how archaeology in the individual areas responded to the general pressures in each era from Roman Catholic or Protestant apologetics, Western European nationalism and imperialism, or specific sponsorships. In this "areas vs. eras" dilemma, Frend probably chose the better way, even if this compels the reader to revisit familiar sites again and again to witness archaeological progress across the centuries.

To anyone well acquainted with biblical archaeology, Frend's reportage may at first seem somewhat unbalanced. Except for recent discoveries in Israel and Jordan, the "Holy Land" seems to get short shrift in these pages, and the great William Foxwell Albright, for example, is not even mentioned. It must, however, be immediately recalled that Frend's theme here is the archaeology of early Christianity, which is, of course, predominantly postbiblical.

As if to compensate for any such omission, Frend includes a massive amount of material on North African Christian archaeology, not only because Frend himself was active in digs there, but because the Christian West must never forget how powerful and active Christendom was in that area prior to the Muslim onslaught. The same, of course, applies to Asia Minor, whose Christian archaeology is also admirably reported in these pages.

The greatest finds in all the Mediterranean lands—and their finders—are well described in Frend's facile prose, as well as the most important Christian archaeological discoveries and discoverers in France, Germany, and England. The vignettes of the giants in the field are vivid, and the way they responded to the influences impinging on them from time and circumstance are memorable indeed. As indicated, various engines often drove archaeology in times yore: religious triumphalism ("Catholic" archaeology in the Roman catacombs to "prove" the claims of the Roman church or Protestant criticism to "disprove" them), German radical criticism that questioned everything, European nationalism that wanted to superimpose the flag over every find, or an aggressive neoclassicism that prioritized whatever was pagan over whatever was Christian.

Fortunately, most of this has been surmounted in current scientific archaeology, but Frend does identify one large cloud remaining on the horizon. "The main threat," he writes, "comes from the population explosion of the present century and the ever-expanding and destructive infrastructure needed to sustain it" (p. 387). When rivers are dammed or cities expand, ancient sites are destroyed, and international salvage projects have not always succeeded in rescuing them.

This appropriate warning is typical of the good sense that underlies all these pages. Once again, W.H.C. Frend has taken a broad topic, surveyed it with meticulous care for detail, and then presented it in a form that will engage any reader, lay or professional.
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The question of a center or many centers as a unifying theme for biblical theology has long been debated. It is in this context and from an evangelical
viewpoint, that Fuller writes another book about the subject. The purpose of the work is to facilitate the teaching of what Fuller calls "the whole Bible" to interested lay persons.

The unifying theme of the Bible for Fuller is the upholding of the glory of God, His name, and His mercy (xiv). This thesis can be seen most clearly in its relation to salvation history (reminiscent of the approach of Oscar Cullmann). Therefore Fuller divides his book into four parts, each one dealing with an aspect of salvation history. In Part 1, he finds a theological center in the promulgation of God's glory, a view that for him brings unity to the apparent diversity of the various genres of Scripture. Part 2 focuses on how God's glory is upheld through the plan of redemption. Part 3 demonstrates how God's name is glorified through His long interaction with Israel. Part 4 shows that Jesus Christ is the ultimate expression of the unifying theme of Scripture, the glory of God, His name, and His mercy.

Fuller's book has a number of strengths. First, he clearly emphasizes the unity that undergirds the Bible and its interpretation. This is especially relevant in an age where that truth has been eclipsed. Furthermore, his attempt to apply an inductive method of biblical study (106-110) to understand what its original writers were communicating is indeed a refreshing perspective. The assumption is that the Scriptures themselves, not external sources, must supply the data from which one interprets Scripture—a most timely emphasis. Finally, Fuller's concern for producing a readable book on the subject of the unity of the Scriptures so that lay persons as well as professionals can understand it and use it for apologetics makes this book a useful tool.

As one reads this book, one wonders whether or not the book should not be retitled for it seems to be more of a theology of justification than a book on the unity of Scripture. It appears that Fuller has allowed his presuppositions to provide an undergirding for his support of his thesis. For example, he states that he presupposes that the Bible is verbally inspired and inerrant (xvii) and then goes from there to say that one needs to prove a verbally-inspired Scripture, which is at best circular reasoning. Again, he seems to hold that one proves the supernatural intervention of God in this world by arguing from the implication that a natural event has a cause, and so the cause for the special status of Israel in God's eyes and in the world must be God's (supernatural) intervention, for it does not make sense to take it any other way (34). While this may make sense to the person who believes in God as a causative factor in human history, it does not prove it to one who starts at another point. Hence, the assumptions of Fuller's presuppositions may well mitigate the use of his work for apologetic purposes, which is ostensibly his reason for writing the book. Thus the work illustrates the danger of allowing one's presuppositions to determine the shape of one's understanding of doctrine.

Related to this, it seems that Fuller has not really engaged the Bible in the form of an inductive inquiry, i.e. allowing the text to determine his theology. Rather, he appears to do quite the opposite. Immediately following his introduction of the methodology he used in discovering the unifying center of Scripture (106-110), he moves right to an explanation of the Trinity rather than to the text of Genesis and its understanding of creation as that doctrine upholds God's glory, which is his stated purpose. Hence, his conclusions about Gen 2
appear to be colored more by his understanding of the Trinity than by the text itself. It seems, then, that his view that God’s glory is the unifying center of the Bible is, perhaps, based more upon his theological presuppositions rather than upon the inductive data originating in the text.

In spite of its weaknesses, Fuller has made an evangelical contribution to the discussion of the unity of Scripture. Perhaps its lasting contribution may be the very call to attempt to engage in inductive study when dealing with Scripture and its attempt to emphasize the Bible’s unity rather than its often-supposed disunity.
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Norman Geisler and Ralph MacKenzie have coauthored a book which describes the theological agreements and differences between Roman Catholics and Evangelicals. But, let me add quickly that this is not a book to refuel the doctrinal controversies between the two traditions. Its purpose is quite the opposite. Though conscious of real doctrinal differences, the authors intend “to examine some of our common spiritual roots and see if we have any theological or moral bridges upon which we both can travel” (15).

Conspicuous for the writing of this book is the March 1994 document signed between Roman Catholics and Evangelicals, “Evangelicals and Catholics Together.” Although the authors wait until the last appendix of the book to evaluate it, they articulate a positive and sincere doctrinal response in favor of this document. Even in their candid, and sometimes blunt, expositions of the doctrinal differences between the two traditions, they write with respect for and genuine pathos toward Roman Catholics. Their aim is obviously to present the doctrinal foundation on which these two groups of Christians can have a united voice “to fight the forces of evil in our society and our world” (357).

The twenty chapters are divided into three parts. Part one, “Areas of Doctrinal Agreement,” presents eight doctrines shared by both traditions and based upon “the creeds and confessions and councils of the Christian church of the first five centuries” (17). The authors believe this doctrinal unity is essentially Augustinian. Thus both traditions agree on the doctrine of Revelation and an inspired and inerrant Scripture (chap. 1). They share the same basic orthodox view of God and the Trinity (chap. 2), of human beings (chap. 3), and of Christ (chap. 4). In chapter 5, the authors discuss the common core of Augustinian beliefs in the doctrine of salvation by grace. The agreements on the doctrine of the church center around its foundation, nature, and function (chap. 6), and those on ethics are rooted in the nature and will of God and his revelation to mankind (chap. 7). Finally, both share common views about personal and cosmic eschatology (chap. 8).

Part two includes eight chapters which deal with areas of doctrinal differences. These include the apocrypha (chap. 9), the infallible authority of