continuing debate within Adventism and provides a fair, balanced, and objective analysis of the controversy, though some may take exception to this appraisal.

Third, Knight's annotations to the 1957 text, sprinkled throughout the book, provide further background information, clarification of terms, criticism of theological concepts and expressions, and updated understanding of doctrines. As can be expected, the most extensive annotations are reserved for the most controversial portions of the text—those that discuss the Trinity, the divine and human natures of Christ, and the atonement. On the whole, the annotations reveal Knight's laudable—and successful—attempt at providing a fair and honest analysis of these hotly debated issues. Though his personal theological leanings are by no means sympathetic to Andreasen and his last-generation theology, Knight is admirably even-handed in his critique of Andreasen's reactions to the book's treatment of the doctrines of the atonement and the human nature of Christ. In the end, what he offers through these annotations is restoration of the theological balance that was lacking in the original edition and a corrective to the self-contradictory stances that Andreasen took in reaction to Questions on Doctrine (though contemporary followers of Andreasen, no doubt, would disagree with this assessment).

The contribution that this new edition makes to the ongoing theological discussions within Adventism would have been further magnified, had more annotations been supplied for those chapters that were not yet controversial in the 1950s but became important in the ensuing decades. One example would be the section on prophecy, Dan 8 and 9, and the 2,300 days. Though Knight does not ignore the section altogether, he could certainly have elaborated much more on the issues that would become key points of debate among Adventist scholars since Desmond Ford's public questioning of the validity of the traditional Adventist interpretation of apocalyptic prophecies. Other sections that could have benefited from the annotator's attention are the chapters on Ellen White's writings and the remnant church. These are two other "hot potato" issues that have figured prominently since the 1970s. A nod to these more recent developments, which he does not avoid making in several other places, would have been helpful. However, this being said, it should be recognized that Knight's primary interest lay in the issues that have become controversial as a result of the publication of Questions on Doctrine.

All in all, the republished, annotated edition of Questions on Doctrine helps readers gain a more mature, nuanced view of the doctrinal controversy that proceeded from the original publication. Clearly, it is a volume that must be consulted and referenced by anyone seeking a deeper understanding of contemporary Adventist theology. Pacific Union College

Julius Nam


Everything about this book is massive. It has 528 pages even with a smaller print font, and weighs 1.7 pounds! There are three editors overseeing twenty-nine chapters. Contributors include Ruth Tucker, Walter Liesfield, the late Stanley Grenz, Roger Nicole, William Webb, and Alvera Mickelsen. This line-up requires five pages just to introduce all the authors with their academic profiles.

The volume is a "long read." There is no "fluff" or padding, where one can let go of the argument and relax. Each chapter is carefully thought out and presents a
necessary aspect undergirding and/or explaining the position the editors seek to
demonstrate on this still hotly-debated topic of the role of women in the church. In
fact, it is the first comprehensive scholarly collection of essays from an egalitarian
perspective published in North America in the last three decades.

The book probes a wide range of issues: biblical, theological, historical,
hermeneutical, and practical. One finds a whole gamut of thought regarding the roles
of men and women, whether in the church, the home, or society at large. Editors
Pierce, Groothuis, and Fee have carried out an extraordinary task editing this much-
needed volume that, among other things, vanquishes arguments that women in ministry
are defying God’s mandate in Scripture. The position of universal gender hierarchy is
shown to be unscriptural, and thus erroneous and even detrimental to the church. In
so doing, the reader is forced to confront the presuppositions or grid with which they
interpret the Holy Writ.

Discovering Biblical Equality helpfully provides a single resource that covers the main
issues and arguments for biblical equality. It can also be seen as a (nonpolemic)
response to Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: Reaffirming the Patriarchy, edited by
Wayne Grudem and John F. Piper, which argues on the other side of the debate.
Interestingly, even the cover designs of the two books are similar, except for color.

Careful arrangement of the chapters helpfully organizes the tome’s broad themes:
“Setting the Stage (The Historical Backdrop),” “Looking to Scripture (The Biblical
Text),” “Thinking it Through (Logical and Theological Perspectives),” “Addressing the
Issues (Hermeneutical and Cultural),” “Living it Out (Practical Applications).”

As is the case with multiauthored books, each chapter could receive comment. For
example, William Webb discusses the important “redemptive movement” hermeneutic
that is then applied by I. Howard Marshall. One of the editors, Gordon Fee, in two
separate chapters tackles the much-debated Pauline passages of 1 Cor 14 and Gal 3:26-
28. Editors Rebecca Groothuis and Ronald Pierce each contribute, respectively, a
chapter: “Equal in Being, Unequal in Role” and “Contemporary Evangelicals for
Gender Equality,” respectively. One also finds chapters on abortion, abuse, and even
homosexuality. This is significant since the hierarchical-complementarian position
argues that defending egalitarianism leads consequentially to acceptance of
homosexuality. However, these authors show that the Bible itself treats these two issues
in diametrically different ways.

