in the Factor Correlation Matrix (Table 6), simple correlations among factors ranged from > .19 to ≤.30. There were very strong factor loadings (> .50) on 6 factors as a simple structure in the factor structure matrix (Table 5). As indicated in Table 5, there were several very strong or greater factor loadings (≥ .50) in the factor pattern matrix with most of the factors. Items 12 and 27 were eliminated because of redundancy or lack of homogeneity with the constructs corresponding to the 6 factors.

TABLE 7

Factor Correlations and Factor Alpha Coefficients (*N*=251)

Factor	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Charismatic Model	32.20	7.79	(.81)					
2. Enhancement Model	39.47	7.31	.197	(.82)				
3. Modern Model	34.88	6.62	.206	.064	(.83)			
4. Charismatic Model	13.03	3.79	.251	.003	.182	(.64)		
5. Modern Model	40.51	4.29	.212	.166	.281	.254	(.71)	
6. Traditional Model	20.07	4.94	.070	.300	.155	.018	.124	(.66)
Total Scale								

Range: 1.00 to 5.00
Note: Reliability estimates appear in the parentheses on the diagonal.

Cronbach's Alpha

Table 7 indicates normal between-factor correlations, and the alpha coefficients for the factor scales. Only between-factor correlations ranging from approximately .20 to .30 (Nunnally and Bernstein 1994) were considered in the results according to the expectations of the study using an oblique solution. Between-factor correlations ranged from .197 (between factors 1 and 2) to .300 (between factors 2 and 6). The reliability estimates are presented in parentheses on the diagonal of the Table 6 ranging from .64 to .83. Cronbach's alpha was .65 for the total scale coefficient (N = 50).

As indicated in Tables 3a – 3e, based on the between-factor correlations, factors 1 and 4 could be combined as a single factor to form a composite scale as the Charismatic FBPT style, and factors 3 and 5 could be combined to form a composite scale as the Modern FBPT style. There was between-factor correlation with factor 1 of the Charismatic style and factor 2 of the Enhancement style of .197. There was no between-factor correlation indicated between factor 6 as the Traditional style and factors 1 or 4 as the Charismatic style with a satisfactory coefficient in the factor correlation matrix.

Factor 6 as the Traditional style revealed a negative between-factor correlation of -.30 with factor 2 as the Enhancement style. There were also negative between-factor correlations between factors 3 and 5 and factors 1, -.20 and -.21 respectively. Factor 4 was also negatively correlated with factors 3 and 5, thus suggesting a negative correlation between the Charismatic and the Modern styles.

The patterns of religious faith according to the factor analysis suggests FBPT styles can be summarized as follows: (a) Factor 1 indicated explicit patterns of constitutive religious faith in the Charismatic Style; (b) Factor 2 indicated explicit patterns of instrumental religious faith in the Enhancement Style; (c) Factor 3 indicated implicit patterns of instrumental religious faith in the Modern Style; (d) Factor 4 indicated explicit patterns of constitutive religious faith in the Charismatic Style; (e) Factor 5 indicated implicit patterns of instrumental religious faith in the Modern Style; and (f) Factor 2 indicated implicit patterns of constitutive religious in the Traditional Style. The Characteristics of Religious Faith Chart illustrates the correlations and arrangements of the styles that allow us to describe the corresponding categories with their respective dimensions with implicit and explicit traits.

Principal Component Analysis

A principal axis analysis approach suggests that the items of the hypothetical constructs were generally consistent with factor loadings presented in the structure matrix (see Table 5 and 6). Factor loadings that ranged from a high of .80 to a low of .30 were interpreted as ranging from *excellent* to *fair* respectively according to the different FBPT styles summarized in this study (see Tables 3a-3e). The section below outlines the results based on factor loadings.

Factors 1 and 4 (Charismatic Style) was supported as expected due to the number of factor loadings as originally conceptualized, ranging from *excellent* to *strong*. Although there was 1 item not expected to load on this factor (item 23), it was reasonable to reinterpret an item with a strong factor loading as belonging to the Charismatic Style. As indicated in Table 5 of the pattern matrix, there were *excellent*, *very strong* and *strong* factor loadings with 6 items (items 45, 2, 22, 23, 53, and 57) ranging from .73 to .53 on factor 1 as Charismatic Style items. Item 23 was the only item that loaded as a *strong* factor loading of .57 according to the structure matrix. There was 1 item (item 48) that resulted in a *very strong* factor loading in the structure matrix after an oblique rotation, .64, in factor 4, Charismatic Style. It was concluded that the items were most consistent with the Charismatic Style, thus resulting in two factors supporting the Charismatic Style.

Factor 2 (Enhancement Style) was supported as expected due to the number and strength of its factor loadings. This model had two factor loadings rated as *good* as items that could reasonably be reinterpreted as belonging to the Enhancement Style. There were 5 *very strong* and 1 *strong* factor loadings on factor 2 of items 18, 15, 46, 55, 24, and 16, ranging from .68 to .54, as Enhancement Style items. Two other items (items 41 and 47) that loaded on factor 2 were not originally generated as Enhancement Style items. Item 41 was a negative correlation and loading for this factor (Enhancement) as a reverse value score.

Factors 3 and 5 (Modern Style) were supported as many factor loadings from *excellent* to *strong*. There were *excellent* to *strong* factor loadings with 6 items (10, 36, 26, 29, 3, and 50) ranging from .79 to .55 that loaded on factor 3 (Modern Style). The results of the factor loadings supported factor 5 as the Modern Style as indicated with 4 items loading from *very strong* to *strong*. Item 26 which loaded with a value of .51 was originally expected to load for the Traditional Style. Unexpectedly, the results of these loadings indicated another dimension more consistent with the Modern Style construct that were otherwise expected to support the Enhancement Style. The correlation matrix also supported this interpretation. There were *very strong* and *strong* factor loadings with 4 items (items 37, 49, 1, and 42) in factor 5 ranging from .63 to .50, indicating the Modern Model. Two items, 42 and 58, were not originally generated for this factor.

Factor 6 (Traditional Style) was supported by several items. There were *strong* and *good* factor loadings with 4 items (items 52, 14, 5, 20, and 38) in factor 6, ranging from .56 to .42, from several of the items. However, the strongest item (Item 52) indicated the Traditional Style, while three other items (items 5, 13, and 56) provided a coefficient that loaded with a rating of *good* and as Traditional Style items. Four other items in factor 4 (items 54, 39, 30, and 13), originally anticipated to load on a factor that represented the Traditional Style, resulted in loadings *good* to *fair* with their loadings ranging from .33 to .46.

Description of Styles and the Dimensions of Religious Faith

The study suggests that explicit religious activities tend to be associated with specific patterns of religious faith while implicit religious activities such as meanings and symbols tend to be associated with specific patterns of religious faith. There are at least two traits in each dimension that are either implicit or explicit and can be attributed to a specific style. The results also indicated various instrumental and constitutive dimensions of patterns of religious faith to support them as functioning as categories of religious faith in social service programs.

For instance, constitutive religious faith was indicated in the Charismatic Style (Factor 1). For example, it indicated constitutive religious faith in item 53 where religious activities are preferred over social service activities with a *very strong* factor loading of .61, and in item 2 (Charismatic) with a *very strong* factor loading of .63 where religious activities are of primary importance for spiritual transformation. Constitutive religious faith in the Charismatic Style was indicated with a *very strong* factor loading of .595 in item 48. Items 3 and 29 loaded on the instrumental dimension as factor 3 (Modern Style) with *very strong* and *strong* factor loadings, .62 and .53 respectively. This indicated that religious meaning was implicit in the social service activities and that social service activities have a superior role over spiritual activities in social service programs.

The Enhancement Style (Factor 2) showed instrumental religious faith in items such as 18 and 55. Items related to the integration of religious resources that influence the social program activities were indicated. Their factor loadings were *very strong* at .57 and .54 respectively. The Enhancement Style items indicated instrumental religious faith by indicating a preference for integrating religious activities to support social service activities with *strong* and *good* factor loadings as factor 2 such as item 18 (.57), item 15 (.59), item 46 (.56), item 55 (.54), and item 24 (.49).

The Modern Style items indicated instrumental religious faith by indicating how social service activities may initiate or lead to spiritual transformation without the aid of religious activities with factor loadings ranging from *excellent* to *strong* in factor 3 with item 10(.83), item 36(.76), item 26(.51), item 29(.53), and item 3(.62).

Traditional Style items (factor 4) loaded as expected ranging from *strong* to *fair* loadings with items 52 (.56), 5 (.41), 13 (.35), and 20 (.34). These items validated constitutive religious faith by indicating that religious and social service activities have distinctly different goals, and although they may share certain resources, religious activities are considered separate from the social service program component.

Closing

To date, there have been few widely accepted conceptual frameworks that resolve the dilemma surrounding the "secular" versus "spiritual" nature of Christian social service programs. In fact, there remains a dearth of research data on constructs that adequately represent the range of social service programs offered by religious organizations and or churches. As a consequence, there is very little useful empirical evidence to help practitioners determine and self-assess the value of the various approaches for social change using a meaningful religious paradigm.

This present study builds upon a theoretical framework that utilizes a normative lens where specific patterns of religious faith can be observed in social interventions. Having validated models of the role of faith in religious social service programs may enable researchers and practitioners to examine and investigate the worth of such a role using conventional methods toward a common understanding of religious social action and various types of change. The study supports using an approach that seeks to measure dimensions and traits of religious faith and spirituality that indicate normative patterns and theological presuppositions that influence the program. Evaluators may be asked whether there is a relationship between the effects of social service programs and the particular style of religious faith exhibited in the program. Further investigation is needed to determine whether these styles are a factor in other faith traditions such as Islam, Judaism, and probably polytheistic faith traditions, as they are in Christianity. Evaluators need to know the extent to which they can serve religious faith organizations and the funders that support them. Further studies are needed utilizing the results of this study to support using these styles as concepts for public policy and decision makers who may need to justify inclusionary or exclusionary practices. These points and questions highlight some of the limitations of the results of this study.

At the same time, they suggest that more study may be needed to address the issues related to religious faith in social service programs.

Mark Harden, Ph.D., is the Vice President of Academic Affairs and Dean of the College at Pillar College in Newark, NJ. Dr. Harden received his doctorate at Michigan State University in Family and Child Ecology and received his training in advanced research at Michigan State University and the University of Michigan Institute for Political and Social Science Research. His background is in urban church and community ministry. Dr. Harden has served for sixteen years as a theological educator and professor of community outreach and community development with several seminaries including Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary in Boston where he also served as the Dean of the Center for Ministerial Education (CUME). Prior to teaching Dr. Harden served several churches in ordained ministry, World Vision, USFO as a Regional Program Coordinator, and numerous community-based organizations including as a police officer in Detroit, Michigan.

References

Ebaugh, H. R., Pipes, P. F., Chafetz, J. S., Daniels, M. 2003. Where's the Religion? Distinguishing faith-based from secular social service agencies. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 42 (3):411-426.

Fabrigar, L. R., Wegener, D. T., Macallum, R. C., Strahan, E. J. 1999. Evaluating the use of exploratory factor analysis in psychological research. *Psychological Methods* 4 (3):272-299.

Gorsuch, R. L. 1983. *Factor analysis*. 2nd ed. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. 1990. Common Factor Analysis versus Component Factor Analysis - Some Well and Little Known Facts. *Multivariate Behavioral Research* 251 (1):33-39.

Harden, M. G. 2006. Towards a Faith-based Program Theory: A reconceptualization of program theory. *Evaluation Review* 30 (4):481-504.

Jennrich, R. I., and Sampson, P. F. 1966. Rotation for simple loadings. *Psychometrika* (31):313-323.

Kaiser, H. F. 1974. An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika* (39):32-36.

Tabachnick, B. G., Fidell, L. S. 2001. *Using Multivariate Statistics*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Unruh, H. R., and Sider, R. 1999. Saving Souls and Society: Exploring the spiritual and social dynamics of church-based community activism. In *Unpublished manuscript*. Philadelphia.

Velicer, W. F., and Jackson, D. N. 1990. Component Analysis versus Common Factor-Analysis - Some Further Observations. *Multivariate Behavioral Research* 25 (1):89-95.

Review Article of *The Rise and Fall of the Complementarian Doctrine of the Trinity* by Kevin Giles (Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2017)

William David Spencer

Let me underline at the outset that this simply-written-to-be-accessible book is one of the most entertaining, exhilarating, and instructive books on the Trinity I have read in all the recent offerings that are currently pouring out from publishers. I applaud this book; it invites reaction. It provides ample proof that theology is exciting and controversial, two characteristics that describe the author himself. That the Rev. Dr. Kevin Giles has had one of the most significant voices in the recent evangelical debate on the nature and structure of the Trinity is undeniable. In his several books and many articles, this Anglican scholar and priest has been tireless in print and debate in championing the historically orthodox view that, as the Athanasian Creed explains, "In this Trinity none is before or after, none is greater or less than another. But the whole three persons are co-eternal and co-equal" (105).

