antidote for armchair-and-ivory-tower-theologians (245-249, 251-254). Most importantly, the book exposes the mortal dangers of naturalism and secular humanism. It can be likened to a smoke detector that emits a shrill sound, bidding us to act because an engulfing “fire” is surrounding the “building” of Western culture.

The book, however, leaves the reader with some unanswered issues: (1) How is one to balance between theonomism (or Christian Reconstructionism) and secularism? If Henry had his wish, how is his state different from a Hindu or Muslim state? (2) In view of his convictions that moral directions and political power are inseparable (73), how would a Henry-minded ruling party, representing the majority, resist the temptation to directly or indirectly enforce its ideology on minorities that happen to hold to a radically different ideology? It is one thing to lavishly promise religious freedom (181-182, 189, 192, 235), and quite another thing to restrain the logical ramifications and operations of one’s presuppositions on account of the religious freedom of another. (3) If Oriental religions are looked upon as evidence of man’s revolt against God (222), why is it that Henry fails to mention the apparently high morality evident in the lands as well as in the ethical teachings of the Oriental religions (e.g., Ahimsa or nonviolence of the Hindus)? (4) Isn’t there a need for balancing his crusade for biblical theism with a crusade for Christ-like living? This is not to suggest that Henry has altogether ignored it (e.g., ch. 22), but he has hardly raised the issue to the level and intensity of biblical theism and its ramifications.

In conclusion, it may be pointed out that the book needs a little more careful editing. For instance, on page 263, there is “meeting” instead of “meaning.” But this is not hard to figure out. However, what does “. . . he ‘birth’” . . . mean? (264). Surely both word and grammar must be in trouble, here! “Evangelism theism” (268) should be “evangelical theism.” “Rest’ of truth” (280) should be “test’ of truth.” “Word,” for the Greek Cosmos (285), should be “world.” “Three Self patriotic movement” (286) betrays a careless handling of the story of contemporary Chinese Christianity. The name consists of all four words and is written: “Three-Self Patriotic Movement.” And what about the title of the book itself? Should it be “gods of this Age or . . . God of the Ages?” (front cover), or “Gods of this Age or God of the Ages?” (header), or “Gods of this age or god of the ages?” (the verso of the title page). In this last instance, would it not be more appropriate to use an upper-case “G” for “God’ of the ages?” He surely deserves it!

Spicer Memorial College
Pune, India

BOXTER KHRABTENG


Editors Hess (Glasgow Bible College) and Tsumura (Japan Bible Seminary) introduce Gen 1-11 and then by their writing and choice of articles lead the reader on a guided tour of key parts in these chapters. After three introductory essays—two by Hess (one original and one a reprint) and one by Tsumura (original)—25 other essays by 23 different authors are presented. All 25 are reprints
from earlier publications. They are arranged into two major sections: (1) A comparative section which deals with other ancient Near Eastern literature, primarily Sumerian, Assyrian, and Babylonian as it relates to Gen 1-11; and (2) a slightly shorter section on literary and linguistic approaches to Gen 1-11. Authors range from long-recognized authorities such as D. J. Wiseman, Abraham Malamat, and E. A. Speiser to more recently known names such as Gordon Wenham and Phyllis Bird. A threefold index of scholarly authorities, ancient sources, and Scripture concludes the volume.

The purpose of this book, as well as others in this series, is to introduce key primary sources so that those interested in the area of study can deal firsthand with the foundational works as well as with written responses to them. Scholars are also served by being able to consult key works in their area in a readily accessible form. Students as well as teachers are thus clearly in mind as an audience. Two of the essays have been translated into English for the compilation as have scattered words and quotations for the convenience of those who speak only English.

The introductory essays and the choice of articles and authors make clear Hess and Tsumura's interpretation of the current state of Gen 1-11 studies. Although the amount and availability of ancient Near Eastern material that is related to and contemporary with Gen 1-11 has grown, the conviction that there are close direct relationships between the two bodies of literature has lessened. Words like "borrowing" or "dependence" are less often heard. Although the ancient Near Eastern sources are seen as valuable for general historical and cultural background as well as linguistic studies, the idea that direct dependence or literary and ideological borrowing can be demonstrated has almost been abandoned.

