

consecutive-conjunction definition of "with the result that," implying that Adam's sin resulted in the history of sinning on the part of the human race.

In connection with this, Mounce argues that 7:14-25 does not describe the totality of Paul's spiritual experience, but instead provides a preparatory introduction to the description of the triumph which follows in chapter 8 (166-168). On the basis of etymology and context in 8:29-30, Mounce explains predestination as God's *purpose* for us to become like Christ (cf. 2 Cor 3:18), rather than as something concerned with *election* to salvation (188-190).

I find Mounce to be hasty in his conclusions on certain points such as: the purpose of the law in 10:4 (207); the salvation of Israel in 11:25-36 (223-225); submission to authorities in 13:1-114 (243-244); the role of Phoebe as "deacon" in 16:1-2 (272). I find this to be somewhat unsatisfactory.

All in all, I would like to commend the evangelical vitality of this able, concise, and readable exposition. The work is accompanied by a short subject index, a useful person index, and a selected-Scripture index.

Faculté Adventiste de Théologie
Collonges-sous-Salève, France

ROBERTO BADENAS

Numbers, Ronald L., ed. *The Creation-Evolution Debates*. Creationism in Twentieth-Century America, vol. 2. New York: Garland, 1995. 505 pp. Hardcover, \$98.00.

In *The Creation-Evolution Debates*, Ronald Numbers notes that there is a worldwide renaissance of creationism. This is evident in that 47% of Americans are creationists and that state courts and the Supreme Court have examined creationism. However, Numbers rejects (as restrictive earth history) the creation-science proposal that earth may be no more than 10,000 years old.

Numbers seems to depreciate contemporary creationism as a recent unjustified innovation. While recognizing the ancient roots of creationism, he argues that creationists did not use "the creation science" approach before the influence of books like Whitcomb and Morris's *The Genesis Flood* (1961), and the influence of organizations like Creation Research Society (1963) and Institute for Creation Research (1972) (vii-viii).

Numbers calls attention to an often overlooked aspect of the history of creation science, namely, the early role of Seventh-day Adventists in creationist thought. He documents SDA participation in two debates that took place in 1925: George McCready Price versus Joseph McCabe on the topic "Is Evolution True?" and Maynard Shipley versus Francis Nichol and Alonzo Baker in "The San Francisco Debates on Evolution" (x-xi).

Numbers also mentions SDAs in his comments on the 1928 debate between William Riley and Harry Rimmer on the days of creation. Early twentieth-century fundamentalists were divided among those who regarded the creative days as (1) geological ages, (2) twenty-four-hour days while allowing for pre-Adamite fossils, and (3) twenty-four-hour days while rejecting pre-Adamite fossils. The latter (SDA) view became popular later in the twentieth century (xi-xii).

Numbers seems to indicate his assessment of SDA creationist thought in

comments on the 1937 debate between D. J. Whitney and Edwin Tenney Brewster on the topic: "Is Man a Modified Monkey?" First, Numbers mentions Whitney's short-lived career and his support of the "limited" SDA model of Flood geology. Second, Numbers mentions Brewster's delight in pestering Flood geologists about the alleged incompatibility of their views with the OT and their innovation of miracles when stumped for scientific answers (xi-xiii). With regard to the comment on Whitney, it seems significant to this reviewer that the limitations of early Flood models were matched by the limitations of early Darwinian-evolutionary models. Flood models and evolutionary models have both progressed a great deal since 1937. With regard to the treatment of Brewster, ironically, Brewster himself contrasts the evolutionary theory with biblical Creation (469, 479, 501).

Another significant aspect of Numbers' documentation is that his selection of debates demonstrates that the creationists did not always lose their debates with evolutionists. In fact, where there were official judges, the creationists won in one debate and tied in another. Where there were no official judges, the audience decided another debate in favor of the creationists. In 1925, Price, "the leading scientific authority of the American fundamentalists," left the stage humiliated and never debated again (x). The 1925 San Francisco debates (mentioned above) ended in a tie. John Roach Straton (the "fundamentalist pope") won a unanimous decision over Charles Francis Potter (the "rank infidel") in 1924. In Arkansas in 1928, William Bell Riley debated Charles Smith on the topic: "Should Evolution be Taught in Tax-Supported Schools?" Both agreed that Darwinism is atheism, and Arkansas voted that it should not be taught (ix-xi). In 1934, Aimee McPherson debated Charles Smith on the existence of God and on creation by chance or design. McPherson stood by a picture of Christ, and Smith stood by a picture of a gorilla. The audience sided overwhelmingly with God and McPherson (xii).