The Rise and Fall of the Complementarian Doctrine of the Trinity follows his *The Trinity and Subordinationism* (2002) and *Jesus and the Father* (2006), which dealt with the topic of equality versus hierarchy as the permanent, eternal structuring of relationships of the three Persons of the Godhead, and, at the same time, it also succeeds his *The Eternal Generation of the Son* (2012), a painstaking attempt to show that the "Faces" or "Persons" (*prosopon*) of the Godhead that theology has come to identify as the "Second" and "Third," are eternally, respectively, being begotten or "proceeding" from the "First" Person of the Triune Godhead (i.e., "The Father begets the Son and breathes out the Spirit in eternity and sends them both into the world in time," 97), and that this extra-biblical doctrine, suggested by Justin Martyr, is actually egalitarian and not hierarchical in nature, as it might initially appear, since it seems to posit that two Persons of the Trinity are dependent on the third for their very existence.

The Content

After providing an introduction outlining his focus ("The doctrine of the Trinity is the main agenda, not gender," (4), listing the scope of his book, and his "unique qualifications" for analyzing this topic (7), Kevin Giles moves to a more detailed sketch of the history of the recent debate among evangelicals on the nature of the Triune God in chapter 1, "The Rise and Rise of the Complementarian Doctrine of the Trinity" (8). Herein, he tells us how the doctrine was invented, locating it in George Knight's 1977 book, *New Testament Teaching on the Role Relationships of Men and Women* (9-12), showing "how Knight's hierarchically ordered doctrine of the Trinity came to prevail" (12-14). As he explains, "The very first person in history to speak of 'the role subordination' of women, and of 'the eternal role subordination of the Son of God'…was George Knight III in his highly influential 1977 book…In descending order of authority stand the Father, Son, man, woman…Before Dr. Knight wrote, the modern word 'role' had never been used to speak of the essential difference between men and women or of the essential difference between the divine three" (9).

The discussion of George Knight's thought is followed by sections on the hierarchical contributions to the debate by Wayne Grudem, Bruce Ware, Robert Letham, and the application of their appeal for such an order in the Trinity as "the ground for hierarchical ordering of the sexes" (24-34).

Chapter 2 details the "civil war" in the complementarian camp when a new generation of scholars began to question the hierarchical structuring theory leading to "The Fall of the Complementarian Doctrine of the Trinity," as the chapter is entitled (35). He notes this war was

spearheaded by two complementarian women, Rachel Miller and Aimee Byrd (the renowned "Housewife Theologian") and two men, Carl Trueman and Todd Pruitt, through their Alliance of Confessing Evangelicals and its influential website, *The Mortification of Spin* (39). They were soon joined by Liam Goligher, pastor of Philadelphia's Tenth Presbyterian Church. In this chapter, author Giles also returns to the more moderate Robert Letham (who emphasizes "submission" rather than subjection of the Son to the Father) to qualify his critique. Chapter 2 particularly details "the battle at the ETS [Evangelical Theological Society] conference San Antonio, November 2016" (44) and its aftermath and includes an analysis of its residual impact.

Chapters 3 and 4 summarize Kevin Giles's own view on "Doing Evangelical Theology" (67), critiquing the view that "the Bible alone is the basis for doing theology" (68), while cautioning, "The whole of Scripture must be the locus of theology. For this reason, texts that are discordant with what all of Scripture would seem to teach must be interpreted in the light of the whole" (72). Further, while underscoring the role of "tradition," he warns, "The creeds and confessions of the church…do not stand over Scripture or have the same authority as Scripture. Rather, they sum up after a time of conflict and debate what the church has agreed is the teaching of Scripture on the central doctrines of the faith and thus to be believed, *and* they prescribe how Scripture is to be read on these doctrines" (75). Such is a conviction he often repeats, for example, "Once the church has agreed that this confession [i.e., a creed] captures what Scripture implies – even demands – then we are bound to believe this" (92) or be ruled out of the orthodox camp (see 103). Under "Reason," he adds what is for him a central argument, "If evangelical theology does not spring directly from Scripture, good minds enlightened by the Spirit of God will be needed to find coherence within the diversity in Scripture and draw appropriate inferences from what is given in Scripture" (78). In his view, accepting "inferences" such as the eternal generation of the Son becomes the key to his argument that the "claim that 'my doctrine of the Trinity comes directly from Scripture' is untenable. It is simply not true," but it "developed in history" (81). Such inferential "developments" become dogma that cannot be rejected for anyone to remain orthodox, for example, "This somewhat esoteric and little understood doctrine of the eternal generation of the Son is foundational to the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity. It guaranteed the two essentials of the trinitarian faith, the full divinity of the Son and his distinction from the Father. To reject this doctrine is to reject the Nicene faith, most authoritatively spelled out in the Nicene Creed" (57). For those of us to whom the eternal generation doctrine sounds unbiblical, illogical, and inherently hierarchical, Brother Kevin answers with a spirited, sophisticated, and sincere defense. As can be seen from the title, the central thrust of Chapter 4 is "How the Doctrine of the Trinity Developed in History and What Was Concluded and Is Now Orthodoxy" (81). These chapters also add in some of his argument's most important points (e.g., "theologians before the twentieth century" did not use the Trinity for a social agenda, 101).

Finally, in chapter 5, his views on the equality of men and women emerge naturally (it is, after all, a topic on which he has been publishing books since the 1970s), and he ends his book with a gracious and gently worded style, giving pastoral guidance by suggesting that gender hierarchists might rethink their position on the power relationships between women and men. Given the collapse of their theory on the eternal, hierarchical structuring of the Trinity as modeling and mandating a God-given hierarchy among men and women, he suggests they might consider widening their view on how women and men might work together. After citing several complementarians' reassessments of their position on this topic, he summarizes his chapter's topic "where do we go from here?" (110ff) as: "Given that the complementarian doctrine of a hierarchically ordered Trinity has now been abandoned, even by leaders of the complementarian movement, and that they have agreed that 1 Corinthians 11:3 neither subordinates the Son nor women, the reality of a major crisis for complementarian theology cannot be denied." This means that complementarians can "examine afresh what the Scriptures actually teach on the relationship

of the sexes, without any appeal to the Trinity." And he adds, "Fortunately, they have evangelical and Reformed egalitarian friends, holding to the highest view of Scripture, who will gladly sit down with them to recommence the healthy and open discussion on what the Bible teaches on the status and ministry of women that flourished before the Danvers Statement was promulgated in December 1987, claiming to rule authoritatively on what the Bible teaches. With the Trinity now excluded from this discussion, complementarians and evangelical egalitarians have the opportunity to listen and learn from each other for the first time in thirty years after they divided into hostile opposing camps" (113). He ends the book extolling the "excellent theological work" being done by women, a plea that all of us need to move beyond the curse, and the assurance of the affirmation of "Christian family values" by both sides of the debate (113-14). It is a positive, uplifting, and irenic ending.

Assessment

To me, one of the best features of the book is the clarity with which Kevin Giles discusses the question of whether the Trinity is hierarchically stratified. He knows his topic and explains it well. Here is an example of the lucidity he brings when his writing is at its best:

> Tradition 1, the exegetical and theological tradition, should be highly valued because it reflects how the best of theologians from the past have understood the Scriptures on issues in dispute. Their conclusions have been codified in the creeds and confessions of the church. These documents do not stand over Scripture or have the same authority as Scripture. Rather, they sum up after a time of conflict and debate what the church has agreed is the teaching of Scripture on the central doctrines of the faith and thus to be believed, *and* they prescribe how Scripture is to be read on these doctrines. If we ignore the weighty guidance of the creeds and confessions, as complementarian theologians have done, we are bound to fall into error" (75).

Such lucidity and freedom from the usual propensity for jargon that plagues so many texts on theology, distancing all but the most engaged readers, is refreshing.

Although the book is brief (only 128 pages), it is so full of information and author Giles's personal impressions on the topic and on the participants he has encountered in his engagement with it, that I think the best approach for readers to navigate this controversial book might be to approach it as several briefer books included under one cover. This will help those who do not know Brother Kevin Giles personally not to be put off by some of what appear to be his more outrageous statements.

Book #1, so as to say, begins right in the introduction with these opening words: "I have been crying out to complementarians for nearly twenty years, 'Go back, you are going the wrong way on the Trinity. What you are teaching in the light of the creeds and confessions is heresy.' For well over a decade, I could count on one hand – and have fingers to spare – the theologians who openly supported me. Most evangelicals and Reformed theologians for most of this period in fact opposed me and were very critical of my work" (1-2).

What are we to make of this statement? "For nearly twenty years" could suggest he is referring to the period circa 1977-1997 when his first book on women's ministry was published, or, since his *The Trinity and Subordinationism* appeared in 2002, he could mean 1999 until 2017, the date of publication of this present book, or was the period in which our Brother Kevin found himself as practically a lone voice, supported for "well over a decade" by only four or less other theologians indicate either sometime between c. 1999-2012 or c. 2003-June 3, 2016, when the blowup in the conservative camp took place (35)? Of those four or less theologians who supported him in this period, he cites twenty names (!) on page 49 (although he qualifies Millard Erikson's entry, due to their disagreement on the necessity of the doctrine of the eternal generation of the Son and some

differences on interpreting Athanasius's views, as Kevin Giles concludes, "I must mention that he has not been entirely supportive," 1.ftnt.#1). Twenty colleagues to fill the four or less slots would seem curiously paradoxical, suggesting he is telescoping his impressions and omitting data. If he means an earlier period, we should note that Christians for Biblical Equality began in 1987 as a North American affiliate of the British organization Men, Women, and God, International, firming up the present name of this North American offshoot the next year, so there was support available. Even in this early period, I notice among the significant books he is missing is, for example, Royce Gruenler's 1986 Baker book, *The Trinity and the Gospel of John*, which remains in print from Wipf and Stock and warns "that overemphasizing the model of authority/submission may reintroduce the one-way subordinationism that troubled earlier discussion of the Trinity in the history of the church."[1] Also missing from the end of that first period is logician Rebecca Merrill Groothuis's contribution on "Functional Subordination and the Godhead" in *Good News for Women*, where she reasons: "Unlike functional subordination, eternal subordination cannot be described as the subordination of one equal to another for the purpose of accomplishing a particular function; rather, it is built into the very nature of the subordinated person. If Christ's subordination is not limited to a specific project or function but characterizes his eternal relationship with God, then Christ is not merely functionally subordinate; he is by nature subordinate. Subordinate is what he is, what he always has been, what he always will be. It is a matter of ontology (i.e. being), not merely of function."[2] Another significant woman's contribution that Dr. Giles omits is classicist Dr. Catherine Kroeger's work on "source" as the proper rendering of "head" in 1 Corinthians 11:3-12's explanation of the Father's relationship to the Son (see her 2006 cover article in *Priscilla Papers*) This is an omission I find puzzling since her argument and its proof are germane to Brother Kevin's argument. After a careful summary of her data, Sister Catherine concluded: "In the case of our understanding of 'head,' an enormous emotional and spiritual significance is attached, as the Bible declares God to be the head of Christ and man to be the head of woman. To declare the Father as 'boss, chief, or authority over' is to deny the status of the eternally begotten Son, equal to Father and Holy Spirit in goodness, power, and love."[3] Her definition of "head" (*kephalē*) was already noted in Liddell and Scott's lexicon as "source, origin"[4] but highlighted, developed, illustrated, and applied by Catherine Kroeger to the hierarchically complementarian/egalitarian Trinity debate during this period in which Brother Kevin was feeling so alone and unsupported. We should also note that her explanation rests on the doctrine of the eternal generation of the Son, which he champions. Also, on the related topic of Christians for Biblical Equality's (CBE) work on the Trinity, he omits "An Evangelical Statement on the Trinity" (2011), the creed CBE commissioned and I drafted with a consultation team, including Kevin Giles himself: "We believe that the sole living God who created and rules over all and who is described in the Bible is one Triune God in three coeternal, coequal Persons, each Person being present as distinct yet equal, not as three separate gods, but one Godhead, sharing equally in honor, glory, worship, power, authority, rule,

1 Royce Gordon Gruenler, *The Trinity in the Gospel of John: A Thematic Commentary on the Fourth Gospel* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 1986), xiii. He points out the "problem in literally extrapolating into the interrelationship of the eternal divine Family Jesus' language about always listening to and obeying the Father and being less than the Father. It would mean that only the Father would have authority to speak, while the Son (and Spirit) would be eternally cast in the role of passive listeners. That is of course absurd and no one would go so far as to follow it to such a logical conclusion. Yet that is what must logically follow if the sent/listen/obey sayings of Jesus are taken as absolutes that describe the eternal relationship of Son (and Spirit) to the Father," xv. In case this Baker book was missed the first time around, I reviewed its Wipf and Stock edition in *Priscilla Papers*, vol. 19, no. 3 (Summer 2005): 29-30.

2 Rebecca Merrill Groothuis, *Good News for Women: A Biblical Picture of Gender Equality* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1997), 57.

3 Catherine Clark Kroeger, "Toward an Understanding of Ancient Conceptions of 'Head,'" *Priscilla Papers*, vol. 20, no. 3 (Summer 2006): 7, col. 1.

