

larger typeface than its Greek, and *MLOP* suffers in comparison.

Both devotionals offer vocabulary on the Hebrew texts, but *MLOP* has vocabulary for the Greek as well. The Greek vocabulary is very helpful in the daily readings, though many readers will want more information than usually given. In general, the Greek readings in *MLOP* are longer and more difficult than those in *LOP*. Though *LOP* gave Hebrew vocabulary in German, Latin, and English, *MLOP* is an English-only text, making it less international in scope.

*MLOP* provides far less Hebrew vocabulary than *LOP*. Jer 17:7-8 is the daily reading for February 11 in *LOP* and 14.5 in *MLOP*. *LOP* provides fifteen vocabulary entries with definitions provided for each along with parsing and prefix/suffix notes. However, *MLOP* provides twelve vocabulary entries; only ten are defined, and the other two are parsed with prefix/suffix information but no definition. The vocabulary system for *MLOP* also seems less than consistent. On 13.1 the entry בִּסְפָרְתָךְ is glossed "account" with no note of prefix or suffix, but סִפְרָתְךָ is glossed as "v.2.m.s.pf.Q.plene [סִפַּר]" with no vocabulary given. The reader who is less than confident in either Greek or Hebrew will find the vocabulary helps in *MLOP* to be less than satisfying.

Finally *LOP* avoided readings in Aramaic (e.g., Dan chaps. 2-7), but *MLOP* has four readings from Daniel in Aramaic with disturbingly little vocabulary. Day 15.3 has Dan 3:21-22 for its reading, a text of five lines. However, only two terms are parsed and no definitions are given. On 51.3 the reading is Dan 7:13-14, 4 lines with one term parsed and no definitions. This is grossly insufficient information for a seminary graduate trained in Hebrew and Greek with little or no coursework in Aramaic. Many who use this devotional may wish to skip those daily readings or cheat with a translation.

Overall, there is substantial white space on almost every page of *More Light on the Path*, and some of this white space easily could have been given to a slightly larger typeface on the Hebrew texts and more vocabulary help. A devotional of this type is very helpful for those who wish to keep up their Greek and Hebrew. *Light on the Path* filled this need well. *More Light on the Path* also fills this need, but not as well as it could.

Madison, WI 53703-2678

JAMES E. MILLER

Brown, Warren S., Nancey Murphy and H. Newton Malony, eds. *Whatever Happened to the Soul? Scientific and Theological Portraits of Human Nature*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998. 272 pp. Paperback, \$19.00.

No matter how complicated the universe becomes, nothing presents us with greater challenges than trying to understand ourselves. This book makes a noteworthy contribution to the ongoing conversation between science and religion by focusing attention on the nature of human beings. In ten chapters written and edited by three faculty members at Fuller Theological Seminary, it seeks to unite the Christian understanding of human beings with various images of the human that emerge from scientific study in the areas of evolutionary biology, human genetics, and brain research.

The authors develop their argument in two directions. As they see it, scientific

investigation requires (and theological reflection allows) a view that situates human beings firmly within the material world. So, there is a physical dimension to every aspect of human experience. Consequently, they reject all forms of dualism—the idea that there is something non-physical, such as “mind” or “soul,” that connects with our physical bodies to make us human beings. At the same time, they embrace the essential Christian conviction that human beings have special significance in the cosmos. Human beings are more than sophisticated arrangements of matter or just one more biological species. Consequently, they reject reductionism. We are not simply “naked apes” or “computers made of meat.”

*Whatever Happened to the Soul?* thus espouses a view of the human that lies between dualism and reductionistic materialism. We are *fully* material—there is nothing about us that is not involved in the physical—but we are not *merely* material. So, we are something more than what science strictly requires, but something less than Christianity has traditionally claimed. To avoid both the dualism of traditional Christianity and the reductive materialism of certain scientists, its authors stake out a position they call “nonreductive physicalism.”

The book divides roughly into two parts. After an introductory overview of various philosophical and religious views of the human, chapters 2-4 examine the implications of evolutionary biology, genetic research and brain research for our understanding of the human. In two pivotal chapters Brown and Murphy argue against the reductionism that some thinkers infer from such investigations. Then three religious thinkers explore nonreductive physicalism from biblical, theological and moral perspectives. Brown provides a concluding chapter.

