it is unacceptable that only a few passing remarks are made with respect to the 10-40 window, which has about 90 percent of the unreached populations of the world.

4. Theologically, it is hard to justify one contributor's claim that Christ, therefore, lies at the heart of all religions (51). Further, the author is self-contradictory since, as he rightly claims, Adventists reject the notion that all religions are parallel, or even partial, ways to salvation (51). If Christ is central to all religions then they are all equal and parallel ways to salvation.

5. Finally, as a reference tool, this book would have been greatly enhanced if each chapter or section had been furnished with a bibliography for further reading and research by the interested reader.

Kenneth Mulzac

Green, Joel B., and Max Turner, eds. *Between Two Horizons*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000. 246 pp.

Green and Turner, editors of this book, have collected articles of various authors. This work aims at establishing foundations for the Two Horizons Commentary (THC) series. The THC "seeks to reintegrate biblical exegesis with contemporary theology in the service of the church" (2). Its "general concern is with the relationship of biblical studies to the theological enterprise of the Christian church" (1). In the introductory article, "New Testament Commentary and Systematic Theology: Strangers or Friends?" Turner and Green describe the aim of the THC thus: "To address this intellectual setting [post-modernism], providing theological exposition of the text, analysis of its main contribution to biblical theology, and broader contemporary theological reflection" (11). The shift of focus from "behind the text" to "in the text" and "in front of text" approaches provides an important setting for this new task. This current interpretive situation "resists the claim of any approach to arrive at objective/absolute meaning" (8).

In chapter 2, Green describes the relationship between the two disciplines in his article: "Scripture and Theology: Uniting the Two So Long Divided." It is Green's contention that it will take more than technique, but also commitment and intentionality, to connect these two, because the gap is so wide. In chapter 3, Turner discusses the shift from the former focus to the recent focus in his article: "Historical Criticism and Theological Hermeneutics of the New Testament." The former trend in NT studies was historical criticism. Recent changes emphasize theological hermeneutics that can help church theology. To have more understanding of biblical theology, a "behind the text" approach for the study of epistles is significant, while for narratives and apocalyptic an "in the text" approach is more appropriate.

Stephen E. Fowl, in his "The Role of Authorial Intention in the Theological Interpretation of Scripture," lists reasons against limiting a text's meaning to an account of authorial intention. One of them is because this trend will not yield practical results. I would caution that ignoring or going beyond the authorial intention will produce pluralistic interpretations. For him "it is not plausible to argue that an interest in authorial intentions should be the sole or primary interest of theological interpretation" (85).

Robert W. Wall's article, "Reading the Bible from within Our Tradition: The 'Rule of Faith' in Theological Hermeneutics," sounds very similar to "Tradition, Authority, and a Christian Approach to the Bible as Scripture" by Trevor Hart. Wall proposes that "Scripture's performance as a persuasive word and enriching sacrament depends upon interpretation that contains the theological teaching of a biblical text by the church's 'Rule of Faith'" (88). This contention is based on the historical understanding that the church existed first, before the Scriptures were finalized. If we emphasize the fact that "the church has formed Scripture to form the church's theological understanding and Christian living" (95), our focus moves toward tradition. Then Christians will need just beliefs and some stories. The suggestion that "any interpretation of Scripture is now gladly received as truly Christian when it agrees with this same Rule of Faith" (98) opens a door to pluralistic interpretations.

John Christopher Thomas's "Reading the Bible from within Our Tradition: A Pentecostal Hermeneutic as Test Case" is more practical. On the one hand, Pentecostals generally have an extremely high view of Scripture because of their awareness of the immediate and direct ministry of the Holy Spirit. The reason behind this is that their church seems to have begun with a spiritual experience and only later moved to a consideration of Scripture. On the other hand, Pentecostals seem to have marginalized the place of Scripture in decision making. Thomas gives weight to the community as the major element in hermeneutics, based on Acts 15, but he also includes the role of the Holy Spirit and the biblical text. Acts 15, however, forms a poor basis for a hermeneutic by which to interpret the text, because it does not provide a case of interpreting the text. It rather provides the rules for decision making in the church. The Jerusalem Council employed a number of things, including Scripture. We cannot use Acts 15 as the basis for biblical hermeneutics. Of course, "the community can offer balance accountability, and support" (119). I believe the community can guard against rampant individualism and uncontrolled subjectivism.

In chapter 7, John Goldingay discusses "Biblical Narrative and Systematic Theology." He points out clearly that doing theology on the basis of biblical narrative requires special attention to scenes (for insights), plots (for theology). characters (God and Israel), and themes. He is right in his observation that "with biblical narrative, theological issues are the text's major concern" (127). His point is well taken when he states that "the primary concern of biblical narrative is to expound the gospel, to talk about God and what God has done" (137).