4 Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, comp., rev. Henry Stuart Jones, Roderick McKenzie, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (New York, NY: Oxford, 1940), 945, col. 2.

and rank, such that no Person has eternal primacy over the others."[5] So, I find myself compelled to ask: what on earth is going on here with such omissions?

Another baffling issue also raises simultaneously: his constant references to "most evangelical and Reformed theologians for most of this period" who "opposed" him (see 1-2, 3, 4, 8, 12, 17, and so on). At first, I thought that "evangelical" must mean Arminian, since some "free will" theologians I have encountered in conservative circles have also favored the hierarchist-complementarian position, but this is unclear since Brother Kevin uses "evangelical" as a general term as well for conservative theologians. But then, I noticed he wrote specifically targeting the Reformed camp:

> No review caught the attention of the confessional Reformed community more than that by Michael S. Horton, the J. Gresham Machen Professor of Theology and Apologetics at Westminster Seminary, San Diego. I believe it was his review of my book, published in December 2014 in *Modern Reformation,* that made it possible for other confessional Reformed theologians to openly dissent from the Grudem-Ware doctrine of the Trinity (57).

Why I find these statements so baffling is that Dr. Catherine Kroeger was Reformed in doctrine (a ranked adjunct professor at Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, Hamilton, and the chief founder of Christians for Biblical Equality [CBE] in 1987[6]). She was supported in this endeavor by Dr. Roger Nicole, also a Reformed Theologian and Gordon-Conwell professor. Further, editors of CBE's journal, *Priscilla Papers*, who served in the decades of Brother Kevin's self-sensing isolation like Gretchen Gaebelein Hull and I myself were Reformed. In passing, Brother Kevin mentions the initials "CBE" in footnote 5 on page 82, n. 5, though without spelling out the organization's name. And its journal, *Priscilla Papers*, is listed in the bibliography (117-18), as it published five of his own articles to which he refers, but he neglects to mention that this journal also published numerous other articles on equality versus subordination in the structure of the Trinity all throughout these periods when he felt so alone (including entire issues on the topic in 2008 and 2011).[7] Also, in place of Sister Catherine's more seminal contribution on the topic, he chooses

---

5 See "An Evangelical Statement on the Trinity," *Priscilla Papers*, vol. 25, no. 4 (Autumn 2011): 15-19, reprinted in "Man, Woman, and the Triune God," "a special edition journal of Christians for Biblical Equality, distributed, among other places, at the 2011 annual meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society, reprinted in Dennis W. Jowers and H. Wayne House, eds., *The New Evangelical Subordinationism? Perspectives on the Equality of God the Father and God the Son* (Eugene, OK: Pickwick, 2012), and available to be read and signed on its own website: www.TrinityStatement.com. Kevin made several suggestions which were very helpful and worthwhile. He might also have been encouraged had he heard my 2005 paper, "Would the Nicaean Party Call Today's Hierarchists in the Trinity Semi-Arians?" and its follow-up "Athanasius's Use of the Word *Taxis*" (often rendered "rank" in translations of Athanasius's writing), both presented at the Evangelical Theological Society, taped and distributed. Why do I bring these several omissions up? I mention these few examples, personal and otherwise, that come immediately to my mind to illustrate a growing conviction that, if he has omitted all of this work in these periods, especially excluding the creed to which he contributed, then, I would question, has he not also skipped over other books, articles, perhaps creeds (like Stanley Gundry's, which supplemented my theologically-oriented emphasis with a biblical one). Perhaps, since he affirmed both an egalitarian view of women and men and he also supported the doctrine of the eternal generation of the Son, he felt isolated and omitted some of these items written by those who, as I myself, are not enthusiastic supporters of the theory of the eternal generation of the Son and, therefore, he suspected of not being fully orthodox (!). Of course, for those of us who question the eternal generation theory, we stand with such stalwarts as B.B. Warfield, and it would seem to me the collective drafters of the original Creed of Nicaea (AD 325) (despite their individual convictions), together an august assembly of defenders of the faith once given to the saints in which to belong.

6 It was inspired by Great Britain's Men, Women, and God: Christians for Biblical Equality, International (from which it derived its name) out of the London Institute for Contemporary Christianity, led by John Stott and other prominent British evangelicals. Current CBE president, Dr. Mimi Haddad, has provided an enlightening sketch of CBE's history in context in her article "Dr. Catherine Clark Kroeger: An Evangelical Legacy" in the *Priscilla Papers* tribute issue, "Honoring the legacy of Dr. Catherine Clark Kroeger," vol. 25, no. 3 (Summer 2011): 4-10.

7 Such significant *Priscilla Papers* articles that may stand as representative are former One by One director Kristen L. Johnson's "Just as the Father, So the Son: The Implications of John 5:16-30 in the Gender-Role Debate," which astutely demonstrated "equality is based on interdependence with the Father – not independence from him or subordination to him," vol. 19, no. 1 (Winter 2005): 16, col. 2. Also, "The Trinity and Gender: Theological Reflections on the Differences of Divine and Human Persons," by Gary W. Deddo, then senior editor for academic books at Intervarsity Press, argued cogently, "As

instead to cite Philip Payne's excellent but much later summary of the data, including Catherine Kroeger's views on the topic, and Brother Kevin also ignores her book *I Suffer Not a Woman*, which made its own significant contribution to the debate. I find her absence from his book mystifying.

On page 12, he does nod toward "some evangelicals and Reformed theologians" who, due to a "totally new social context, created by the advent of women's lib…began advocating for a radical break from the traditional understanding of the relationship of the sexes." But is this enough?

Following Clarissa Danforth's 1815 ordination as the first woman ordained in the United States by the Free Will Baptists in New England,[8] Ruth Tucker and Walter Liefeld note that the first woman ordained in a "recognized denomination" was Antoinette Brown in 1853,[9] an Arminian and eventual Unitarian. In 1889, Louisa Woosley, historically orthodox and evangelical, became the first woman ordained by a Reformed body, the Nolin (Kentucky) Presbytery of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church (CPC).[10] In our lifetime and well before the December, 2014 review of Dr. Giles's book in *Modern Reformation* (57), a plethora of Reformed evangelical egalitarian colleagues have been championing equality in the Trinity and the equal leadership of women, for example,

---

far as the contested notion of headship goes, theologically speaking, the doctrine of the Trinity decidedly lends its weight to interpreting the term 'head' as 'source' without hierarchical connotations…the earthly obedience mirrors the humility of the whole God in that the Father glorifies the Son and the Son glorifies the Father," vol. 22, no. 4 [Autumn 2008]): 11, col. 1. Nancy Hedberg, a Vice President at Corban University and author of a concise and helpful monograph *Women, Men, and the Trinity* in a carefully researched article, "One Essence, One Goodness, One Power," tackled "the temptation to equate the immanent Trinity with equality of essence and the economic Trinity with subordination of function," demonstrating "that is a mistake," vol. 25, no. 4 [Autumn 2011): 8, col. 2.- 9, col. 1. Eastern University Professor of Philosophy Philip Cary's Evangelical Press Association's award-winning, "The New Evangelical Subordinationism: Reading Inequality Into the Trinity," which keys off Kevin Giles's work, observed, "The ancient church fathers were hierarchicalists to a man…But despite themselves, what they found at the utmost height of the chain of being was equality in the very essence of God," CBE's *Man, Woman And The Triune God* (2011): 30, col. 2. For myself, as editor of *Priscilla Papers* between 2004-14, when all these articles and many more like them were published, I did editorials and articles such as "Is God like a Totem Pole or a Circle? Why We Need to Insist on Nicaean Orthodoxy to Avoid Falling into Heresy," vol. 27, no. 4 (Autumn 2013), see pp. 19-22.

8 See https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/TiAmeline_of_women's_ordination_in_the_United_States. See also Aída Besançon Spencer, "Evangelicals and Gender," in *Evangelicals Around the World: A Global Handbook for the 21st Century*, eds. Brian C. Stiller, et. al (Nashville, TN, 2015), 117.

9 Ruth A. Tucker and Walter L. Liefeld, *Daughters of the Church: Women and Ministry from New Testament Times to the Present* (Grand Rapids, MI, Zondervan, 1987), 279-81.

10 See Tim Lee, "Louisa Woosley: Trailblazer in the Cumberland Presbyterian Church," *Priscilla Papers,* vol. 28, no. 2 (Spring 2014): 16. See also Mary Lin Hudson, "Shall Woman Preach? Louisa Woosley and the Cumberland Presbyterian Church," Cumberland Presbytverian Church website, http://www.cumberland.org/hfpcp/minister/woosleyL.htm. Tim Lee also notes, "During the late 1800s, women in CP churches were serving as teachers and officers in the Sunday schools and contributed greatly to missions efforts and to church schools and colleges. In 1877, the appointment of women serving as trustees and deacons in churches was approved by the Pennsylvania Presbytery." Although the Presbyterian Church (USA) did not get around to ordaining "its first female minister, Margaret Towner," until 1956, https://wwwq=W.google.com/search?client=firefox-b-1-d&, (although its first female elder had been ordained in 1930, see https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Timeline_of_women%27s_ordination_in_the_United_States), and the southern Presbyterian Church in the United States ordained its first woman minister, Rachel Henderlite, in 1965, the United Presbyterian Church posted an article from a newspaper, *San Francisco Call*, vol. 99, no.23 (Dec. 23, 1905), reporting, "A special Sunday evangelistic meetIng (sic) will be held on the evening o*(sic) December 24 at the First United Presbyterian Church, Golden Gate avenue and Polk street. Mrs. Edith Livingston Peake will preach. Mrs. Peake/ was formerly an actress," CENTER FOR BIBLIOGRAPHICAL STUDIES AND RESEARCH CALIFORNIA DIGITAL NEWSPAPER COLLECTION, https://cdnc.ucr.edu/?a=d&d=SFC19051223.2.48.11&e=-------en--20--1--txt-txIN--------1. This indicates that women were being invited into Presbyterian pulpits to preach before the formalization of Reformed ordination. For Arminian denominations, the spread was also large between dissenting groups and mainline denominations. For example, the Wesleyan Methodists ordained their first woman in 1861 and the mainline Methodist Protestant Church, which would join with others to become today's United Methodist Church, in 1880 (after ordaining its first female deacon in 1866), https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Timeline_of_women%27s_ordination_in_the_United_States. In the worldwide Anglican Communion, in the United States' Episcopal Church, the first women were ordained in 1974, "regularized" in 1976, and the first "regular ordination" was 1977. In New Zealand, the first woman priest was also ordained in 1977, but, in Australia, not until 1992, see https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ordination_of_women_in_the_Anglican_Communion.

those who created A Covenant Order of Evangelical Presbyterians (ECO), the denomination that split off from the mainline Presbyterian Church (USA) in 2012, ordaining women, endorsing the Nicene Creed, and affirming equality in the Trinity.[11]

So, what are we to make of this impression? That in contrast to Arminian-oriented theologians, "most" "Reformed theologians" were stratifying the Trinity and denying ordination to women as they crowded together in the complementarian camp? And, further what is the point of his distinction? Are "Reformed theologians" not "evangelicals"?

I also wondered about his statement: "Before Dr. Knight wrote, the modern word 'role' had never been used to speak of the essential difference between men and women" (8). Is this statement accurate? Perhaps the problem with all the omissions above is related to the disadvantages of writing about the genesis of trends in cultures and locales other than one's own, where one is not able to be present other than on visits. Understandably, one would miss the environment in which the trend generated. Kevin Giles, as perceptive as he is, is based in Australia, on the other side of the world from the United States, and he would understandably miss a lot of the materials and the discussions constantly going on, as appears to be the case with this claim about George Knight originating the use of the term "role" for gender differences. By 1977, the teachings of Bill Gothard, which codified and disseminated earlier hierarchical thinking, had already become endemic in conservative churches, since he began spreading his teaching publicly by the early 1960s. Fundamentalist churches like the one in which I was born and reared[12] were already like fish tanks of hierarchical attitudes on men and women in which their membership routinely swam, unchallenging, automatically assimilating it all in. Bill Gothard's *Institute in Basic Youth Conflicts* manual, in 1975 (first published in 1968) uses role language for distinctions between men and women on page 2: "In today's society the father has not assumed his role of spiritual leadership; thus, his discipline is without Scriptural foundation. The mother has tried to fill the gap, and the children are in a struggle for independence to conform to the fast-changing standards of their society."[13] His section on family, entitled "Authority and Responsibility," includes the top-down, totem-pole structure of Father on top, an arrow down to Mother in second place, and the final arrow to children. This is the first of four top-down lists, the other three paralleling Government, Church, Business with the primal family structure.[14] Perhaps Prof. Knight simply worked out the details and alerted the academic world, as is the task of a scholar.

But, finally, numerous misprints in this book suggest another idea of what to make of these omissions and missteps.[15] All of these peculiar errors I list in the footnote below suggest to me

11 In addition to the various official ECO websites, one can find an interesting comparison of the beliefs of the PC(USA), ECO, and the Evangelical Presbyterian Church (EPC) at https://www.pcusa.org/site_media/media/uploads/theologyandworship/epcecopcusa_comparisonchart_1_1_2015.pdf.