As for literary and linguistic approaches, the editors see a weakening of the hold of the old Wellhausenian documentary hypothesis. The earlier approach—what Anderson calls "analytic and diachronic" (417)—is being replaced by a synchronic methodology under the triple impact of rhetorical criticism, oral-tradition studies, and structuralism. Although parts of the old system still hold sway, scholars today by and large are more interested in the final form of the text. First priority is being given to the text in its received form and to its "functional unity" (434).

Is such an anthology valuable? Is it better than a "secondary synthesis" (ix) by a single author? I'd say yes—a mildly enthusiastic yes. Yes, because for the student it is valuable to hear directly from the original authors. A variety of short essays is also less monotonous and more colorful than the words of only one author. A qualified yes because the idea that real objectivity may result is an illusion.

For serious students of the OT, the basic question, of course, is how close the editors, Hess and Tsumura, are to the truth. Is the direction of Gen 1-11 studies they portray anywhere near the truth? The answer to that question lies to a large extent with the reader's personal viewpoint. While perhaps not the only interpretation of Gen 1-11 studies, I believe it is a valid read. Scholars like J. Van Seters and J. A. Emerton would certainly disagree. While essays from these two writers do not appear in the book, their works and views are at least noticed and referred to (25, 27).

Questions remain about the choice and placement of various individual essays. Why is Hess's essay on "The Genealogies of Gen 1-11 and Comparative Literature" in the introductory section rather than the comparative section? How
crucial to the major issues of Gen 1-11 is the 1958 essay by E. A. Speiser on “Nimrod” and the 1963 piece on “Lamech’s Song to His Wives” (Gen 4:23, 24) by S. Gevirtz. Perhaps a brief introductory paragraph by the editors on the significance of each article and the reasons for its choice would have been helpful. When you have limited space and the book is published in 1994, do the 11 essays published in the ’50s and ’60s that appear in this anthology deserve inclusion?

In spite of the caveats mentioned above, I found the book to be helpful. It is a convenient way to introduce students, pastors, and Bible scholars in other specialities to what has been happening in Gen 1-11 studies. Serious dialogue on Gen 1-11 and its significance cannot take place unless one is familiar with the history of interpretation and current debate this volume affords.

Andrews University

Jon L. Dybdahl


Incarnational ministry is the missiological contribution to the growing body of literature on church planting. Although the book does not reveal exactly who wrote its various sections, it is a joint product of the father-daughter team of Paul Hiebert (Trinity Evangelical Divinity School) and Eloise Hiebert Meneses (Eastern College). Sandwiched between an opening chapter on theoretical foundations and a brief concluding chapter on incarnational ministry are the core chapters of the book. These eight chapters cover in order band, tribal, peasant, and urban societies. Each society is described in a chapter and then the principles to be followed in planting a church in that type of society are outlined in an immediately following chapter.

Much of what I have heard through books and presentations about church planting in my present North American context differs from the approach of this book. *Incarnational Ministry* is not a church planting “cookbook” which gives a recipe for planting a church. No time table, organizational sequences, or formulas are presented!

The volume deals with principles, attitudes, and general directions for church planting, leaving specific plans to the individual church planter. IM’s strong point is its clear anthropological description of these various types of societies. Although the authors are careful to point out that the classification of these four societies is not something cut and dried, their descriptions nevertheless point out important distinctions. In every case the societal descriptions are larger (sometimes over twice as large) as the chapters on church planting in that same society. It seems fair to say that the authors appear to know more about each type of society than they do about actual church planting in that particular group.

Initially I wondered why the book was called *Incarnational Ministry.* Only one paragraph in the introduction (18) specifically talks about the incarnational approach. As I read further and finally contemplated the concluding chapter which is titled “Incarnational Ministries,” I came to believe the book was appropriately named. Although the actual word “incarnation(al)” may not occur often, that is the basis for the book. Thus, instead of furnishing a “cookbook,” this