conducive for Markan Priority. Of the synoptics, Luke poses the greatest challenge to Blomberg's approach. However, he solves this by looking at the chiastic link between Luke and the Book of Acts (140ff).

Of much concern to me in this section are the following: First, Blomberg downplays the prominence of women clearly evident in Mark's Gospel (120). Second, he introduces themes that he doesn't explore. An example of this is his implied belief that empowerment for obedience to moral demands was not available before Christ (129). In the same vein, one has to question what he means by a "law-free Christianity" (148). This lack of treatment may be made excusable by the limitations of space, but it is indeed unfortunate.

In part 4, Blomberg provides a survey of the life of Christ. The first chapter of this section surveys the various approaches to the historical Jesus by examining works of scholars such as Bultmann and Schweitzer. His survey eventually brings him face-to-face with the "Jesus Seminar," which he berates as having "wildly improbable methodological presuppositions" (184). From this, Blomberg outlines a brief chronology of the life of Christ based on selection of the Gospels' main themes and patterns. It is interesting that he proposes to attempt the explanation of "a few commonly held misinterpretations of passages" (178), but makes some blatant mistakes himself.

For example, his use of Acts 10 to argue that God declares unclean food clean (276) is a clear misinterpretation of a vision dealing with bigotry and racial prejudice (see Acts 10:28). In addition, his use of Acts 20:7; 1 Cor 16:2; and Rev 1:10 as proof that Christians replaced Sabbath with Sunday lacks credibility, since there is nothing within these passages authorizing such a change. I strongly suspect that many evangelicals will also be alarmed at the prospect of Peter being the rock upon which the church of God is built (278, 279).

Blomberg's concluding section, "Historical and Theological Synthesis," looks at extrabiblical evidence for the Gospels' reliability, and concludes with a survey of the theology of Jesus. The list of additional evidences he provides is a positive feature of his book. The survey of the theology of Jesus is a fitting conclusion to a valuable contribution to the study of the Man—Christ Jesus. It is not surprising that Blomberg concludes with an appeal to follow Jesus.

Despite relatively few areas of concern, I am impressed with Blomberg's pedagogical skills and wealth of knowledge. His interest in the person of Christ more than the study of Christology is not only refreshing, but hopefully infectious. His work is worth the reading.

West Indies College
Mandeville, Jamaica


Scores of books interpreting earth history from a conservative Christian perspective have been published in recent years, but few of these books have been authored by persons as scientifically well-informed as Leonard Brand. Brand's
fundamental premise in *Faith, Reason, and Earth History* is that the Bible is “a body of information communicated to us by the God who has participated in the history and workings of our planet and of life” (87). While the Bible, he posits, “is not a scientific textbook in the sense of giving exhaustive scientific information, ... where the Bible does give scientific information, that information is accurate” (86). Thus, he believes the Creation stories in Gen 1 and 2 and the flood story in Gen 6-9 are scientifically trustworthy summaries of physical events that occurred within a temporal framework constrained by the genealogies in Gen 5 and 11. Life, in Brand’s view, has experienced limited change and is thousands, not billions, of years old; moreover, Noah’s Flood was responsible for most of the geological column and the fossil record it contains. Brand subscribes to “partial naturalism” or “informed interventionism,” the notion that “on a day-to-day basis the processes of nature do follow natural law,” but that “an intelligent, superior being has, on rare occasions, intervened in biological or geological history” (64-65).

*Faith, Reason, and Earth History* is divided (although not formally) into three topical sections. The first section (chaps. 1-6) is concerned with the history, methods, limitations, and philosophy of science. Here Brand contrasts naturalism with “informed interventionism” and establishes an informal theological rationale for the remainder of the book. The second section (chaps. 7-12) is concerned with the origin and history of life, theories of microevolution, speciation, megaevolution, sociobiology, and Brand’s “interventionist theory” of “biological change within limits.” The last section (chaps. 13-16) examines the history of the earth’s crust, with particular emphasis on a model that incorporates the postulated effects of Noah’s flood. Chapter 17 serves as a brief concluding statement. The book’s subtitle, *A Paradigm of Earth and Biological Origins by Intelligent Design*, is a misnomer: The origin of the earth is never addressed, and the origin of life receives only modest treatment; moreover, intelligent-design theory is assumed but not directly discussed.

Subtitle aside, Brand does more than any of his predecessors to bring conservative creationism under the umbrella of normal biology. Absent are the misappropriations, allegations, and denunciations of evolutionary biologists so prevalent in less-informed creationist writings. Brand understands evolutionary theory and has no quarrel with what he believes to be its established principles. Moreover, he does not shy away from employing standard evolutionary terminology—natural selection, adaptive radiation, heterochrony, kin selection, and ordinary evolution—all are used appropriately and positively. Microevolution and speciation fall easily within his comfort zone; he even embraces—although somewhat timidly—some forms of macroevolution, a process dismissed out-of-hand by most other creationist writers. But he rejects the notion of unbridled change, or megaevolution, which he defines as “evolutionary change into new families, classes, or phyla of organisms” (320).

