The abbreviations used for states in the footnote publication data seemed old-fashioned with no standard. Examples are: Mich., Calif., Conn., Ind., Ore., Tex., and N.J., but also Md., Id., and Ga. Most inconsistent was the use of Penn., and also Pa., (538, 544), and Ken., (477, 656), but also Ky. (512). Why not follow the standard postal two-capital-letter abbreviations? Copyright dates should be the original copyright, not reprint dates. One might think Gesenius (1988, p. 428) were still alive, as well as Berkhof (1996, p. 246). I suggest dropping the use of “etc.” on pp. 154, 286, and 351 to enhance precision.

Even with these few technical shortcomings, Gulley’s volume is to be admired, read, and pondered. I gained much from its reading and heartily recommend it to other theologians and serious students of the Word for a fine presentation of prolegomena.

Liberty University
Lynchburg, Virginia

JAMES A. BORLAND


*Prolegomena* is the introductory volume of a proposed multivolume *Systematic Theology* of the doctrines of the Christian faith. The theological orientation of this study is indicated in the “Dedication” to two great evangelical theologians, Carl F. H. Henry and Millard J. Erickson, who are described as “scholars who have stood tall in presenting Scripture as revelation.” Erickson has contributed an affirmative and gracious two-page “Foreword.” In *Systematic Theology*, Norman Gulley, Research Professor of Systematic Theology at Southern Adventist University, Collegedale, Tennessee, who studied under T. F. Torrance in Edinburgh, demonstrates a masterful command of the philosophical, hermeneutical, and theological systems of thought from the early church to the present and a marked ability to describe these in clear, concise passages of thought.

The volume commences with a seven-page “Preface,” in which Gulley points directly to God’s self-revelation in Scripture as the foundation of his system and outlines the concerns, method, and contributions of his study. *Prolegomena* is comprised of thirteen chapters which constitute a comprehensive survey of the foundational and methodological themes of systematic theology. The structure of the chapters indicates that the study is intended for, and admirably suited to, classroom use. Each chapter commences with a declaration of “Purpose,” expressed in several one-line statements. This is followed successively by a brief “Summary” section, an “Outline” of the section headings of the chapter; a brief “Conclusion,” and finally a set of “Study Questions.” There are three exhaustively complete indices—“Name,” “Scripture,” and “Subject”—some sixty pages in all. There is no bibliography, but this is not essential inasmuch as the frequent brief quotations are clearly identified in the footnotes and are readily available via the indices and would have added many pages to an already large book.

This volume, subtitled *Prolegomena*, constitutes the most extensive and detailed such treatment of which I am aware. The concept of *prolegomena*, developed and popularized by theologians of the period of Protestant orthodoxy, usually consists of a chapter or two at the beginning of a systematic theology. Generally, *prolegomena*, meaning “things said before,” have been thought of in two categories: things that must be said “previously,” called external *prolegomena*, and things that must be said “first,” or internal *prolegomena*. External *prolegomena* serve to locate and describe the theological undertaking in relationship to wider currents of thought and knowledge. Internal *prolegomena* define
the subject matter, sources, methodology, and centralizing foundation of the system that follows. Somewhat surprisingly, given the extensive prolegomena presented, Gulley gives only a brief explanation of the significance and functions of prolegomena (xxii). He does not directly differentiate between the two functions, but utilizes each as seems applicable to the particular subject under discussion. In so doing, he treats us to an extensive and detailed series of largely internal prolegomena in preparation for the scripturally based systematic theology that is to follow.

Gulley covers an amazing breadth of material—philosophical, theological, scriptural, and hermeneutical—generally in historical perspective, from the early church to the present. The first two chapters deal with philosophy and science and their relationship to and impact on theological thought; these are followed by two chapters dealing with the foundation, shape, and nature of systematic theology. There follow two chapters on general and special revelation and the place and functions of each in theological construction. The subsequent three chapters deal with the inspiration, trustworthiness, and authority of Scripture. In the following chapter, "Biblical Worldview," the outlines of the biblical cosmic controversy, which constitutes the central organizing theme of Gulley's theology, are carefully explored. The final four chapters deal with hermeneutics, in both historical and methodological perspective, and given Gulley's commitment to sola Scriptura as the propositional foundation of theology, this is the essential base of his work. Sandwiched between the chapters on Scripture and hermeneutics is a chapter with the title "The Postmodern Worldview: Its Challenge to Theology," in which a clear view of Gulley's criticisms of contemporary accommodative theologies and his own response are given.