12 Interesting to note is that in that independent Baptist Church, with a General Association of Regular Baptist Churches (GARBC) affiliation, the senior pastor was a staunch Arminian and the youth pastor a cautious but thorough Calvinist.

13 Bill Gothard, "Introduction," under "6 areas of conflict," point 4, "Harmony at Home," in his *Institute in Basic Youth Conflicts* (no city listed: Basic Youth Conflicts, 1968, rev. 1969,1975), 2. Male spiritual leadership becomes the basis for "developing spiritual oneness" in the "Dating and Engagement" section: "He is responsible for the spiritual leadership in dating" (17). In fact, "The man must be the spiritual leader" (18, col. 1), while "She is responsible for being a spiritual example and challenge to him" (17).

14 Ibid., "Authority and Responsibility," 6. This section also includes the notorious hammer, chisel, jewel diagram, but by the 1975 revision of the manual, the identifying names of Father for the hammer, Mother for the chisel, Children for the jewel had been removed and the descriptive language more emphasizing parents collectively (8). The theme that runs through the book is submitting to authority as the solution for most relational dilemmas.

15 Here are a few I noticed without any special effort to check them: p. 2, line 11 is missing the 3rd word of the sentence, "be"; p. 20, 12th line from bottom, 5th word from end is missing, "s"; p. 65, line one, the last 2 words are run together; p. 77, line 6, between 2nd and 3rd words from the line's end "of" is missing; same page, line 16, between words 6 and 7 "to" is missing; p. 79, line 4, full words 3 and 4 are run together; p. 84, 7th line from the bottom, 2nd word "in" is missing; p. 96, line 1, 4th word from the end is an extra "is"; p. 114, , line 7, "to" is missing after full word 2. The constant use of the racist term "denigrating" (which means "blackening") is offensive and should have been caught in editing and

great haste in producing this book. And that haste, along with all the militant language with which he colors his expressions (e.g., "how civil war over the doctrine of the Trinity broke out in the complementarian world on 3rd June 2016 and how the forces under Generals Grudem and Ware were defeated," [3]; "Grudem and Ware in particular and all the complementarians who follow them need to raise a white flag and surrender. Their teaching on the Trinity has been judged by their peers as a blatant denial of the creeds and confessions; a rejection of what the church has agreed is the teaching of Scripture on the one God who is the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, three 'co-equal' divine persons" [38-39], etc.; "everyone present realized that Dr. Grudem and Dr. Ware had met their Waterloo," [47]). All of this suggested this insight: What we are reading here is Brother Kevin's battle diary, an insider's *personal* history of the recent debate, in short: his view in the midst of war. He can just peer over the edge of his trench into the battle's overwhelming thickness, in which he was so engaged that he was not able to notice all the other soldiers fighting on his side in their own trenches along the same front.

So, in this sense, what I call his Book #1 echoes Elijah's plight, as the prophet complains to the Lord, "I am the only one left, and now they are trying to kill me too" (1 Kings 19:10). The Lord opens Elijah's eyes, however, with this reply: "Yet I reserve seven thousand in Israel – all whose knees have not bowed down to Baal and all whose mouths have not kissed him" (19:18).[16] Brother Kevin, however, did not perceive the Lord's similar assurance. So what we are reading herein, though limited, is still very valuable as Kevin Giles's personal report under fire from the far southern front.

In what I would call Book #2, he adds on an additional perception to his view as soldier, and that is as informed war correspondent, giving an insightful and perceptive account of the battle. Since, as we noted, Brother Kevin is a long-time insider, this report is eye-opening for anyone who has not been following the details and it is not to be missed. But, even while generously giving credit to the complementarians who precipitated the "civil war," Brother Kevin is still the featured combatant.

At this point, it might be worth making a personal observation about our Brother Wayne Grudem, who appears as an opposing "general" in this account, and about author Kevin Giles, so that readers who have met neither can put this all into perspective. In my observation, Brother Wayne appears to love to debate, as does Brother Kevin. These two warriors in debate appear to me to be prolific, pugnacious, and persuasive. If they are not both fearless, they have me fooled. In action, they both appear shored up by a bulwark of confidence that they are right on every point they defend. And, given Kevin Giles's high view of the creeds, Wayne Grudem delivering such papers as "He Did Not Descend Into Hell: A Suggestion for Following Scripture Instead of the Apostles' Creed," which he presented at the 39th Annual Meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society (held on Dec 3-5, 1987), would doubtlessly fuel their fire. Wayne Grudem, of course, has been tireless in debating many evangelical egalitarians.

For example, Aída Besançon Spencer, who had already in 1974 published her seminal article "Eve at Ephesus" in the *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* (JETS), the seed from which grew her classic work *Beyond the Curse: Women Called to Ministry* (published in 1985, the

---

replaced with a neutral term like "deprecating." On a personal editing note, I noticed my first name is missing on page 56 in his reference to my contributing to a volume under one of the other imprints of his present publisher, a work, I might add, in which he himself participated, Dennis W. Jowers and H. Wayne House's *The New Evangelical Subordinationism? Perspectives on the Equality of God the Father and God the Son* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2012). (He also consistently leaves their question mark out of his rendering of their title, see pp. 56, 120). He dismisses their book, claiming, "This led nowhere and was largely ignored" (56). I, however, certainly found this book to be popular among my students and helpful in introducing them to the issues under debate on the nature of the relationships in the Trinity. I chose this book to be one of several places I introduced "An Evangelical Statement on the Trinity" to which Kevin Giles himself made many helpful suggestions.

16 *NIV Archaeological Study Bible* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2005), 517, 519.

same year that introduced another important work, Gilbert Bilezikian's *Beyond Sex Roles*), had her first debate with Wayne Grudem at the Evangelical Theological Society meeting in Atlanta in 1986. Brother Wayne had just begun promoting his subordinationist views of men and women in scholarly circles and at that meeting made a public announcement inviting any interested members to help him form what was to become his Council on Biblical Manhood and Womenhood (its book, *Recovering Biblical Manhood & Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism*, would appear in 1991). They then debated a second time, following which he even begged her for a third, but, since she had also debated Professor Clair Davis (a man) and Susan Foh on the calling of women to ministry at a joint event of the ETS and Westminster Seminary back in 1974, then did another well publicized debate with Douglas Moo, and participated for decades in many other public discussions, delivering many papers, presentations, talks, classes, articles, blogs, books all on the topic of why women should use their God-given gifts for ministry, she finally decided, after thirty-plus years of it, that to go on debating endlessly was pointless. Neither of these brothers appear to me to share this conviction. Readers should keep all this in mind.

Book #3 is Kevin Giles's discourse on how to do theology, which is succinctly illustrated in a prior quotation I have included. I summarize it this way: Read the Bible through the creeds to avoid heresy. Since Brother Kevin has admitted that the creeds are not canonical, as already cited, but are an essential guide to access the wisdom of the church, his is a position with which I certainly agree, although I would change the order of approach: read the Bible first and then check the creeds. Where we differ and where some other readers may also differ is at the place where Kevin Giles indicates he and Millard Erickson also differ: in our failure to see the indispensable value of the theory of the eternal generation of the Son. I have published my views on what I perceive to be the inadequacy of this speculation in my article "The Need for Caution in the Use of Eternal Birth Language for Jesus Christ in the Early Church and Today" (*Africanus Journal*, vol. 10, no. 1 [April 2018]), so I do not need to go into great detail here. But I would add a few observations about Brother Kevin's position that error comes when one accepts a plain reading of Scripture and does not conform it to the wisdom collected in the orthodox creeds.

First, I recognize a qualification he assumes. He is only talking about orthodox creeds and he is explicit on this point (see his disapproval of Michael Ovey's "choosing rather to endorse the teaching of *Arian* creeds" (28). This objection may sound obvious to some, but not to those of us in mainline denominations which began adding questionable creeds to our books of confessions decades ago.

Second, I would add that not all orthodox creeds include all the data that is in others. That may be because they are addressing a certain problem and want to concentrate on that, or they are hesitant to include items on which some of their supporters are hesitant,[17] rather than because they are committing a careless mistake of omission on the part of their councils. For example, the Apostles' Creed (c. A.D. 340) of Marcellus of Ancyra and the Creed of Aquileia (which seems to

17 Interesting to note is that, despite the passion with which these early theologians contended for orthodoxy, they could show surprising gentleness and understanding with some who still hesitated to agree with them. For example, his opponents accused Athanasius of all sorts of intrigue and repression and violence done by his supporters, even of sorcery using the severed hand of someone he supposedly murdered, although the "corpse" later showed up alive with both hands intact (see R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy, 318-381* [Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2005], 256-57, see especially chapter 9: "The Behavior of Athanasius"). And yet Athanasius, the great champion of Nicaean orthodoxy, is able to make allowances for those who may hesitate on accepting his key term of "one in substance" for the Father and the Son, if they seem to be embracing the orthodox idea of the equality of the Father and the Son, when he writes, "They are not far from accepting even the phrase 'One in substance;' of whom is Basil of Ancyra, in what he has written concerning the faith," "Epistle of S. Athanasius, Archbishop of Alexandria Concerning the Councils Held at Ariminum in Italy and at Seleucia in Isauria," in *Select Treatises of S. Athanasius, Archbishop of Alexandria, in controversy with the Arians*, trans. Members of the English Church in A Library of Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church, Anterior to the Division of the East and West (Oxford: Parker, Rivington, 1842) (hereafter *De Synodis*, i.e., "of the councils"), vol 8, chap. 3, 11.41, p. 139.

be a variation of it) appear to share the conviction of the original creed of the council of Nicaea (AD 325), which omitted the eternal generation of the Son doctrine, even though it was presented to Nicaea's Council for inclusion by Eusebius, the eminent Semi-Arian historian of Caesarea. This distinguished ecclesiastical statesman's arrival, armed with his church's already formulated statement of faith, the Creed of Caesarea, put pressure on Nicaea's council to accept Caesarea's creed as a template. So Nicaea's council chose some parts of this creed to include (its opening words describing God the Father) and not others (e.g., its description of the Son as "firstborn of all creation"), including omitting the eternal generation of the Son, which was in Caesarea's creed. The theory of the eternal generation had been around for nearly two centuries and not only did predecessors like Origen embrace it, but Athanasius references it in his writings. Yet, it took over fifty years and politicking for this doctrine to be officially accepted at Constantinople in AD 381 and then included in the repackaging of the Jerusalem-Constantinopolitan creed, later renamed the Nicene Creed, and, in AD 451, presented to the Council of Chalcedon to supplement (or supplant) the actual Creed of Nicaea.[18] In other words, leaving the eternal generation of the Son doctrine out of the Nicaean, Apostles', Aquileian creeds appears to me to be intentional on the part of the composers (perhaps because it was as controversial then as it remains today). Brother Kevin and many "higher church" theologians assume this theory's intrinsic value and complete veracity. Others, like myself, and those I might call "lower church" theologians, question it. Perhaps our reluctance is simply an application of Ockham's Razor: If we accept the One Triune Godhead as one God with one will, yet with three distinct Faces, or Persons, coequal and co-eternal, then we do not see the need for adding Justin Martyr's platonically-tinged speculation of how that "oneness" occurred.

Further, despite Kevin Giles's admirable and dexterous attempt to find Bible support for this doctrine from Proverbs 8:22-26, that passage seems inapplicable to me for proof since wisdom is created and birthed in time at the beginning of creation as God's first work. In addition, wisdom is presented as feminine throughout Proverbs, Lady Wisdom in chapters 1-9 being contrasted with "the Woman Folly" (9:13-18). Both of these female personifications are competing for the young: Folly, as an adulterous prostitute, grouped together with the criminals who entice the foolish to crime, violence, immorality, and death (see 2:12-19; 7:10-27); while Wisdom seeks to guide wise youth toward knowledge and discretion (8:12); justice (8:15), and prosperity (8:18). When Jesus speaks of wisdom in Matthew 11:19/Luke 7:35, he does not identify himself as "Wisdom," but confirms the feminine imagery, as the image of a quality he himself possesses, even referring to "her works" (*ergōn autēs*, Matt. 11:19) and "her children" (*teknōn autēs*, Luke 7:35). He has himself experienced "growing" (*prokoptō*) in wisdom and stature (Luke 2:52), underscoring it is a quality.