The many contributors take a consistent stand on “complementarity without
hierarchy,” as might be expected. However, there is more than one alternative for the
roles of men and women, both in marriage and in the church. There is no suggestion
of a third possibility for understanding the position of Scripture on this discussion.
Since the fall (Gen 3), with its radical results of sin, God revealed in the Garden a way
for husbands and wives, both now with sinful natures, to maintain unity in the home,
yet never voiding the Edenic ideal. The husband carries the responsibility to shield and
protect his wife and the home. Even Paul argues for this role for the husband in the
NT. Understanding what “submission” means has always been the problem for both
OT and NT texts! However, the husband-over-wife plan is not the “model” Paul holds
up for the church. He insists that the human body, with its many parts, with Christ as
the head, is the proper analogy.

Moreover, the issue of “patriarchy” itself needs to be clarified. OT “patriarchs”
from whence comes “patriarchy,” need to be studied again. In Genesis, “submission”
was defined within these venerable families. For example, Sarah is rather assertive—she
is the one who suggests Hagar to Abraham. In the next generation, the scriptural record
includes much more detail about Rebekah than Isaac, the patriarch. And again, she is
assertive and vigorous. Yes, the patriarchal system grew abusive, but that came later in Israel with the monarchy (cf. Nancy Vyhmeister, ed., Women in Ministry [Berrien Springs: Andrews University Press, 1998]).

Overall, Discovering Biblical Equality is a winsome apology for the position of “complementarity without hierarchy” that honors the humanity of both sexes warmly and harmoniously. Empowered by the Spirit, both men and women in the church stand before God as full members of the “body” of Christ to pursue the ministries to which God has called and enabled them.

Andrews University

JO ANN DAVIDSON


Carl Smith, Associate Professor of History and Religion at Palm Beach Atlantic University, has tackled the knotty problem of Gnostic inception. That Gnosticism existed in the early centuries of the Christian church is not disputed. But what Gnosticism is and where it came from is still a source of much debate. Last century’s discovery of the Nag Hammadi Library texts opened further opportunities to rethink Gnostic origins. Was it a distinctive Christian heresy? Was it a competitor of first-century Christianity? Or was it, perhaps, a pre-Christian folk religion traceable to Oriental roots—a popular modern solution to unanswered questions in religious studies? How should one understand the disparate ideas, writings, and practices that are lumped together under the Gnostic rubric?

As Smith sees it, Gnosticism is an anticosmic dualism between material and spiritual, between the highest God and the Creator. This spawned from Gnosticism’s close relationship with Judaism and Christianity in the late first and early second centuries. He decides that an early second-century dating for the birth of Gnosticism best ties together the historical details of the period, particularly since Egypt, following the Jewish Revolt under Trajan (115-117 C.E.), supposedly provides a ripe context for Gnosticism’s rejection of the cosmos and of the Creator God of the Hebrews. Using Jewish traditions and Scriptures, along with Greek cosmology, Gnostics devised a hermeneutic that resulted in the transposition of Jewish and Christian traditions. Smith writes:

My contention in this book is that evidence regarding the religious and intellectual milieu, geographical context, and chronological sequence of clearly gnostic teachers and documents points to an early second-century rise of the gnostic religion in the Jewish intellectual centers of North Africa. The crisis out of which Gnosticism arose was not that of the Jewish revolts of Judea; rather, it was the lesser-known revolt that originated in Cyrenaica and Egypt in 115-117 C.E. during the reign of the Roman emperor Trajan (4).

The author gives evidence of a thorough survey of secondary materials and competing theories of Gnosticism’s origins. He provides helpful charts, comparing the teachings of different early Gnostic teachers such as Simon, Menander, Cerinthus, Carpocrates, Saturninus, and Basilides. However, he links the main assertions of his case with a series of “ifs” and “it seems.” Other conjectures of Gnostic origins are merely replaced with Smith’s conjectures. Moreover, some of his various interpretations have strong alternative possibilities that weaken his case, such as where he writes that “In the line of Christian polemical writings, Paul’s letters stand as [the] earliest markers along the trajectory toward Gnosticism. Yet, there is no evidence . . . that Paul was concerned with issues related to Docetism” (155). This conjecture in Smith’s mind seems to prevent him