

notes at the end of each chapter, rather than at the bottom of the pages, also makes reading difficult. The chapters contain from 53 to 111 footnotes, covering from 7 to 13 pages. And since they are filled with substantive comments, not merely references, the reader is forced continually to flip back and forth between text and notes, a practice which definitely hampers one's efforts to follow the discussion.

Loma Linda University  
Riverside, California

RICHARD RICE

Young, Norman. *Creator, Creation and Faith*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976. 219 pp. \$8.50.

The author is interested primarily in developing the meaning of creation, i.e., what it means in relationship to the way we live now. He wants to draw out its implications in terms of everyday living. His first section, chaps. 2-4 (chap. 1 is an introduction), discusses the interrelated biblical themes of creation, fall, and new creation. While adopting the position that belief in God as creator of Israel arose before God as creator of heaven and earth, he nevertheless thinks that both are inextricably related. Furthermore, he maintains that the concept that "God is redeemer because he is creator" is primary, while the concept that "he is effective redeemer because, since creator, he is powerful enough to redeem, is secondary" (pp. 40-41). The fall is due to man's dependence on his own wisdom and affects individuals, society, and nature. The new creation must involve all three, and understanding of it must come from the implications drawn from the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ. But exactly what these are remain disputed.

In the second section (chaps. 5-8) Young describes how four recent theologians have approached the themes of creation, fall, and new creation. Barth's view is characterized as transcendentalist because it emphasizes the "infinite qualitative distinction" between God and man. His uncompromising biblical and Christocentric orientation left little room for understanding God through nature and human wisdom. Thus Barth's position shifts theological attention away from the non-human creation as well as human understanding and institutions. Tillich's ontological approach emphasizes continuity rather than discontinuity, since his method is that of correlation. The author's principal criticism of Tillich is his making of non-being and finitude a necessary part of human existence. This would imply a pessimistic view of the possibility of a new creation in human history. The author criticizes Bultmann's existentialist theology because he insisted that "the doctrine of creation is about human existence in the present *rather than* about the beginning of the world" (p. 143). To put human existence at the beginning would place it within the framework of nature and would indicate the indissoluble relationship between man and the rest of the created order. This would prevent man from exploiting nature, since he would recognize his responsibility and accountability toward it in the context of Genesis. Moltmann's eschatological theology is criticized because while he takes the results (the liberation of the poor, oppressed, alienated, and godless) obtained

by the crucified Christ, he does not follow the method by which it was obtained—suffering, non-resistant love.

The last section (chap. 9) deals with the implications of the various theologies discussed from the standpoint of the relationship the Christians should have towards the world. The first standpoint is that of alienation or disengagement from the world. While Christians should consider themselves alien with respect to the world as it is, nevertheless, the main weakness with this approach is that it fails to recognize its own sinfulness and the fact that the Creator-God is not its own special possession. The coalition approach is the other extreme. It tends to identify itself with the world, its thought, and its movements without being critical enough, without recognizing seriously the doctrine of the fall. The approach of innovation accepts Rauschenbusch's statement that "ascetic Christianity called the world evil and left it. Humanity is waiting for a revolutionary Christianity that will call the world evil and change it" (cited on p. 181). Jesus Christ serves as the model of one who recognized the evil in the world but lived within it and overcame it. He was the new creation in this sense, and we need to realize it in our lives. This view sees the world as God's good creation, which when perverted can be renewed through the power of Jesus Christ. This is the view that the author espouses. The revolutionary approach is similar to the first view in that it fails to acknowledge its own sinfulness and fallenness. It fails also to follow the method of Jesus Christ by way of his non-resistant suffering love.

The book does not seem to be correlated adequately. The four views of the theologians do not serve sufficiently as points of departure for the conclusion. Actually, chaps. 5-8 could have been omitted and nothing would have been missed in terms of the author's discussion in the conclusion. The conclusion is also not sufficiently tied in with the themes of creation, fall, and re-creation, although these are mentioned. It seems that the author had two different objects in view: one, to evaluate and analyze contemporary theological views on these themes; and the other, to show what relationship Christians should have to the world. Also, while much is made of the ecological in the earlier chapters, this aspect is omitted in the conclusion.

Another serious weakness in the conclusion is the failure to elaborate on the meaning and implication of the new creation or transformation. Is it only the hope that Christians would follow Jesus Christ; or is it a reality that will take place, and to what extent? Young criticizes the other three views for not taking seriously enough the doctrine of the fall, but where does he himself seriously take it into consideration in his own view? Ultimately, are not all this-worldly attempts to bring about transformation of the world (if this is what is in his mind) blind to the fallenness of men?