In his article "Two Testaments, One Biblical Theology," Steve Motyer assumes there is a unified "theology" to be discerned and affirmed in the Bible despite the grand variety of biblical texts and themes. He looks at four attempts: biblical theology apart from historical criticism; biblical theology arising out of historical criticism; biblical theology abstracted from history; and biblical theology founded upon a new "history," that is, narrated history (146-56). Motyer's definition of biblical theology is "creative theological discipline whereby the church seeks to hear the integrated voice of the whole Bible addressing us today" (158).

Robert W. Wall's "Canonical Context and Canonical Conversations" points out that the Christian canon is a rule and a sacrament. His contention is that "the interpreter should approach a biblical text at its ecclesial address and in light of its canonical roles for Christian formation" (166). His emphasis on theological understanding over historical reconstruction tends to diminish historical value and the original meaning of the text. If interpretation is based on R. E. Brown's historical-critical construction, as Wall accepts, we open a wide door to endorse any interpretation. Historical construction opens any possibility because it looks at the need of the community, and it allows the community to create messages for their own needs. The statement "No interpretation of Scripture can stand as a truly Christian interpretation unless it coheres to this Rule" (173)—the church's Rule of Faith—is important. But it raises questions. We ask, Which church? Is it the universal church? How do we define the church? That there are so many churches should lead us to put Scripture before the community. Because people are losing sight of the God given revelation more than ever, the present time demands that the Bible should decide Christian beliefs. If once the community decided what was Scripture, now is the time when Scripture should decide the community.

N. T. Wright's article. "The Letter to the Galatians: Exegesis and Theology" is an excellent case for bridging between exegesis and theology. He brings to the fore the relevance of the Epistle to the Galatians. He sees Paul's agenda not as the individual salvation of sinners but rather as promoting fellowship between Jewish and Gentile Christians. In Luther's agenda, however, justification by faith was more important.

Green's afterword, "Rethinking, History (and Theology)," concludes with the idea that, since there is Scripture for Christians, the shape of the Christian church will not change much over time. There can be different ways of understanding Scripture, but the differences will not be too big to manage.

I feel that the attempt of the editors of the THC series to reintegrate exegesis with contemporary theology in the service of the church is what many churches and scholars have already been doing sporadically. Evangelicals especially have been foremost in this endeavor, but without such a manifesto as given in this book. Despite my disagreement on certain points, and because of the determination of these writers to integrate exegesis and theology, I believe the THC series will be

beneficial to the needs of many people who would like to hear God's word anew.

Hyunsok Doh

Gregg, Steve, ed. *Revelation: Four Views: A Parallel Commentary.* Nashville: Nelson, 1997. xvi + 528 pp.

Steve Gregg is director of the Great Commission School and Good News Underground, private ministries that focus on the study of Scripture. He also teaches regularly for Youth With A Mission schools internationally. The current work is the result of his personal struggles with teaching the book of Revelation in as honest and objective a way as possible.

Although initially convinced of a particular view of the interpretation of the book, over time he began to realize that matters were not so simple and straightforward as he had imagined. He finally came to the point where he began to respect the various strengths that each of the different major interpretational methods contributes to an understanding of the book. He began to study widely in the commentaries so that he could share with his students the best arguments in favor of each of the four major approaches which he deems "credible" (1). As he culled materials from the various commentaries, Gregg found a tremendous amount of overlap between commentaries within each of the four approaches. Surprised to find that no one had compiled the four approaches into a single work so where they could be compared passage by passage, he decided to undertake the task himself.

This volume is a compendium of scholarly interpretation selected from a broad range of scholarship, mostly edited into four parallel columns representing the four major interpretational approaches, which he labels "Historicist," "Preterist," "Futurist," and "Spiritual." It does not represent Gregg's own views, but rather he attempts to fairly represent the four approaches by citing the views of scholars whom he believes are representative in each respective area. In Rev 1-3 he does not divide the commentary into parallel columns, since "there are not four distinct opinions among exegetes" (5) in interpreting the seven letters of Christ to the churches of Asia, "Though there are portions of those chapters that lend themselves more to one than to others of the four approaches" (ibid.). In Rev 20-22 he exchanges the four columns for three, representing three major millennial viewpoints, the premillennial, the amillennial, and the postmillennial, since the debate in these chapters hinges more on one's millennial perspective than on one of the four approaches used in chapters 4-19.

After his introduction to the commentary, Gregg begins his study with an introduction to the book of Revelation and an analysis of each of the four interpretational approaches. He explains why he selected the four approaches and no others. He also explains how he undertook the difficult task of classifying the