

the most valuable sections of the book are the detailed history of scholarship (chapter 1) and the critical examination of Paul's rhetorical argument in Galatians (chapter 4). The careful and well-balanced analysis offered in chapter 4 sheds a good deal of light on the problem of how Paul addressed key doctrinal issues without causing division within the community.

Some may want to criticize Lewis for his creation of the neo-logism "theo-ethical reasoning." The author might also be accused of engaging in contemporary theological and ethical debate rather than a historical reconstruction of Pauline theology and ethics. However, this does not appear to be so. Throughout his exegesis of 1 Corinthians and Galatians, Lewis repeatedly shows how Paul's theological and ethical arguments have been fused together, arguing that one cannot exist without the other. According to Lewis' reading of Paul, believers are exhorted to engage in both theological and ethical reflection.

In short, the author's study offers a fresh perspective into this important relationship between doctrine and praxis in Christian communities. The interaction with the secondary literature is impressive and anyone studying 1 Corinthians or Galatians would benefit from his balanced and careful exegesis of these epistles. Moreover, his groundbreaking work opens the door for further inquiry. For example, what role does cognition language itself play in the apostle's theological and ethical arguments? Romans 12.1-2 is one of the most well known and often quoted passages among Christians. Here, the apostle urges believers to resist the world's way of thinking and "be transformed by the renewing of your mind." Scholars readily agree that the passage serves as a kind of rhetorical bridge, linking the more theological portion of Romans (chapters 1-11) to the more ethical section (chapters 12-16). In a word, the passage is important for understanding how Paul's theology relates to his ethics. Lewis deals with this passage only briefly in his concluding chapter thereby paving the way for further investigation of Romans and other letters like Philippians and Colossians where cognition terminology is frequently found.

Lee S. Bond, Aberdeen, Scotland

The Birth of Satan: Tracing the Devil's Biblical Roots

T. J. Wray and Gregory Mobley

New York: Palgrave Macmillan,

2005, 203 pages, £14.99

ISBN: 1-4039-6933-7

SUMMARY

This book provides an introduction to the development of Satan throughout history. It holds that monotheism is unstable since it presents God as the author of evil; thus, the Jews

developed Satan to exonerate God. The book assumes the only way the Jews could free God from evil was to blame the devil. It overemphasises the similarities between the Jewish idea of Satan and that of her neighbours, and does not address the role of evil powers as agents of God in the NT. This book, however, would serve as a beneficial introduction and summary.

RÉSUMÉ

Ce livre cherche à reconstruire l'histoire de l'élaboration des conceptions concernant Satan. Les auteurs tiennent le monothéisme pour une conception instable parce qu'elle présenterait Dieu comme l'auteur du mal. C'est d'après eux pour cela que les Juifs ont développé une doctrine de Satan, pour exonérer Dieu. Ils présupposent que la seule manière pour les Juifs d'ôter à Dieu la responsabilité du mal était de l'imputer au diable. Ils ont tendance à exagérer les ressemblances entre l'idée juive de Satan et les idées des peuples voisins. Ils ne traitent pas du rôle d'agents de Dieu attribué aux puissances mauvaises par le Nouveau Testament. On trouvera cependant dans ce livre une introduction et un résumé utiles.

ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

Dieses Buch bietet eine Einführung in die geschichtliche Entwicklung der Satansfigur. Es vertritt die Ansicht, Monotheismus sei instabil, da er Gott als Urheber des Bösen präsentiert; daher entwickelten die Juden Satan, um Gott zu entlasten. Das Buch nimmt an, dass der einzige Weg, Gott vom Bösen zu befreien, darin bestand, dem Teufel die Schuld zu geben. Es betont die Ähnlichkeiten zwischen jüdischen und benachbarten Ansichten über Satan zu stark, und es behandelt nicht die Rolle der bösen Mächte als Werkzeuge Gottes im NT. Dennoch kann das Buch als eine nützliche Einführung und Zusammenfassung dienen.

* * * * *

"Satan. As children, we feared him; . . . but as scholars, we understand him." Thus say Wray and Mobley as they share this understanding, which is in reaction to traditions that used Satan to scare the laity. The authors target a popular audience, one made up of anyone who 'has ever been afraid of the devil'. To reach this audience, they include personal testimonies, entertaining comments, and modern illustrations. Moreover, the authors provide an introduction to the authorship, formation, structure and context of the Bible. Next, they deal with the nature of God in the OT, followed by a treatment of the nature of Satan. Before examining the role of the devil in the NT, the authors discuss the influence of Israel's neighbours upon the idea of Satan and the evidence of this influence as found in extracanonical literature. The authors also provide an excursus on the development of hell. The last chapter entitled "Why Satan matters," primarily serves a summary of the previous chapters.