Even further, we know that God has no gender, as Deuteronomy 4:15-16 warns us, so positing God the Father gives birth to the Son in heaven and not just on earth makes the metaphor too literal. For one thing, it means the Father births the Son with no maternal counterpart included. In the incarnation, a human maternal counterpart, Mary, is involved, as the "Son" is sent from the "Father," through the conduit of the Holy Spirit, into her womb to be born both divine and human. Such a claim that the heavenly Father without a mother would give birth to a child sounds less like biblical orthodoxy and more like a current research project of the University of Cambridge and the Weizmann Institute, exploring the possibility of using "skin stem cells from two adults of the

18 A concise description of the history of these creeds can be found in Henry Bettenson and Chris Maunders, eds, *Documents of the Christian Church*, 4th ed. (New York, NY: Oxford, 2011), under the titles, "The Old Roman Creed," for the Apostles' and Aquileian creeds, 25-26, "The Creed of Caesarea" and "The Creed of Nicaea," 26, and "The 'Nicene Creed," with this explanation, "Found in Epiphanius, *Ancoratus,* 118, c. AD 374, and extracted by scholars, almost word for word, from the Catechetical Lectures of S. Cyril of Jerusalem; read and approved at Chalcedon, 451, as the creed of '(the 318 fathers who met at Nicaea and that of) the 150 who met at a later time'(i.e. Constantinople, 381). Hence often called the Constantinopolitan or Nicaeno-Constantinopolitan creed, and thought by many to be a revision of the creed of Jerusalem held by Cyril," 27.

same gender to make human egg and sperm cells."[19] Neither this activity of eliminating a mother on earth, nor adding a divine mother in heaven as syncretism in ancient Israel attempted to do with Asherah, an activity which is condemned in Jeremiah 7:16-19, sounds like something the divine "Father," who created humanity as male and female and put pro-creation in their care (Gen. 1:27-28), would model for humanity.

Besides the gender confusion of the language employed, other problems arise. For example, is the Son indistinguishable in the Father before being "brought forth" in "self-differentiation"[20] to do the work of creation? Kevin Giles tells us "no" (87). But clearly the Son and the Holy Spirit, whom a parallel doctrine claims is eternally proceeding from the Father, are dependent on the Father for existence and for "divine substance," if they are being birthed and emitted respectively from the Father. Such a theory seems to be innately hierarchical to me, that the Father is God and the Son and Spirit are derived God. The preferred terms by proponents are "begotten God" and "processing or spirating God," but these also sound hierarchical to me. This is how Semi-Arians responded to this doctrine during the ancient debates, when the orthodox attempted to use it to prove that Jesus was God. The Semi-Arians then concluded that the Father is true God and the other Persons secondary Gods (as the noted church historian Eusebius did in a letter to Bishop Euphration, quoted at the 7th General Council, "The Son Himself is God, but not Very God" (Act 6).[21] Such an historical reaction suggests a less encouraging reason why our contemporary former hierarchists in the Trinity may have no problem accepting a Son and Spirit in a one-way dependency on the Father for their godhood.

In addition, Hebrews 1:5, in interpreting the prophetic dimension of Psalm 2:7 with 2 Samuel 7:12-16, wherein the Lord promises to be a "father" to an earthly king, uses future tense language (*esomai* and *estai*, "will be") to refer to the future begetting in Jesus's incarnation, not to an everlasting birthing.

Now why do I raise these questions? Because I find the absolutist language in Brother Kevin's book troubling. I am content to accept those who do believe a doctrine like this, since it is not heretical, as they explain it, and theologians I deeply respect like Athanasius, Calvin, and Kevin Giles himself accept it, but, honestly, in some of the warnings Brother Kevin includes, I am not certain he extends the same privilege to us who do not. Reject any part of any orthodox creed and one is heterodox and outside the orthodox camp is what I read (see p. 57).

To my mind that makes the creeds *ipso facto* canonical. One may argue that the creeds are authoritative but not canonical, but if questioning any part of any of them rules someone else out of the orthodox camp, if this were in the Middle Ages and that excommunicated individual ended up at the pyre, as the smoke billowed around her or him, the fine distinction between "authoritative" and "canonical" would simply appear to be semantics.

Also, readers from a more conservative, inerrancy-of-the-biblical-autographs-alone-oriented background might be put off, or even find ourselves cringing, at the use of the term "development" for the Trinity doctrine as an expression smacking of theological liberalism: it sounds like the doctrines are being invented. Those of us who are conservative theologians in liberal mainline churches hear a claim like "doctrines develop and take shape in history, and that there can be objective advances of what is said explicitly in Scripture in the 'doing' of theology" (68) as nonsense. There are no "objective" advances, every idea is subjective. Only the revelation of God can be objective. The un-self-examined are those I have noticed who claim objectivity. The liberal establishment with which I have struggled in my denomination often claims objectivity,

19 See Hayley Richardson, "Biological Babies for Same-Sex Parents a Possibility After Stem Cell Breakthrough," https://www.newsweek.com/biological-babies-same-sex-parents-possibility-after-stem-cell-breakthrough-309453.

20 Kevin Giles gives a fuller explanation on page 72 of *The Eternal Generation of the Son* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2012).

21 Athanasius, *De* Synodis, vol. 8. 2.4.17, note p. , 99.

but it is plagued by reinterpretation, relativizing, and doubt. Doctrines evaporate like morning mist, replaced with new "advances" that end eventually with Jesus posited as a simple carpenter preaching love. At the same time, theological liberals rightly point to conservatives as oppressed by power preachers, potentates driven by the lust for power and wealth, and plagued by the sexual sins at which they rail, so that only the Scripture can be regarded as the objective rock that breaks these rods of power. For many liberals in denominations like my own, such sins are often simply accommodated as "modern" behavior, if they are consensual. And faith is socially defined. If creeds are employed in worship services, they have sometimes fallen into the "creeping creedalism" I have heard conservative opponents deplore, simply rote repetition of creeds and set readings that sap the Bible of its authority and become stultifying.

Each side then comes to rely for authority and authoritative interpretations either on mega-church pastors, television preachers, and the titular heads of evangelical organizations, or, conversely, on a committee, or on a pope, or an archbishop, or on other ecclesiastical authorities, any of whom can stray from biblical truth and take a denomination with them. In these contexts, the vibrant creeds can be reduced to, or perceived as, esoteric mumbled jargon, leaving laity longing for another Reformation so that the rise of a "plain reading of Scripture" movement that confirms patriarchy is so seductive. Despite the fact that they may leave 60 percent of their churches virtually barefoot and pregnant and doing much of the heavy lifting in the shadows, conservative churches flail around searching for moral male individuals with God's correct plumbing on which to hang the credit. Such a configuration can look straight if one holds one's brain at the right angle. This is what Brother Kevin clearly wants to avoid. Yet, insisting on the acceptance of a doctrinal development that demands the faithful read the Bible through some ancient lens or be deemed ignorant or even ruled out as unorthodox seems less than compelling, especially when one sees laity muttering the text of that lens in a church that has currently begun celebrating behavior which the Bible has declared unacceptable. To troubled parishioners, it may all sound corrupt.

So a renovation of language is needed. The creeds are neither canonical nor magical, so over-selling them is hardly the answer. They are mostly indispensably wise, like a doctor's advice, but they are not infallible and the extra-step in presenting them as such and ruling out of the orthodox faith anyone who questions one of their inferences is counterproductive. There are tenets on which all orthodox creeds agree that are clearly scripturally- based and scripturally-illuminating and these should be the test of orthodoxy. But, as for an inference built on shaky (if any) biblical foundations, like the eternal generation of the Son doctrine, it is just that, an inference. It works for some, but not for others, so making it dogma whose acceptance is a badge of belonging when it was not included in the original Creed of Nicaea appears to be the same as making an open canon. In other words, I hear this argument appearing to say: "This is the Bible and this is the other stuff not in it that provides the authoritative interpretation that you have to regard as part of it if you are going to continue to belong." Authoritative interpretations without changing the *Book of Order* is what sent most of the evangelicals out of the denomination to which I belong. We do not need to have another door shut on us with another inference that is presented as "authoritative."

Therefore, I would prefer a more modest phrase to describe the creeds as "clarification of the revelation already inherent in the text." If an argument can be made by enough responsible thinkers (and who decides how many that is?) that it is not inherent, then we should agree to disagree, as we do on baptism. At its best, the doctrine of the eternal generation of the Son is a proof that God is one, of shared substance, and triune. If one does not need that particular proof, or finds it inadequate as a proof, such convictions should be respected.[22] Doubting a subsidiary inference is not heretical, even if it is claimed that orthodoxy depends on it by those who embrace it. Ruling

22 After all, this doctrine is not in itself an actual statement of faith on the level of "God Is Triune." It is an attempt to explain how God is triune. Therefore, it does not strike me as a precept that should be dogma, as much as one explanation of a dogmatic precept.

out of orthodoxy all those who disagree with an argument of logic that is not clearly biblical seems more to me a demonstration that the point is weak. If it were not, it would not need the bludgeon of excommunication to compel dissenters to accept it.

At any rate, all of this demonstrates how Kevin Giles's book can stir up controversy. In present day theology that is a very good thing. Would I recommend this book to professors, seminarians, Sunday School teachers, and informed lay readers? Absolutely. I am intending to require it in my upcoming Theology Survey 1 class. Yes, it is controversial. Yes, it will upset some of my hierarchical students, and lower church students, and any who are convinced "the most important thing is not whether we believe Jesus is God or the Trinity exists but that we all just learn to get along together" (as one cross-registered student from another seminary objected to my first day [and by his choice his last day] of my class reviewing challenges to orthodoxy). But this book is an antidote to theological ennui. We have slacked off in our thinking and proclaiming long enough. This may be the moment to supplement all those self-help and devotional books hawked to the Christian public with hard thinking that is clearly presented and will awaken in the captives of the cell phone an appreciation that God's nature matters and getting right doctrine and appropriate action counts. They may get disturbed by this book, but no one will stay asleep reading it. It is a worthy wake up call to each of us to check up on what exactly we believe and how we apply each belief. Theology has always been a matter of eternal life and death and all of us need to take it as seriously as Kevin Giles does.

William David Spencer is Distinguished Adjunct Professor of Theology and the Arts for Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary's Boston Campus/Center for Urban Ministerial Education. He is the author or editor of 16 books, is listed in *Contemporary Authors (New Revision Series)* and *Who's Who in America*, and has won over twenty writing and editing awards. Two of his books, *Chanting Down Babylon: The Rastafari Reader* and *Mysterium and Mystery* (which was nominated for an Edgar Award by the Mystery Writers of America) are universally considered definitive in their fields and his first novel, *Name in the Papers*, won a Golden Halo Award for Outstanding Contribution to Literature from the Southern California Motion Picture Council. His two newest books are *Empowering English Language Learners: Successful Strategies of Christian Educators* (edited with Jeanne DeFazio) and an adventure novel *Cave of Little Faces* (authored with Aída Besançon Spencer), both from Wipf and Stock's House of Prisca and Aquila series.

Review of *Berkeley Street Theatre: How Improvisation and Street Theatre Emerged as a Christian Outreach to the Culture of the Time*, House of Prisca and Aquila Series, edited by Jeanne C. DeFazio (Eugene, Oregon: Wipf & Stock, 2017)

Christopher Hodgkins

Plays, it is said, are things that reflect lives and catch consciences. Actors beginning a tale will attract our eyes and ears almost magnetically, and, if the tale is strong and the portrayal true, live performance can hold our attention more deeply than any other kind of entertainment, so deeply that we feel like genuine participants in the story. But what happens when the theater is the street, and when the street is in the tumultuous Berkeley of the early 1970s, and when the tale is "the greatest story ever told"? How to win a hearing in that wild and often hostile marketplace of ideas and ideologues? How to convert passers-by into an audience long enough to catch the conscience and even touch the heart? And how might theatrical lessons learned decades ago on Telegraph Avenue and Sproul Plaza translate into contemporary communities and street scenes?

These questions are central to the lived experience of the contributors to Jeanne DeFazio's *Berkeley Street Theatre*. All of them, the editor included, have either performed actively in improvisational Christian theater troupes of past and present, or have long and keenly observed the old Youth Counterculture of what me might call "the long 1960s" in both its secular and evangelical manifestations. Thus the book is organized into two main chronological parts, with five chapters each, framed by the editor's introduction and substantial Foreword and Afterword sections by her long-time collaborators David W. Gill and William David Spencer.

Part 1, *Christian Guerilla Theatre Then*, presents five brief memoirs of this Jesus-centered outdoor dramatic movement that began on the sunny University of California campus in 1970—and radiated into the city of Berkeley, the East Bay, San Francisco, southern California, and eventually across the country. Chapter 1, by Jeanne DeFazio herself, reflects on "Berkeley Street Theatre: The Jesus Revolution and the California Dream Merge in a Dramatic Outpouring of the Holy Spirit"; Chapter 2, "Choose or Lose" by Gene Burkett, recalls a particular street play of that name (a piece of modernized "Everyman" drama) and the troupe's varied experiences in performing it; Chapter 3, "Registration" by Charlie Lehman, remembers a well-received performance piece satirizing bureaucratic indifference in contrast to the love of Christ's kingdom; Chapter 4, "The Great Divorce" by Susan Dockery Andrews, describes the troupe's adaptations and presentations of C. S. Lewis's famed dream-vision fantasy about a bus excursion from the outskirts of Hell to the edges of Heaven; and Chapter 5, "Surprised by Christ" by Father James (aka Arnold) Bernstein, narrates the author's spiritual journey from the Conservative Judaism of his Queens youth to his embrace of Jesus in early adulthood, and the role that Berkeley Street Theatre played in his Christian development towards his calling today as a priest in the Orthodox Church in America.