Throughout the volume, Gulley locates, briefly outlines, and evaluates systems of thought in clear, bold lines and frequently gives brief citations that allow the masters to speak for themselves. He passes judgment on even the "greats" of history with a clear-cut boldness that is refreshing and, at times, surprising. The analyses of thought he presents—whether on philosophy, hermeneutics, or theology—are generally developed in historical perspective. This is almost as much a history of Christian doctrine as a presentation of prolegomena. The indices are somewhat like an encyclopedia; hardly a significant name or subject title is absent.

As far as I am aware, this will be the first comprehensive systematic theology written by an Adventist. Over the years, many volumes on Adventist church doctrine have been published, but no systematic theology. It thus seems of importance to inquire into the significance and meaning of the term. Gulley answers this in detail in the chapter "What Is Systematic Theology?" For Gulley, "systematic theology" means, first, that the various loci are connected and find meaning within a centralizing system; and second, that it employs a disciplined methodology and has both a rational structure and a clearly defined function. Gulley devotes a major section of this chapter to "Theology as Science." This may seem strange in an era when the word "science" conjures up thought of empirical investigation of the things of nature; however, upon reflection it would appear that the case can be sustained.

A question that naturally arises is whether this theology is addressed primarily to an Adventist or a general evangelical readership. No specifically Adventist issues are addressed in Prolegomena, and judging by the contents and issues addressed, it is located in the conservative evangelical orbit of thought. If this assessment is correct, it seems appropriate to ask what particular contributions it is intended to make. The book is published at a time when there has been an outburst of evangelical theologies, several of which have departed from the usual propositional foundationalism. First, Gulley
makes the case for a theology based on the *sola Scriptura* principle. In so doing, he appears to be concerned to call evangelical theology back to Scripture as the only propositional foundation of theology. Second, he develops a theology centered upon the biblical cosmic controversy. Here he introduces the Adventist Great Controversy theme, but develops it as a theological center that provides the most satisfactory solution to the age-old theodicy problem, for it is in this context that the love and justice of God can be most clearly explicated. Third, he seems to be concerned to demonstrate the rational validity of scripturally based answers to the challenges of postmodernism.

Some readers will doubtless ask whether, in all of this, Gulley cuts the line too fine in pressing for *sola Scriptura* as the sole foundation and authority of theology, in rigidly rejecting the *prima Scriptura* position, and whether he exaggerates the stance regarding *sola Scriptura* taken by the Reformers. Certainly, the *sola Scriptura* principle was affirmed by Luther and Calvin, but not as exclusively as Gulley seems to affirm. They were heavily dependent upon tradition—the great creeds of the early church—in the definition of doctrine, and Luther could hardly have been the exegete he was without this background. And while Gulley rigorously endorses the *sola Scriptura* principle, he is also open to the functions of tradition, reason, and experience at a secondary level. He writes: “General revelation in nature, history and the human conscience is an avenue for the working of the Holy Spirit even as particular revelation is in Scripture. . . . [G]eneral revelation is more available than particular revelation” (224). How then can he write as negatively as he does about what has come to be called the Wesleyan quadrilateral? Wesley certainly accorded supreme foundational authority to Scripture, but in addition allowed that tradition, reason, and experience were helpful sources of theological understanding. Gulley judges this “a backward step from Luther, Calvin and Turretin, and a position not much different from the Council of Trent. . . . [I]t lowered Scripture from its sovereign position. . . . What the papacy could not do at Trent, Protestants have done in the so-called Wesleyan Quadrilateral” (557). He tars the work of Fritz Guy (95, 110), Richard Rice (372, 373), and Woodrow Whidden (558, 559) with the same brush. In arriving at this position, he applies uncompromising terms such as “foundation,” “authorities,” and “bases” to the subordinate triad in the Quadrilateral, instead of the usual Wesleyan reference to them as “sources” and “vehicles” of knowledge and revelation. In thus radically downplaying the *prima Scriptura* position—which upon examination appears not to be significantly different from his own—in order to bolster a *sola Scriptura* position, he may, unfortunately, alienate some theologians who otherwise would be supportive of the case he builds for a scripturally based theology. His judgments of the work of several other theologians may have a similar effect. I cite one further instance. He categorizes the theologies of Moltmann and Pannenberg as “some of the theologies of modernity that really are secular, because in varying degrees, they reject the full authority of the written Word of God” (384).