While Brand stands firmly in the young-earth-creationism and Flood-geology camp, he repeatedly takes pains to distance himself from some of the more egregious claims of his fellow apologists. For example, unlike many other writers of his persuasion, Brand rejects a strict Baconian view of science (26-27); sees naturalism as a scientifically productive, if ultimately false, paradigm (73-75);
denies that evolutionists and their theories are “stupid” (74); hopes for a “peaceful coexistence” between naturalist and creationist views (76); rejects simplistic denials of evolutionary theory argued from the second law of thermodynamics (103); and cautions against the assertion that natural selection theory is based on circular reasoning (116-117). But despite the scientific open-mindedness found here, *Faith, Reason, and Earth History* is not a place for philosophical subtlety or theological innovation. Brand is deeply committed to a biblical hermeneutic that is virtually indistinguishable from inerrancy. One looks in vain for references to other contemporary, well-informed science/faith writers like John Polkinghorne, Howard Van Till, Davis Young, Richard Bube, and Arthur Peacocke, who, like Brand, take Scripture seriously but who, unlike Brand, favor less wooden interpretations of the biblical text. Nonetheless, Brand writes with a patient, understanding voice, one with genuine appreciation and comprehension of the views of his nontheist opponents.

Use of Noah’s Flood to foreshorten geologic time has a long and venerable history among Christians. Brand’s particular version of Flood geology can be traced back to the “ecological zonation theory” of Harold W. Clark, whose much-reproduced diagram of the pre-Flood world, complete with terraced seas, is once again represented here (281). Readers knowledgeable in geology and paleontology may wince at some of Brand’s admittedly speculative proposals and interpretations: for example, his “simple principle” of “little water—much time; much water—little time” (213-214); his hypothesis that an interconnected network of water-filled, subterranean caverns—presumably the “fountains of the deep”—penetrated pre-Flood continents (276-277); his suggestion that antediluvian flowering plants, bony fish, snakes, lizards, turtles, birds, mammals, and humans were restricted to “the cooler upland areas” of the pre-Flood world (281); his conjecture that egg-retaining dinosaurs repeatedly darted out (from where?) to exposed patches of newly deposited sediments to build their nests and lay their eggs during intermittent retreats of the Flood water (293); his calculation that over a thousand-year period the continents may have sped apart at an “average speed of 1.2 feet/hour” (294).

Historical geology, of course, in both its conventional old-earth and its nonconventional “Flood geology” forms, is decidedly extrabiblical. The Flood story recorded in Genesis 6-9 says nothing about sedimentation, erosion, turbidity currents, volcanism, mountain building, paelomagnetism, seafloor spreading, continental drift, etc., which of necessity form the warp and woof of any scientific theory of earth history. Brand would have done well to warn readers that IF someday flood geology quietly fades into oblivion, biblical faith need not disappear with it. To his credit, however, he does point out many of the more vexing problems associated with his model to which he has no satisfying answers: present-day geographical distributions of marsupials and other animals, increasing percentages of unfamiliar types of organisms at progressively deeper levels of the geologic column, the apparent time required for multiple glacial episodes, the restriction of modern humans to relatively superficial fossil horizons, and radiometric age dating, to name a few. “Wouldn’t it be easier just to accept the long geological time scale and fit creation into that scenario?” he asks. “Probably,”
he replies (267). But Brand exhibits no predilection for easy answers.

In his passion to defend young-earth creationism and flood geology, Brand overlooks several of the most crucial science/faith questions. Why is death a seemingly integral component of all modern, healthy ecosystems? Why did an all-wise God create a world in which pain and death could become so prevalent? How does death relate to the problem of evil? Did God create the universe in such a way that both chance and determinism would play a role? How is chaos involved in determining order? Does God ever use chaos and other natural processes to create? What stewardship responsibilities do Christians have toward the creation? These questions transcend the interesting, but more mundane considerations of evolving gene pools, enigmatic fossils, and planetary chronology. Readers, however, will need to look elsewhere for discussions of these issues.

_Faith, Reason, and Earth History_ is poorly indexed, but well referenced and richly illustrated. It will provide a useful starting point for discussions of science and faith in churches, colleges, and universities. I applaud Brand's effort to address this contentious and potentially divisive topic with candor, thoughtfulness, and humility.

Andrews University  
Berrien Springs, MI 49104

JAMES L. HAYWARD

---

James Byrne, senior lecturer in theology and religious studies at St. Mary's University College in London, has published an excellent book on seventeenth- and eighteenth-century religious thought. _Religion and the Enlightenment: From Descartes to Kant_ seeks to place in context and understand the ideas, both religious and secular, that gave rise to modernity and modern religious thinking.

The book is divided into ten chapters. The first two provide a historical introduction and context to the Enlightenment, while the next seven chapters analyze the thought and writings of major thinkers from Descartes to Kant. The concept undergirding the whole book is Byrne's belief that the Enlightenment is not to be studied as "a clear and unified train of thought . . . or as simply an interesting historical period." Rather, he views the Enlightenment "as a particular cultural space within which there emerged new ideas, new developments, even new scientific disciplines, and which has shaped for better or for worse the world in which we live today" (229-230). In spite of attempts to concisely reduce the Enlightenment to a few characteristics, he specifies that one should not be misled to think that this period was therefore a coherent movement. The reality was that this "period was one of intellectual exploration and even thinkers who are sometimes brought under the same label actually held widely divergent views" (14); the Enlightenment "varied from nation to nation and from culture to culture" (52). According to the author, the common cause of the Enlightenment is not to be found in what its most famous thinkers agreed on but rather in what they rejected: "the weight of tradition, the power and influence of the church,