The retrospective quality of Part 1 addresses what above I've called the "old Youth Counterculture," and certainly the word "old" applied to America's most famed "youth" movement is full of ironies both sad and happy. On the "sadly ironic" side, it's now 2018, and "time and chance have happened to them all"—all the veterans of "The Revolution," whether believers or skeptics. Revolutions inevitably lose their spontaneity, authenticity, and freshness, having been victimized by failure but also by success—as "the 60s" have been institutionalized in powerful political platforms and laws and government agencies, and merchandized like a fashion line or a soft drink brand. Just as "The Greatest Generation" began taking its final bows in the 1990s, so their often unruly children are now rising to the top of the mortality tables and reminiscing, in their seventies, about a time when they were told to trust no one over thirty.

While the "Jesus Movement" frequently softened this intergenerational hostility and tempered its youthful zeal with biblical knowledge, there's an inevitable valedictory quality to many of these accounts which will stir nostalgia in readers of a certain age (the present reviewer among them) as well as many wry smiles as we remember how people used to speak with "the fierce urgency of now": Said a 1969 "streetwise" introduction to the Gospel of John, "Like, your life's been one big ego trip with rotten rip-off things. Get it into your head that God thru Jesus loves you no matter how wasted you are. This is no plastic rap" (113). Ideas and emotions were "HEAVY"; everyone denounced "the system"; a Christian rock opera by schmaltz maven Ralph Carmichael was titled *NATURAL HIGH*; Berkeley's underground Christian newspaper was originally named *Right On*; and most of this book's contributors once happily identified as "Jesus Freaks" belonging to "The Christian World Liberation Front." As David Gill candidly admits at the end of his Foreword, "by 1975 times had changed and the CWLF changed as well, dropping the 'Liberation Front' name that now felt like a pretentious cliché" (xviii). But if these "veterans" are winningly aware of the transitory nature of cultural trends which move quickly from emergent and urgent through truism to trite, they and their fellow contributors also share a heart-deep conviction that the theatrical outreaches of times past have much to teach us about communicating the gospel in the present.

Thus Part 2 is entitled, undaunted by the passing decades, *Christian Guerilla Theatre Now*. Chapter 6 by J. M. D. Myers, "Still Small Theatre Troupe and the Place of Grassroots Christian Theater Today," modestly describes the more than modest success of the Still Small ministry in and around Beverley, Massachusetts, which connects the spontaneous, improvisational quality of street theater into productive partnerships with many churches, schools, food pantries, prisons, women's and community centers who provide a variety of flexible venues. Chapter 7, "The Passion Play" by Joanne Petronella, describes in a brief vignette her revival of this ancient form of Christian public theater quite literally on the same streets of Jerusalem where Jesus carried his cross and bled; Chapter 8, "Hollywood Outreach" by Jozy Pollock, provides a few notes on her ministry in California's notoriously ungenuine entertainment capital, from its penthouses and premieres to its church aisles and its often mean streets and jails; Chapter 9, "Estuary Ministries" by Olga Soler, describes her journey to Christ through a well-meaning but anti-artistic fundamentalism to a fuller understanding of the powerful role that drama can play in a truly "prophetic" church; and Chapter 10, "Pensacola Outreach" by Sheri Pedigo, tells of her grass-roots—or perhaps we might say beach-roots—dramatic and musical ministry to the amused-to-death beach and street crowds of her adopted Florida town.

As one might expect from a collection of improvisors, these ten chapters vary in style and polish, from fairly casual reflective notes to closely-reasoned, well-sourced essays. Perhaps the most bracing, and finally rewarding, is William David Spencer's Afterword, a thirty-page survey of the Christian Counter-Culture or "Jesus Movement" based on his extensive collection of the movement's literature from 1969 to 1976. Although his essay goes somewhat far afield from its opening mentions of Berkeley Street Theatre, it ultimately serves to locate "guerilla theater" in the context of evangelical Christians' sometimes belated improvised responses to the systemic and seismic challenges of the 1960s secular counter-culture. Although, as noted, some of these time-bound responses will sound like trite counter-cultural imitations to our post-modern ears, at their best these Christian disciples treated the crisis of Christian America as an opportunity to rediscover the eternal, the enduring spiritual roots of righteousness—that which is genuinely "radical" and tapped into Christ's incarnation and sacrifice and resurrection. And, as Spencer observes, the impulse to perform, to dramatize, to enact a story—and for an audience to discover itself in this action—is so deeply rooted in the Divine Image, and so fundamental to Christ's teaching technique, that "guerilla theater" is likely to serve as a great bridge for the gospel in our sadly divided days. "Did the master story-teller, who was God-Among-Us in human incarnation, rivet his audiences any less than did . . . the Berkeley Street Theatre with their innovative plays depicting his message? Not likely!" (98).

To end on a personal note: though a long-time North Carolina resident and professor of Renaissance Literature and Shakespearean Drama, I am a native Californian with my own memories of a ministry internship in Berkeley in 1980-81, where I encountered many of the people, publications, and institutions described in this book—although a few years on. Indeed, the editor is my first cousin, the daughter of my mother's beloved brother, and the account of her time in Berkeley, slightly overlapping my own, encapsuled for me not only a moment in my own family's intergenerational history, but also a moment in American history when the Greatest Generation came to terms with spiritual and social forces "beyond their command." It's my prayer that a rising generation of disciples—playwrights and players among them—will follow Christ's great command by going out into the highways and byways to catch consciences anew and to invite the great, lost, white-for-harvest crowds into the feast.

Christopher Hodgkins is Professor of Renaissance Literature and Atlantic World Studies at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, Director, Atlantic World Research Network, The Folger Institute Consortium Executive Committee, Washington, D.C., Board Member-at-Large, The English-Speaking Union of the United States, New York, NY, George Herbert Society; Co-Editor, *George Herbert: The Digital Temple* and *George Herbert: The Complete Prose, with Latin and Greek Verse*.

Review of *The Revelations Trilogy (First Book–Nature, Second Book–Biblios, Third Book–the Christ)* by Olga Soler (Bolton MA: Create Space/ Leap Over the Edge Publishing, 2017)

Jeanne DeFazio

The Revelations Trilogy was written to bring into contemporary light the theme illuminated in the *Space Trilogy*[1] by CS Lewis. It is science fiction that uses the vehicle of time travel as Lewis used the vehicle of space travel to reveal the unseen world and the conflict between light and darkness Paul identified in 2 Corinthians 4-6: "For God, who said, 'Let light shine out of darkness,' made his light shine in our hearts to give us the light of the knowledge of God's glory displayed in the face of Christ" (KJV). It was further written as a tribute to the First Cause of all things, whom nature and the Bible unveil as God and whom Christ personified uniquely and entirely, as recognized by Paul in Romans 11:36: "For everything comes from him and exists by his power and is intended for his glory. All glory to him forever! Amen" (NLT). The story unfolds in nine inter-dimensional adventures in which the protagonist travels back in time through her own DNA to observe a common theme through the eyes of her ancestors. *Trilogy* begins by defining Sarah's time travel as *Midstream DNA*:

> *Sarah was moving away from Cal and tree and all that was familiar around her. The stranger's voice echoed far in the distance but Sarah could not be hearing correctly what was being said:*
>
> *"Don't go yet…time is now." "Midstream, DNA, DNA…"*
>
> *In her hand she held the thing that the stranger had been carrying, some sort of device. She said she was a time traveler. Could she have been telling the incredible truth? Sarah was moving and not just in space but in form. She was as it were transforming and moments seemed to be lengthening and shortening all at once.*
>
> *Was this thing she held in her hand doing this to her; drawing her into its own reality against her will. Did she have a choice about this? All at once she shunned and desired what was happening to her. Ambivalence indicated partial consent and this experience would not be as invasive with that consent. She determined in a moment to embrace what was happening; but how? This child that had intruded upon her was a third of her age but wise in the use of the device. What was it she had said?*
>
> *"Midstream, DNA."*
>
> --Excerpt from *First Book – Nature* (p. 14).

Sarah is not initially a believer in Christ but the journey's revelations produce such evidence that in the end she is persuaded. She has dimensional access to Ancient Cathay, Puerto Rico during the Inquisition, Ireland and the high seas, Medieval Spain, Colonial New England, Qumran, Dietrich Bonhoeffer's Germany and the streets of New York in the 60s through the 90s. The final adventure reveals her prophetic mission and takes place in the dystopian future with uber human minions of evil.

> *"You have no doubt noticed Bella who is one of our prototypes. Who could help but notice her? She is genetically engineered for beauty, health, sexual appeal and objectivity.*

1 Clive Staples Lewis, *The Space Trilogy* (*Out of the Silent Planet, Perelandra, That Hideous Strength*) (New York: Scribner, 1946).

She is not easily distracted or taken down I assure you."

"Bella you?"

"Don't look so surprised Jamison," she remarked.

Now the merely human Zachary realized he had been dealing with a genetically engineered goddess and understood why he was so enthralled. But--superior being or no, Sarah had taken her down. Bella had been as helpless at the Uni-Mundus tower as all the common rabble was around her. Of the two the Sarah who was showing her age, was the more powerful. "Dominion" was a mystery he had to solve. His cunning mind was working overtime.

--Excerpt from *Third Book – The Christ* (p. 443).

Christ as the paragon of time and space upon which all true believers past, present, and future must converge is the theme of this book. The unfolding of this theme is gritty at times and there are encounters with many different ideologies, some of which approach Christ and others that lead away from Him. There is history, adventure, romance, and humor rolled into the mix and the result is intriguing, thought provoking, entertaining, and inspiring.

The author's point of view is egalitarian as we see men and women, slave and free, struggling through and grappling with intense issues and dangerous situations to minister together finally despite the challenges of the social environment around them.

When Lieb described all this to Erzshebet she understood little but Sarah much. She saw that God was not about separation but about oneness. The destruction of all these separations upon the death of Christ was key. His plan was to atone for our sin that we may be "at one" with Him and with each other again. He sent Yesuah to take the impediments to this oneness away so that He and His beloved people could be blissfully reunited. At His death Yesuah paid the price for us and accomplished just that. So the partition between God and people (the veil), the partition between priesthood and laity (the Khekel doors) and the division between men and women and Jew and gentile, and clean and unclean (the Nacaner Gate) were opened now. The divisions were removed because of that one cosmic act. And now they were told that in Christ: "There is neither Jew nor Greek, slave nor free, male nor female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus. If you belong to Christ, then you are Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise" (Gal 3:28 NIV).

--Excerpt from *Second Book – Biblios* (pp. 241-42)

Having studied theology, author Soler is convinced the Bible is the authoritative and inspired word of God. Her characters through history come to this conclusion from many different points of view. For example, a scholarly Moorish ancestor in medieval Spain extols God the Creator:

"Baree'shyt baraa Elohiem et h'shemiam v'et h'zaretz."

*"In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth" (*Gen 1:1 NIV).

These words, somehow held the key. This was not about clinical data. If this was what it claimed to be it had another dimension, one that connected this matter in which she now dwelt with a reality beyond it. More than that it connected her with the One who was beyond nature and who ruled time.

--Excerpt from *Second Book – Biblios* (p. 112)

During the writing, Soler pursued historic integrity reading close to thirty volumes by authors characterized in the books: Dietrich Bonhoeffer, Bartolomeo de las Casas, Arthur Miller, Josephus, Nathaniel Hawthorne, as well as other scholarly and reputable volumes regarding the Dead Sea

Scrolls, the letter to the Hebrews, the community at Qumran, Convivencia in Spain, the Qur'an, the origins of the Chinese language, the memoirs of Marco Polo and Abigail Abbot Bailey, theories of time travel, and the inquisition. Two views (one anthropological and one historical) that the author used are controversially viewed and hotly debated in their spheres: that of the migration of indigenous people over the Bering Strait between Russia and Alaska and the forced mating of Irish indentured servants and African slaves. Soler felt there was enough evidence for both of these views to include them in the book. The author drew from her own experience as an artist and human services worker. The hardest adventure to write was the eighth which addressed the subject of mental illness, addiction, and urban poverty using the history of her own recently diseased mother. Soler also drew information from personal interviews with horse handlers, builders of round houses, yurts, and hogan, historians, and theologians.

A sub plot in the *Trilogy* identifies the imperative of human community bringing the reader up close and personal with historical figures like Arzachel the Astronomer, Josephus the Historian, and the undying Enoch. *Trilogy's* protagonist, Sarah, begins her journey as a recluse but ends it as a matriarch in a modern tribe of faith in the throes of the millennial tribulation.

Trilogy's biblical time line points the reader to the triumphant return of Jesus as the hope of things to come (Heb 11:1), as prophesied in Daniel 7:13-14: "In my vision at night I looked, and there before me was one like a son of man, coming with the clouds of heaven. He approached the Ancient of Days and was led into his presence. He was given authority, glory and sovereign power; all nations and peoples of every language worshiped him. His dominion is an everlasting dominion that will not pass away, and his kingdom is one that will never be destroyed" (NIV).