If this deeply spiritual, solidly scripturally based *Systematic Theology* is intended to be a general evangelical theology with the Great Controversy theme as its organizing and theologically orientating center, it will serve a great purpose and provide much for which to praise God and be thankful. However, if this judgment is correct, and there is nothing in *Prolegomena* to indicate differently, then another set of questions from a specifically Adventist point of view arises. If Gulley intends this to be the systematic’s text of choice in Adventist universities and seminaries, how does he propose to bridge the gap between evangelical and Adventist theology at crucial loci? A quick mental listing of Adventist distinctives, viz., the Millerite Movement, a people of prophecy and the Three Angels’ Messages, the Spirit of Prophecy, the Sabbath and its significance, conditional
immortality, judgment, and eschatological hope, serves to indicate that in spite of a general parallelism with evangelical thought there are many distinctive differences. Gulley must have wrestled with all of this, but Prolegomena is significantly silent about anything distinctly Adventist and gives no hint regarding the manner in which he intends this study to serve his own church.

One such case of silence in Prolegomena stands out because of the central focus it gives to revelation and Scripture. In the seven chapters dealing with Scripture and hermeneutics, no reference is made to Ellen White or W. W. Prescott and the Adventist understanding of Scripture and the gift of prophecy. There is no mention of the discussions regarding inspiration and inerrancy during the decade commencing in the late 1880s, which were occasioned by W. W. Prescott’s propagation of the dictation and verbal inerrancy theory of Scripture. This view was derived from François L. Gaussen, the Swiss interpreter of Daniel and preacher of the Second Advent, who gave shape to the Adventist doctrine of Scripture and revelation (cf. Ellen G. White, “Introduction” to the Great Controversy, and letters in Selected Messages 1:14-23, and 111, Appendix C. Ellen White was actually opposed to this view). It would not seem to be possible to present an adequate concept of the Adventist understanding of the nature and functions of revelation without consideration of the discussions and decisions of this period.

As is inevitable in any large work, there are some errata:

173 Turrentin (1623–87) “sixteenth-century reformer” should be “seventeenth-century reformer.”

183, n. 136 Ibid. should relate to n. 134, not to von Rad, n. 135.

193, line 1 anknupfungspunkt should be anknupfungspunkt.

333, line 4 “Princeton was founded in 1812” should be “Princeton Theological Seminary was founded in 1812.”

370, line 10 Should be expressed “by” Isaiah.

502, nn. 213 and 216 Should include vol. 1.

524, center of page “fourth-century A.D.” should be “fourth-century B.C.”

540, line 4 “One must be realized” should be “One should realize.”

746, line 5 from Rom. 9:26 should be Rom. 11:26.

It is with considerable interest that I await the next volume to see whether, and in what way, Gulley addresses the distinctive Adventist self-understanding and doctrines. Notwithstanding these issues, Prolegomena is a mine of competently integrated and focused theology that is academically fulfilling and spiritually inspirational. I believe teachers and students using this text as a text will find the experience highly rewarding.

Andrews University

RUSSELL STAPLES


Leslie Hoppe, Professor of Old Testament Studies at Catholic Theological Union in Chicago, states in his Introduction that the purpose of this work is “to determine how the Bible can help individual believers and communities of faith shape their response to the poor and poverty today” (7). His further intent is for the reader to become “engaged