It is not easy to fight a battle on two fronts, or pursue a conversation with two partners at the same time. And in the final analysis it is not clear that the two phases of the discussion unite to form a single, coherent portrait of the human. But the authors make important strides in that direction and offer a number of valuable insights along the way. One is the relational character of human existence. In a beautifully written essay, Joel B. Green shows that for the biblical writers, the distinctive quality of humanity, the image of God, consists not in a unique possession, such as a soul, but in a unique capacity for partnership with God, companionship with others, and relation to the entire cosmos (157). In other words, we are human, not as “individuals,” but only as *persons in community*. On the philosophical level, the notions of “emergence” and “supervenience” provide helpful strategies for showing that human beings can be “more” than merely physical even though we are inextricably embedded in material reality.

Whether there is enough here to convince those on either side of the argument is problematic, of course. Many scientists will no doubt want more information before allowing humans the distinctive place in the cosmos that religion accords them. And conservative Christians, in particular, will question the compatibility of traditional anthropological notions with any scientifically derived view of humanity.

In many ways, the book is a prolegomenon to further study. An obvious implication of non-reductive physicalism is the importance of corporeal existence. Once it is clear that human beings exist only in bodily form, indeed, that we *are* bodies, how shall we understand and interpret our corporeal selves and lives? The

rejection of both dualism and reductionism also raises profound questions about human destiny, and while there are a few references to the resurrection of the body, this concept is relatively unexplored.

Although there is much more to be said on the topics they raise, these essays join to form a helpful line of thought that all parties in the discussion can learn from.

Loma Linda University  
Loma Linda, CA 92350

RICHARD RICE

Buchanan, George Wesley. *The Gospel of Matthew*. Mellen Biblical Commentary. New Testament Series, vol. 1. Lewiston: Mellon Biblical Press, 1996. 536 pp. Hardcover, \$119.95.

Buchanan sums up the results of the research reflected throughout his commentary with the words: "The author of the Gospel according to Matthew probably designed the Gospel as a literary form. Based on the Hexateuch type, the author took all the sources that were available to him and organized them as closely as possible to the first six books of the Bible" (1034). In other words, Matthew was the first Gospel written, and he patterned his book on Genesis through Joshua. The parallels to the Hexateuch are important to Buchanan's approach to the Gospel, as is indicated by the fact that the commentary on eighteen of the first twenty-one chapters are introduced with an explicit section, "Matthean parallels to the Hexateuch" (the exceptions are chaps. 6, 9, and 10). The point of the parallels to the Hexateuch is revealed in the cyclical nature of ancient thought: like Israel of old, Christians were about to be delivered from the Romans (the equivalent of the Egyptians and Babylonians) and were poised on the brink of the kingdom of God.

The method of commentary explicitly adopted by Buchanan is that of intertextuality. On several occasions he rejects the need to make reference to hypothetical documents such as Q or ur-Markus. Instead, he makes extensive reference to known sources: the first Testament, which comprises both the MT and the Pseudepigrapha. The commentary frequently provides parallel columns of various passages for comparison. The Gospel of Matthew frequently shows the characteristics of either homiletical or narrative midrashim. The parallel texts show the way that the Gospel of Matthew is built on the earlier narratives.

In many ways this is a highly individualistic commentary; indeed, in some respects it might be fair to describe it as idiosyncratic. For example, the commentary is based on Sinaiticus rather than any modern eclectic text such as that of Nestle or the United Bible Societies (44); it uses the abbreviations IA and BIA (international age, before international age) rather than C.E. or B.C.E. (47-49); it transliterates the tetragrammaton as Yahowah rather than Yahweh (50), and so on. Furthermore, it uses underlining rather than italics, which are otherwise universally adopted in printed materials. At times, too, the style is more related to that of a notebook than a coherent commentary. Sometimes material appears under a heading with little help given to the reader to work out how it fits into the larger scheme of things. One notable example is the listing of geographical sites in Matthew given on p. 47. They are just listed, without any comment on their significance, or any apparent connection with the paragraph that goes before (dealing with the principle of discontinuity as a mark of the authenticity of a saying attributed to Jesus), or the one after