Trilogy's unifying and transforming scriptural motif is the redemptive work of Jesus for the salvation of humankind. Each character meets Jesus at a spiritual turning point. Jesus then pours out His own Spirit on each world-weary repentant traveler, regenerating them, forgiving them, and ensuring their eternal life and membership in His kingdom. Soler's *Trilogy* is a delightful sci-fi adaptation of Jesus's Great Commission: "Therefore go and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and teaching them to obey everything I have commanded you. And surely I am with you always, to the very end of the age" (Matt 28:19 NIV).

Trilogy's strength lies in its ability to engage the reader in the spiritual rebirth of characters who receive Jesus as Lord and Savior and are "buried as natural human bodies, and raised as spiritual bodies" (Rom 15:44 NIV). I saw no weakness in the work and nothing to disagree with but strongly agree with the *Trilogy*'s underlying spiritual message: Jesus's redemptive love holds all creation together: "He existed before anything else, and he holds all creation together" (Col 1:17 NIV).

Soler attended Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary-Boston (CUME) for her M.Div. and is a Therapeutic Artist who has contributed to many books published by the Prisca and Aquila Series of Wipf and Stock: *Redeeming the Screens*, *Creative Ways to Build Christian Community*, *Berkley Street Theater* and *Empowering English Language Learners*. She has worked in many branches of human services and ministers using the creative arts. She has presented, performed, and spoken at many churches, schools, colleges and conferences all over the U.S. and U.K. Soler's books by other publishers includes *Just Don't Marry One* (tongue in cheek title) regarding interracial marriage, and *Tough Inspirations from the Weeping Prophet*, a book for victims and support people regarding domestic violence, using the book of Jeremiah as inspiration. Her ministry is *Leap over the Edge Productions*, and readers can access her services and other books on her web site, leapovertheedg.com (no final "e" on edge).

Jeanne DeFazio, the author of this review, is the co-editor of the following Wipf and Stock publications: *Creative Ways to Build Christian Community*, *Berkeley Street Theatre* and *Empowering English Language Learners*. She co-authored with Teresa Flowers: *How to Have an Attitude of Gratitude on the Night Shift* and authored *Keeping the Dream Alive: A Reflection on the Art of Harriet Lorence Nesbitt*. She completed a B.A. in history at the University of California, Davis, and a M.A.R. in theology at Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary Boston. She has also served as an Athanasian Teaching Scholar in Gordon-Conwell Boston.

Review of *Early Jewish Literature: An Anthology* edited by Brad Embry, Ronald Herms and Archie T. Wright, 2 volumes (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2018)

Seungho Ko

Students seeking an in-depth knowledge of the literature of the Second Temple period are often surprised at its extensive amount of documents and find trouble in deciding where to begin their study. The usual response is to scout around the library for relevant sources and see their hands full with numerous different thick volumes of writings, such as the Apocrypha, the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, the Dead Sea Scrolls, the works of Philo and Josephus, and the Greek Old Testament (LXX) all at the same time. Each of these wide ranges of documents in the Second Temple period is what *EJL* (*Early Jewish Literature: An Anthology*) seeks to capture in one collection. *EJL,* a new work edited by Brad Embry, Ronald Herms and Archie T. Wright, will help lessen the toil and save much time. In this collection of various literary sources, showing the complex and fascinating worldview of Judaism and the social, political, and theological mind of the early Jewish communities during the Second Temple period is the two volumes' most important contribution.

The editors carefully chose seventy representative collections from early Jewish literature on which to draw and organized them by eight literary genres based on form and theme. The eight literary genres are as follows: Scriptural Texts and Traditions; Interpretive History; Romanticized Narrative; Biblical Interpretation and Rewritten Scripture; Wisdom Literature and Legal Texts; Apocalyptic Literature; Psalms, Hymns, and Prayers; Testamentary Literature. However, the categories and grouping decisions are not intended to be taken rigidly, because some documents will fit well into several different genres (xiii). At the beginning of each new genre category, the editors offer a brief explanation of its characteristics. Also, every selection is accompanied by invaluable introductory material presenting up-to-date scholarship on it, followed by an English translation of the document. This arrangement aids readers in acquiring an overall understanding of each writing and direct engagement with the primary texts (4). The introduction includes these elements: narrative description; author/provenance; date/occasion; text, language, sources, and transmission; theology; and reception during the Second Temple period. Among these elements, to me, the last two ones are most distinctive. In these two sections, readers will find documents holding significant positions in Jewish literature, dealing with various theological themes and motifs which also emerge in the Old Testament and the New Testament. For example, readers can read particular issues of the theological relevance of 1 Enoch to the Old Testament and the New Testament regarding the term "Son of Man." They can also compare how other Jewish authors take up the 1 Enoch corpus in varying degrees in their literature (185-7). The editors made many efforts to highlight points of contact between the documents included and the New Testament texts and other Jewish documents from the period. This is one of the great benefits of this volume.

EJL consists of two volumes, and each volume has four chapters representing particular genres with complete text or extracts from the text.

In the first volume, Chapter 1 begins with "Scriptural Texts and Traditions." In addition to the canonical texts, the editors have incorporated biblical recensions found at Qumran. The chosen representatives include these selections: the book of Daniel; the three Greek additions to Daniel; the Aramaic additions to Daniel found at Qumran; the Great Isaiah Scroll; Psalms and Psalters at Qumran; and LXX Psalm 151. Readers will recognize the dynamic nature of textual formation and the Jewish commitments toward their spiritual heritage during the Second Temple era. However, one thing that readers should be cautious about is that the book of Daniel itself implies in several

passages that Daniel was its author, and it was probably completed in the early sixth century B.C., while the editors view the composition of the book of Daniel as developed during the Maccabean period (second century B.C.). Chapter 2 deals with the "Interpretive History" genre. The editors assume that all history or historiography is, to greater or lesser degrees, interpretive (169). This volume includes the whole texts of 1 and 2 Maccabees and some extracts from the writings of Jewish historian Josephus. Chapter 3 is titled "Romanticized Narrative." The documents in this genre were composed in crisis periods of Israel's history to challenge the Israelites to remain holy, preserving moral values (359-60). The selections include the book of Tobit, the Letter of Aristeas, Joseph and Aseneth, and the Life of Adam and Eve. The last chapter in volume one covers "Biblical Interpretation and Rewritten Scripture." The editors have selected various documents from the Dead Sea scrolls and from Philo with a useful introduction to Philo's life and works. Readers will appreciate the several principles of biblical interpretation employed in a specific community or group during the Second Temple period.

Volume two starts with Chapter 5, entitled "Wisdom Literature and Legal Texts." Although the editors admit that there are notable differences between sapiential and legal texts, they suggest the two categories may share some of the same theoretical or spiritual terrain, in a dualistic framework. They collect extracts from Sirach and Wisdom of Solomon as well as some wisdom and legal literature from Qumran (e.g., 1QS, CD, 4QMMT) and 1 Enoch. Readers will notice that the collections in this chapter especially have many overlapping ideas with those in the New Testament, such as dualism, eschatology, the work of the law and righteousness. Chapter 6 presents "Apocalyptical Literature." The strength of this chapter is the editors' providing a definition for "apocalypse," and several distinguishing features of the genre: (1) authoritative voice; (2) mystical knowledge; (3) hope and resolution (175-6). The apocalyptic writings were written to reorient the moral vision and theological perspectives of their audience. The representative selections are as follows: 1 Enoch; Sibylline Oracles Books 3, 4, 5; the War Scroll; Qumran messianic texts; 4 Ezra (2 Esdras 3-14); and 2 Baruch. Chapter 7 focuses on "Psalms, Hymns, and Prayers." These articulate ideological and theological positions during the Second Temple era and function liturgically in a public, communal, and possibly cultic context. Along with Psalms of Solomon and Odes of Solomon, this section includes several hymns and prayers from Qumran. The final genre in *EJL* is "Testamentary Literature" in Chapter 8. It employs the near-death settings of heroic figures in Israelite history in which words of preparation and farewell are recorded with an ethical discourse. The selections are Testament of Levi, Testament of Abraham, and Testament of Moses from the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and the Aramaic Levi Document from the Qumran scrolls.

If we compare these two volumes with the *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha (OTP)* edited by James Charlesworth, the initial comparison indicates that the *EJL* anthology collects more diverse bodies of early Jewish literature and provides the essential information more succinctly while *OTP* offers a more in-depth introduction and the full text with a plethora of footnotes and marginal references. Nevertheless, readers can obtain more updated information for specific text in *EJL* than in *OTP* (e.g.1 Enoch, the book of Jubilee, etc.). If compared with *Ancient Texts for New Testament Studies: A Guide to the Background Literature* by Craig A. Evans, *EJL* makes readers dive into the original text directly after the overall theological explanation of a selection. Moreover, *EJL* provides not only an overview of history of the Second Temple Period, but also a glossary of biographical names and terms for basic knowledge of early Jewish literature. For advanced readers, it adds additional further readings and advanced readings on each section.

Despite many strengths, one noticeable lack is that, though the editors admit that their grouping of selections in a particular genre is not rigid, readers might find themselves confused at the classifications of the literary genres if they do not read carefully. Another lack comes from its fundamental limitation of selections. Not all sources from each body of literature are included. Hence, readers will have to search, for example, for 3 and 4 Maccabees in *OTP,* if necessary. Also,

since the material contained in this anthology is pre-rabbinic, these volumes are limited for those who want to study classical rabbinic literature.

In conclusion, I would highly recommend these two volumes to any professors, seminarians, or readers who study the Jewish literature of the Second Temple period. I am convinced that they will greatly benefit from this anthology. For students or scholars who study the New Testament, *EJL* will undoubtedly contribute to their gaining many insights concerning themes and motifs shared between early Jewish literature and the New Testament.

Seungho Ko is a Presbyterian pastor who has experienced pastoral ministry for five years in South Korea. He finished the Th.M. in New Testament studies (*Summa Cum Laude*) at Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, South Hamilton, MA in 2018 and began the Ph.D. program in New Testament at The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, KY in January 2019. He is interested in Pauline studies and has a passion for church revitalization in South Korea and for world mission as well.

Review of *The Letter to the Hebrews: Critical Readings* Edited by Scott D. Mackie (London: T&T Clark, 2018)

Euntaek David Shin

The Letter to the Hebrews: Critical Readings contributes to the series *T&T Clark Critical Readings in Biblical Studies*, as companions intended for graduate students and scholars. Scott D. Mackie, the editor of this volume as well as a published scholar of the book *Eschatology and Exhortation in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007) and over a dozen essays on Hebrews, has carefully collected twenty-three essays, originally published as chapters in books or as articles in journals since the mid-twentieth century. By bringing these critical works together, the editor aims "to offer a window" into the recent scholarship of Hebrews (3). The book, on one hand, preserves foundational works that have been neglected; on the other, it seeks to keep students and researchers *au courant* with the rapid growth of scholarship in Hebrews. Accordingly, an introduction prefaces the volume as a whole, orienting the reader to the significant topics debated among scholars. As a reflection of these topics, the book comprises six parts: (1) "Theology, Christology, and Pneumatology"; (2) "Eschatology"; (3) "The Author and the Addressed Community"; (4) "Structure, Greco-Roman Rhetoric, and Hortatory Strategy"; (5) "The Old Testament and the Relationship with Contemporaneous Judaism"; and (6) "Soteriology." An introduction precedes each segment along with a brief summary of each essay. Finally, each section ends with an annotated bibliography of suggested further readings.

This volume shines most from the editor's effort to orient his readers to research in Hebrews. The general introduction sketches the topics that have been in debate, stirring the appetite of the student or scholar for the main essays. The minor introductions to each section, then, acclimates the reader to critical concepts and languages for understanding the literature that follows. For example, the introduction to part 2, "Eschatology," briefly discusses the temporal and spatial dimensions of Hebrews' eschatology in addition to the degree of Plato's influence on Hebrews (141-44). Furthermore, occasional definitions of terminologies provided in footnotes keep students new to the study of theology or biblical studies away from discouragement when reading the essays. For instance, the editor writes, "Soteriology is the study of salvation" (409), while also giving definitions for "eschatology" and "Christ event" (141). Moreover, the summary of each essay and the annotated bibliography further aid those who are unaccustomed to reading the secondary literature of academic research. These helpful discussions and notes presented with lucidity and concision makes the collection accessible to a wide spectrum of readers. A final noteworthy feature complements the fact that no single volume could exhaust the history of scholarship of one topic. In a footnote the editor thus befittingly provides a list of German and English literature for the "histories of scholarship." These articles and books, published as early as 1964 and as late as 2016, open further windows for readers to expose readers to the study of Hebrews (3).

Just as it has been the goal of the series of *Critical Readings in Biblical Studies*, this reviewer recommends the present volume to graduate students, scholars, and researchers, and perhaps even upper-level undergraduate students. The volume will find itself helpful for individual research as well as course work on Hebrews. One possible obstacle for a student foreign to biblical studies rests in the nature of secondary literature. Most of these essays assume a working knowledge of Greek, some presuppose the reader's capability of reading Hebrew, and most presume an awareness of extra-biblical primary sources. Nevertheless, such inevitable characteristics of secondary literature should not deter the student nor do they undermine the quality of this volume. If anything, this reviewer suspects, the essays may function as a catalyst for further learning of the languages and the primary sources that surround Hebrews.

