The above review refers to the *New Historical Atlas* as an edition of Gaustad's original work. There is a sense in which that label is true, since the latest version builds upon Gaustad's original format. But there also is a sense in which the label is false. After all, the entire text has been rewritten, and the book has so much fresh coverage that it truly deserves its revised title.

For all of its excellent contributions, the volume is not without its faults. At times, the colors representing such things as denominational institutions are so close together in tone as to make the illustrations difficult to interpret. But given the complexity of the material, there is probably no way to escape some of these technical problems.

On another level, the authors of any such volume are faced with the issue that many things of importance simply cannot be quantified. This problem is, of course, beyond the control of all researchers. And in spite of this inherent limitation, the authors show that a great deal can be learned from the quantification and mapping of those entities that exist in visible and quantifiable form.

Gaustad, Barlow, and Dishno have provided students of American religion with an indispensable reference work that will need to be consulted by all those in the foreseeable future who seek to grasp the shape of American religious history or the contour of any of its various constituent parts.

Andrews University GEORGE R. KNIGHT

Giberson, Karl W., and Donald A. Yerxa. *Species of Origins: America's Search for a Creation Story.* Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2002. 277 pp. Paperback, $24.95.

American academics are writing books about the creation-versus-evolution debate at a furious pace. Most of these books take one position or the other and argue for its validity, but Giberson and Yerxa take a different approach in *Species of Origins: America's Search for a Creation Story.* Instead of arguing for or against creation, they follow the lead of Moreland and Reynolds in *Three Views on Creation and Evolution* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1999), attempting to document what the different positions are. Giberson and Yerxa do make an argument, but it is not that one position is correct; rather they seek to convince the reader that both creationism and Darwinism offer strong arguments, especially when taken within the context of the worldviews from which they spring.

Early chapters of *Species of Origins* present in stark contrast classical Darwinian and creationist positions. The middle chapters present what Giberson and Yerxa call "via media" positions that seek to reconcile differences between Darwinism and creationism. These "via media" positions include theistic evolution, the day-age model, and others, but the primary focus is on theistic evolution. The final chapters deal with Intelligent Design (ID), exploring the arguments and reactions to ID publications with special emphasis on those written by William Dembski and Michael Behe. Included in these chapters is a concise history of the ID

movement, along with several uncritically presented counter arguments made by opponents of ID including Ken Miller and Howard VanTill.

Trying to present all sides of an argument without bias, as Giberson and Yerxa attempt, may make the authors appear ignorant of problems in the claims they are documenting. This is a problem in *Species of Origins*, in fact, so much latitude is given to all positions that false claims are treated as factual. This is particularly true in the first few chapters and especially so in those chapters in which the "modern creation story" (Darwinism) is presented. Two errors of fact illustrate this problem. According to Giberson and Yerxa, "there is nothing particularly unique about the chemicals or the coding on which DNA is based, [*sic*] most researchers are convinced that comparable codes could easily have been constructed in other ways" (29). This is nonsense. A significant body of peer-reviewed scientific literature exists on the unique chemistry of DNA and the elegant way in which the genetic code appears to have either evolved or been designed to mitigate, among other things, the impact of mutations (cf. S. J. Freeland, R. D. Knight, L. F. Landweber, and L. D. Hurst, "Early Fixation of an Optimal Genetic Code," *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 17/4 [2000]: 511-518). In the course of my professional career, I have never met a colleague who believed that "comparable codes could easily have been constructed in other ways." In the next sentence, the claim is made that "we find no examples of alternate codes." Currently the National Center for Biotechnology Information (NCBI) lists seventeen different genetic codes (http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov). These different codes represent small but important variations from the "standard" genetic code found in most familiar organisms.

In *Species of Origins*, a description of modern Darwinism is given that is so sharply drawn and riddled with unqualified statements that the final product gives a warped impression of the clarity and factual basis of evolutionary theory. Unfortunately, it is not only "scientific" facts that are misrepresented. Although Yerxa is a professor of history at Eastern Nazarene College, there are a number of historical errors. These appear to be concentrated in chapters outlining the creationist position and, while they may be minor, are presented in such a way that it appears as if they originate in the writings of Henry Morris. For example, "Morris believes that Charles Darwin gets far too much credit for the triumph of evolution. . . . And the publication in 1859 of his *The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection* was followed by a 'relentless evolutionary propaganda campaign' by Julian Huxley, Ernst Haeckel, Herbert Spencer, and others that soon converted most of the world to 'evolutionism'" (107). The problem with this quote is that Julian Huxley (1887-1975) was not alive in 1859 when *The Origin of Species* was first published. It seems far more probable that the authors were thinking of Thomas Henry Huxley (1825-1895), Julian's grandfather, who was known as "Darwin's Bulldog" due to his enthusiastic promotion of Darwin's ideas. How unfortunate that confusion of this sort is put in the mouth of Morris, who may or may not be wrong in the conclusions he draws, but certainly knows the difference between Thomas and Julian Huxley.

Another example that illustrates the problem with muddled history is on the next page (108), where the authors present Morris's argument about the ancient Babylonian king Nimrod as a possible early proponent of ideas related to evolution. Giberson and Yerxa state: "However, like Darwin some three millennia later, Nimrod was just a link in the great chain" (108). It may be that the authors embrace an extremely short-age view of history, but most authorities, including Morris, would put Nimrod at least four millennia before Darwin.

Errors and confusion in the first five chapters of *Species of Origins* sap one's motivation to read on. This is compounded by the distinct impression one gets that the authors didn't do their homework on creationism. It appears that they read one three-volume work, *The Modern Creation Trilogy*, by Morris, concentrating primarily on his concerns about the impact of evolution on society, and left it at that. In addition, the tone is grating, with numerous unqualified statements such as "*all* the data considered solid by the scientific community—astronomical measurements on stars, geological measurements of rock strata, radioactive dating of rocks, and evolutionary reconstructions of the history of life on the planet—converge on this calculation [that the earth is about five billion years old]" (emphasis original). Most informed people realize that no idea in science accounts for *all* the solid data; there are always outlying points that must be accounted for in some way or ignored.

Readers who give up on *Species of Origins* in the first few chapters will miss out on the significantly better last five chapters. These chapters explore attempts to reconcile views held by the "Council of Despair" (as Giberson and Yerxa call those who employ evolution to advocate a meaningless outlook on life) with those who believe meaning arises from man's status as creations in the image of God. Their somewhat dismal view is that reconciliation should be possible, but it is unlikely. A vague attempt is made to put a positive spin on this by suggesting that diversity in outlook may somehow be good, but no reason is given for why this should be so. Those who agree with them about the inability to reconcile these views are left wondering why these views should be reconcilable.

Species of Origins may be of interest to those exploring different views on the origin of life, particularly human life. Unfortunately, possibly due to the authors' efforts to make an uncritical presentation of the various views, numerous errors of fact are scattered throughout the text, especially in the early chapters. This, combined with an apparent lack of serious research into creationist thinking and vague pop presentation of Darwinism, make this book difficult to recommend.

Geoscience Research Institute TIMOTHY G. STANDISH
Loma Linda, California

Hoehner, Harold W. *Ephesians: An Exegetical Commentary.* Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002. xxx + 930 pp. Hardcover. $54.99.

Harold Hoehner, veteran New Testament professor at Dallas Theological Seminary, has labored long and hard to produce a magisterial commentary on