The book is a repackaging of arguments by authors such as N. Forsyth, E. Pagels, and J.B. Russell. In short, Wray and Mobley endorse the argument that there was a development of the devil in the Bible which parallels the

increase and "triumph" of monotheism over henotheism and polytheism in Israel. According to the book, monotheism is unstable since it presents God as the author of evil. Thus, Satan was developed "to relieve God from the duty of evil." Only after centuries of 'relieving God' of this duty by "priestly and prophetic stylists" is God now "presentable in polite company." This development reached a climax during the period of Second Temple Judaism when the Jews borrowed the idea of wicked powers from their neighbours. Thus, by the time one reaches the NT, God is exonerated since evil is now blamed solely on the figure of Satan, who sums up all the other wicked powers in extracanonical literature. The authors conclude then that the Satan in the bible was an *ad hoc* explanation for evil. They do not know whether he is real, only that the one in the bible is *not* him; nevertheless, they encourage the reader to hold on to these passages as parables which demonstrate that although evil moves in the world, it is always opposed by good.

Several comments should be made in response to this book. First, the book gives the impression that the only way the Jews could free God from evil was to blame the devil, and thus, there was a monolithic move among the Jews to find a scapegoat. Even if, however, all Jews felt a need to free God from blame – rather than embracing the mystery of God – the invention of Satan was not the only way to do this. Instead, there are passages which place the blame on wicked people and free choice. Second, in light of synecdoche, one must question the validity of the conjecture that phrases such as the hand of God and sword of the Lord were early attempts to distance God from evil. Next, in the discussions of foreign philosophical influence on the Jewish idea of evil, the authors over-emphasise the similarities. In doing so, they depict the Jewish belief as containing no original thought. Moreover, the conclusion that Satan is no longer an agent of God in the NT is not so clear. For example, in 2 Cor. 12.7, Paul tells how God used Satan for divine purposes. To be fair, the authors do admit this in one line; yet, they did not feel the need to elaborate on that which muddles their thesis. Another unaddressed issue is the problem which results in placing all blame on Satan, namely, the extent of divine sovereignty: if Satan is not an agent of God, then why doesn't God destroy him?

It is unfortunate that some have been abused by manipulative presentations of Satan; but, if the goal was to relieve the audience of fears stemming from this abuse, why dismiss the Satan of the bible. There, he is not so much to be feared as resisted and is one who flees before those who submit to God while counting his days before he is crushed beneath them. Rather than focusing on the speculative birth of Satan, it seems a better strategy would have been to focus on his definitive defeat. Despite the above critiques, this book would serve as a beneficial introduction to 'Satan', summary of works about him, and catalyst for conversation.

J.R. Dodson, *The University of Tübingen*

*Divine Freedom and the Doctrine of the
Immanent Trinity
In Dialogue with Karl Barth and Contemporary
Theology*

Paul D. Molnar

London: T&T Clark Ltd, 2002, v + 357 pp.,

£19.99, pb, ISBN 0-567-04134-4

SUMMARY

As the title suggests, Molnar's concern in this work is the freedom of God, especially in relation to the immanent Trinity. Molnar's basic premise is to uphold God's freedom by revealing the need for a properly conceived doctrine of the immanent Trinity, and by combating the frequently used starting point for formulating such a doctrine, that of human experience. The works of Barth and T. F. Torrance are extensively used in opposition to a broad range of theologians' works on the subject, and in particular, the work of Karl Rahner. Rahner's axiom that 'the immanent Trinity is strictly identical with the economic Trinity and vice versa,' (xi) is questioned in regard to whether or not it can truly respect God's freedom. Molnar contends that God is free, as Father, Son and Holy Spirit, apart from creation, pre-creation and eternally.

RÉSUMÉ

Comme son titre l'indique, ce livre porte sur la question de la liberté divine, en particulier dans son rapport avec la Trinité immanente. Molnar part de la volonté de maintenir la liberté divine en montrant que cela nécessite une doctrine de la Trinité immanente adéquate. Il rejette pour cela le point de départ couramment adopté pour formuler une telle doctrine, celui de l'expérience humaine. Il fait largement appel à l'œuvre de Barth et à celle de T.F. Torrance pour s'opposer à d'autres théologiens qui ont écrit sur le sujet, en particulier Karl Rahner. Il conteste que l'axiome rahnérien selon lequel « la Trinité immanente est strictement identique à la Trinité économique et vice versa » soit à même de faire réellement toute sa place à la liberté divine. Molnar soutient que Dieu est libre, en tant que Père, Fils et Saint-Esprit, indépendamment de la création, de la pré-crétion et éternellement.

ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

Wie der Titel nahe legt, beschäftigt sich Molnar in diesem Werk mit der Freiheit Gottes, insbesondere in Beziehung zur immanenten Trinität. Molnars grundlegende Prämisse besteht darin, an Gottes Freiheit durch die Offenbarung des Bedürfnisses nach einer angemessen konzipierten Lehre über die immanente Trinität festzuhalten. Außerdem bekämpft er die menschliche Erfahrung als oft benutzten Startpunkt einer solchen Lehre. Die Arbeiten Barths und von T. F. Torrance werden ausführlich in Opposition zu einer großen Bandbreite an Werken anderer Theologen zum Thema genutzt. Insbesondere wird das Werk Karl Rahners und dessen Axiom, "die immanente Trinität sei streng identisch mit der ökonomischen Trinität und umge-