The collection of close to a dozen essays and the editorial intentionality in this volume contribute to the study of Hebrews in a timely fashion. As the scholarship of Hebrews continues to grow, this book will be a helpful reflection of past research.

Euntaek David Shin, Ph.D. student at Wheaton Graduate School, holds a B.S. in philosophy from the University of Wisconsin-Madison and an M.Div. and a Th.M. from Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary. He served as Dr. William David Spencer's Byington Scholar and his Athanasius Teaching Scholar in theology at Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary's Boston Center for Urban Ministerial Education.

Review of *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary—15:1–23:35*, volume 3, by Craig Keener (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2014)

Jennifer Creamer

Acts: An Exegetical Commentary—15:1–23:35 is the third in a set of four volumes in what very well may be the longest and most comprehensive commentary written on the book of Acts. Author Craig Keener is the F.M. and Ada Thompson Professor of Biblical Studies at Asbury Theological Seminary. Keener has authored numerous books, including commentaries on John, Galatians, Romans, 2 Corinthians, and Revelation, and topical studies. *Spirit Hermeneutics* and *Christobiography: Memories, History, and the Reliability of the Gospels* are two of his recent publications.

Keener's third volume in his series on Acts is a weighty tome in terms of scholarship: Keener plunders the wealth of Greco-Roman literature to construct a commentary rich in its presentation of historical and cultural backgrounds. Besides the remarkable number of references to Greco-Roman literature, Keener displays an encyclopedic knowledge of secondary sources. Footnotes typically occupy a third of each page, if not more. At nearly 1200 pages in length, this volume challenges the limits of what a book binding can reasonably contain. Rather than printing the bibliography, the publisher chose to include, inside the back cover, a CD with a full listing of works cited.

Volume three picks up precisely where volume two of this set leaves off: Acts 15:1. For introductory information, the reader should consult volume one (which includes more than 600 pages of introduction to Acts). Keener's treatment of the text includes numerous topical matters, as well as verse by verse remarks. Excursus topics include discussions on circumcision, dreams, hospitality, the pythoness spirit of chapter 16, demons and spirit possession, Epicureanism, Stoicism, and many more. Time and again, Keener argues in favor of the reliability of Acts and in favor of the accuracy of Luke's historiography. His treatment of each passage is thorough: Paul's speech in Athens, for instance, receives more than 100 pages of discussion. The reader will find that Keener's commentary is far from dry: it is engaging and well-written. Keener's deep affinity for the study of historical and cultural backgrounds is infectious.

The sheer size of Keener's commentary may be a drawback for some. It is also a weighty tome in the literal sense: it weighs a solid five pounds. Volume three measures nearly three inches thick. One might think twice before sliding this volume into one's backpack. A second potential drawback may be the cost: this volume retails at $79.99. Although this price is not unreasonable when considering the amount of research contained within the pages, many of those who might benefit from it the most—students, ministers, and teachers— may find the cost puts a new copy out of reach.

Anyone who is serious about the study of the book of Acts and, particularly, seminary students, should consult this volume (as well as the other three volumes) of Keener's commentary. This four-volume commentary on Acts is sure to be a classic work for years to come. Every theological library should own a set for its reference section, if not another for its circulating collection. Anyone considering purchasing the full set should be prepared with at least 12 inches of available shelf space. Alternately, those interested in acquiring this commentary might consider the now-available Kindle version: weightless and more affordable.

Jennifer Creamer (Ph.D., North-West University) teaches biblical studies for the University of the Nations. She received master's degrees in Old and New Testament from Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary (Hamilton campus) and has taught as an adjunct professor at Gordon-Conwell's Boston campus. Jennifer is author of *God as Creator in Acts 17:24* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2017).

Review of *The Worlds of the Preacher: Navigating Biblical, Cultural, and Personal Contexts* edited by Scott M. Gibson (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2018)

Francois W. Augustin

Last year, the world lost a great teacher of homiletics when Haddon W. Robinson transitioned into eternity to be with the Lord. To honor his legacy, preaching professor and former colleague of Robinson's at Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, Scott M. Gibson, edited a manual that expounds on Robinson's reputable lecture, "The Worlds of the Preacher," with contributions from some of Robinson's former colleagues at Dallas, Denver, and Gordon-Conwell seminaries, in addition to contributions from friends at The Talbot School of Theology and Western Seminary. Robinson understood the worlds of the preacher to be in four parts: the biblical context, the modern context, the preacher's personal contexts, and the listener's contexts. Each of these spheres requires the mastery of the history, language, and culture of that domain. Each contributor in this volume writes from one of the four aspects of the lecture through their own lens and expertise. If Robinson's landmark book *Biblical Preaching* serves as the reference manual for evangelical biblical exposition and the primer on the topic of expository preaching, *The Worlds of the Preacher* helps put flesh to Robinson's methodology. This manual is for preachers at all stages in their preaching career. Seminary students, in particular, will find the four worlds to be a very practical and useful hermeneutical and homiletical template. This book is also for pastors who seek to become more effective at communicating biblical truth.

The richness in the content of this book derives from the diversity of background and expertise of the authors of each chapter. Each author expands and illustrates Robinson's idea of the four worlds, with some chapters including excerpts of sermons by Haddon Robinson and others that practically demonstrate the authors' points – a helpful component for beginners. In chapter 1, Gibson, now the David E. Garland professor of preaching at Baylor University's Truett Theological Seminary, presents an edited version of Robinson's lecture, "The Worlds of the Preacher". In chapter 2, Stephen D. Matthewson from Western Seminary presents four aspects that serve preachers well in their preaching from the Old Testament. In chapter 3, Duane Liftin, former preaching professor at Dallas Theological Seminary, presents a theocentric conceptual model for preaching that helps preachers present the word of God, from God, and about God. In chapter 4, Gibson presents the necessity to cultivate a preacher's inner and personal world, the character from which preaching flows. In chapter 5, Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary preaching professor, Matthew Kim, teaches how to do an exegesis of the world of ethnicity and culture in order to increase the effectiveness of our sermons in an increasingly diverse world. In chapters 6 and 7, Gordon-Conwell preaching professors, Jeff Arthurs and Patricia Batten, help preachers to better analyze and understand their listeners. In chapter 8, Victor Anderson of Dallas Theological Seminary reminds us of the missional purpose of the preaching task. In chapter 9, Scott Wenig of Denver Seminary helps us appreciate the importance of history and how historical realities help us preach the Scriptures more fully. Lastly, in chapter 10, Donald Sunukjian of The Talbot School of Theology shows how preachers can paint pictures with their words. An Afterword by Gibson summarizes and concludes the book. As Gibson apply puts it, "When Haddon Robinson stepped up to preach, he came with his Bible in his hand and his sermon in his heart. He shared the text and he shared himself" (xv). This book will teach pastors and preachers how to do both.

Francois Augustin is Pastor of The Livingstone Church-Boston in Jamaica Plain area of Boston. He is a graduate of UMass-Amherst, Harvard University, and Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary.

Review of *Awaiting the King: Reforming Public Theology, Volume 3 of Cultural Liturgies* by James K. A. Smith (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2017)

Woodrow E. Walton

James K.A. Smith's third volume of *Cultural Liturgies* reminds this reviewer of a letter written very early in the history of the Church and addressed to a person by the name of Diognetus. The unknown Christian correspondent describes his fellow believers as living "in their own countries as they were only passing through. They play their full roles as citizens, but labor under all the disabilities of aliens." He continues, "Any country can be their homeland, but for them their homeland, wherever it may be, is a foreign country." Smith does not mention the letter at all but what he contends in *Awaiting the King* is that the lives of Christians suggest another homeland beside that of the lands in which they reside. They are citizens wherever they live, but they represent another political order: "The kingdom of God."

The King for whom the Christian awaits is none other than the Lord who is revealed in Christ Jesus. What is suggested by Smith is not a counter-culture as suggested by John R.W. Stott in his commentary on Ephesians or the separation of church and state as suggested by the founding fathers of the United States of America. Christians live as citizens in whichever country they live, but they represent a culture distinct from that of the "earthly body politic." There is a letter written by Julian the Apostate late in the fourth century in which he wrote that the Christians, whom he did not like, cared more for the sick, the homeless, and the destitute within the Roman empire than did anyone else within the empire.

Smith did not quote Julian, but a statement that he made on page 47 of *Awaiting the King* is plain that the responsibility of Christians within any body politic is that of caring for the welfare of those we live among in whatever "nations and communities in which we find ourselves as pilgrims and sojourners, even when the city is Babylon, we are called to seek the welfare of the city." He cites Jeremiah 29:7 in support.

Smith writes that the church is less a contrast society we retreat into than a re-centering community of practice that we are sent from (p. 96). He is strong on the cultivation of an "evangelical" political theology nourished by the "specificity of the gospel, the insights of special revelation, and the political legacy of the church" in contributing to the common good of pluralist societies. Quoting Oliver O'Donovan throughout his book, Smith points out that "O'Donovan (rightfully) emphasizes that the individual needs to have some 'transcendence' with respect to society: 'There must come a moment at which the individual stands apart and looks upon the social system as it were from the outside'(*The Ways of Judgment,*75)" (p. 106).

Smith, a professor of philosophy at Calvin College, where he teaches Applied Reformed Theology and Worldview, writes from the Reformed tradition. At the same time, he takes issue with both past and present approaches to the "earthly body politic" on the part of the churches with a Reformation heritage in regard to the relationship of church with state. He considers a "two kingdom" theology as insufficient as then there would be no interaction between civil government and the kingdom of God. Likewise, any concord between church and civil government could lead to embracing either a top-down monarchy or a bottom-up socialism, either of which can lead to disastrous results. We await the king "Who is in heaven." The church represents a new humanity, made by the Lord Jesus Christ, which invades any earthly body politic as representatives of a Kingdom not made by humans and, with it, any human-made ideology people espoused. We await the King, and while we are awaiting King Jesus, we invade the body politic as the evangelists of the Gospel of King Jesus.

In the eyes of this reviewer, *Awaiting the King* is a "must read" for students, pastors, and Christian educators.

Woodrow E. Walton, B.A., M.Div., M.A., D.Min., is a Sr. Retired Assemblies of God minister within the North Texas District Council of the Assemblies of God. A former pastor, and seminary dean, he and his wife, Joy, make their home in Fort Worth Texas, where they are involved with Christ Church Assembly of God.

Review of *Reformation Commentary on Scripture on Ezekiel and Daniel* edited by Carl L. Beckwith (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2012)

Lily Wang

The *Reformation Commentary on Scripture* (RCS) is a twenty-eight-volume series of exegetical commentaries. This particular commentary on Ezekiel and Daniel is the XII volume of the Old Testament, edited by Dr. Carl L. Beckwith. Just as with the *Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture* (ACCS), the intended audience of this commentary is pastors, preachers, teachers, scholars, and students of the Bible. Like the ACCS, which informs readers of how the early church fathers did biblical interpretation, the RCS shows modern readers how the Reformers engaged the Holy Scripture and how boldly they proclaimed the Word based on their careful study of the Word in the Reformation era.

The editor of this volume, Carl L. Beckwith, has done an excellent job presenting the Reformation interpretations of both Ezekiel and Daniel. He shows modern readers the history of biblical interpretation from the Reformation era to the mid-seventeenth century. He provides the readers with biblical insights of the leading reformers and exegetes of the past by collecting the works of well-known reformers (i.e., Martin Luther and John Calvin) as well as the works of those who are lesser-known writers. He even includes the works of several English Puritans (such as John Bunyan, John Owen, and Richard Baxter) into this commentary, demonstrating the richness of the Word as well as the diversity of thoughts of these exegetes, strengthening our understanding of the truths that lie in the prophecies of Ezekiel and Daniel. By doing so, Beckwith also encourages modern readers to learn from those exegetes' attitudes of reverence toward God and His holy Word, reminding pastors, teachers, and preachers in our day of the task of correctly handling the word of truth, while renewing their passion for studying the Scripture.

This volume is a fine piece of work. One can see that it is scholarly, drawing upon a wide collection of exegetical works on Ezekiel and Daniel. Prof. Beckwith has done a wonderful job of integrating these insightful comments together. He evidences his own thorough study of the works of the Reformation commentators when he introduces to readers the historical contexts of the writers and their works, theological themes, and the interpretive issues that arise in their works. Overall speaking, the structure of the book is neat and clear. The scriptural text has been divided into periscopes with topical headings and Reformers' comments concerning the passages, which together assist the readers to follow the thoughts and flow easily. Editor Beckwith also provides the readers with full bibliographic details for each Reformation title for possible further investigations and studies.

Therefore, this commentary is informative and worth buying. I heartily recommend it as a great resource for reference book, course book, or even for one's personal spiritual edification. I truly wish that in the near future this commentary could be translated into my mother tongue and many other languages so that more people and churches will be blessed by it.

Lily Wang, graduated from Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary in May 2018. She was Dr. Aida Besançon Spencer's Byington Scholar in the academic year of 2014-2015. She is currently back in her home country and teaching in a school.