A study of the debates compiled by Numbers leads this reviewer to three conclusions. First, in order to evaluate the creation-evolution contest, one needs to look beyond the knowledge or skills of the debaters. The creationist and evolutionist debaters were both generally well informed, but they evaluated the evidence for or against Creation and evolution in different ways. This is evident in the 1925 debate of William Jennings Bryan ("God and Evolution") versus Henry Fairfield Osborn ("Evolution and Religion") and Edwin Grant Conklin ("Bryan and Evolution"). Bryan viewed his proposal as a contribution to the reformation of science. However, Osborn and Conklin viewed his proposal as a pathetic attempt to destroy science by emphasizing differences of opinion about the causes of evolution and by driving a wedge between science and religion.

A second conclusion is that in the future; SDA scientists and theologians can make a significant contribution to contemporary science and theology as they have done in the past. (Numbers discusses the influence of SDAs and the SDA Geoscience Research Institute in his book *The Creationists* [New York: Knopf, 1992], 72-101, 290-298). To this end, SDAs would do well to deal with the issue of the nature of science. If science, by definition, is exclusive of theological explanations, evolution may be the best available explanation of the existence of life on planet earth. However, if the biblical doctrine of creation is true, then a purely natural explanation of life will prove to be impossible.

Third, the creation-evolution debates seem to have been motivated by contrary views on the relations of science and theology. John Puddefoot opines that "in its premodern-childhood science presupposed divine authority; in its modern-adolescence science rebelled against arbitrary authority; and in its postmodern-adulthood science may again recognize the legitimacy of Divine authority and the value of the concept of creation ("Faith's Third Age, Theology and Science in the Third Millennium," *Colloquium* 27 [1995]: 109-128). This offers hope that creation-evolution debates may be replaced, in time, by a more genuine science-theology dialogue. This could lead to a more harmonious reevaluation of the data that is presently being interpreted in very different ways by evolutionists and creationists.

550 Maplewood Ct. H64
Berrien Springs, MI 49103

MARTIN HANNA

O'Collins, Gerald. *Christology: A Biblical, Historical, and Systematic Study of Jesus*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995. 333 pp. Paper, \$18.95.

Gerald O'Collins, is professor of systematic and fundamental theology at the Pontifical Gregorian University in Rome. A prolific writer, he has written during the last 25 years or so in such works as *Foundations of Theology* (1971), *What Are They Saying About the Resurrection?* (1978), *The Easter Jesus* (1980), *Interpreting Jesus* (1983), *Fundamental Theology* (1981), *Interpreting the Resurrection* (1986), *Jesus Risen* (1987), *Jesus Today* (1986), *Newman After a Hundred Years* (1990), *Retrieving Fundamental Theology* (1993), *The Resurrection of Jesus Christ: Some Contemporary Issues* (1993), and numerous articles, in both encyclopedias and theological journals.

O'Collins's *Christology* finds its primary interpretative key in the resurrection of the crucified Jesus and in his presence (vii). The theme of Christ's "presence" permeates the whole book and is the subject of the last chapter, "The Possibilities of Presence." Rooted in the dogma of transubstantiation, O'Collins refers to his as a *Christology* of "presence."

O'Collins devotes nine chapters to exploring and reviewing the christological controversies and formulations that made necessary the early ecumenical Councils of Nicaea I (325), Constantinople I (381), Ephesus (431), and Chalcedon (451). But he refers to the decisions of those great, ecclesiastical councils only after exploring the biblical backgrounds of *Christology* in both the OT and the NT.

O'Collins begins his book by answering "Some Major Challenges" to the knowledge of Christ—serious "historical, philosophical and linguistic considerations" (1). Chapters 2 ("The Background") and 3 ("The Human History") offer a review of the historico-theological information about Christ provided in the Bible. Chapter 4, on the resurrection, completes the survey of biblical data about Jesus. Chapters 5 and 6 explore some of Christ's titles that point to the mysterious combination of his divinity and humanity, such as Son of God, Lord, Savior, God, and Spirit—titles and names through which the "NT Christians explicated their faith that 'the fullness of divinity' dwelt/dwells in Jesus (Col 2:9)" (135). The next three chapters (chap. 7, "To the First Council of Constantinople"; chap. 8, "Ephesus, Chalcedon, and Beyond"; and chap. 9,