
Kenton C. Anderson is Assistant Professor of Preaching at ACTS Seminaries Northwest in Canada. Preaching With Integrity is a sequel to his book Preaching with Conviction (2001), which presented a way for preachers to write their sermons in light of this postmodern age. Like its predecessor, Preaching With Integrity is written as a narrative centered on a fictional pastor, Jack Newman. It also expands upon the integrative preaching model that was first presented in Preaching With Conviction. The purpose of the book is not only to present Anderson's integrative model for preaching, however, but to provide hope for those struggling to maintain integrity in the midst of ministry by explaining the place of one's humanity in the practice of preaching.

The book is divided into two parts. The first part of the book is a narrative in which Anderson explains the principles of the integrative method of preaching. The reader goes through a week with Jack Newman, an evangelical pastor. Jack finds out that his best friend in the ministry has had an affair. As he begins to deal with this event an earthquake hits his city, injuring his wife and destroying his church's building. In the midst of these catastrophes, Jack also has to deal with his attraction to a young woman who works for his brother. Throughout the week Jack struggles with his own humanity and integrity in his preaching. He also has to struggle with preaching a sermon that week, which is where the preaching principles enter the picture. Jack works through the four steps in integrative preaching as he writes a sermon on Heb 12:28-29: telling the story, making the point, responding to problems, and imagining the difference.

The second part explicitly presents the integrative model of preaching and then ends with a chapter on an anthropology of preaching. Anderson calls his model the "integrative" model because it brings together, or integrates, the message of Scripture and the felt needs of listeners without compromising either. Preachers must first engage listeners by explaining the story behind the text and connecting it to their story in the present day. This should be followed by a proclamation of the text's point. After explaining what the text is saying, the preacher should help the listeners work through their own natural objections to the text. Finally, preachers must help their listeners see what practical difference the Scriptures' message will make in their lives. Anderson gives a concrete example of his model by explaining how he applied it to his own sermon on Heb 12:28-29.

The last chapter of the book deals with some issues related to the humanity of the preacher. Anderson deals with these concerns under three headings: Immanence, Integrity, and Disclosure. Preachers must remember that God is immanent; preaching is something that God does, God works through human language, and God uses human beings to preach his message. Preachers must also remember that the Bible requires integrity and listeners require a godly example, but that preachers require grace in order to have integrity. Finally, our humanity can get in the way in our preaching, but it is also inescapable and the disclosure of one's self often helps in reaching people with the message.

Anderson's book is an innovative and effective presentation of a preaching method. The narrative is well-written and fun to read. It is as if the reader actually gets to be inside another preacher's head as he develops his sermon. The integrative model of preaching is also sound. It is not a detailed method, but rather a helpful way to approach the text. The brief anthropology of preaching at the end of the book is convicting and encouraging as well, and could easily be further developed with great benefit. While the primary audience of this book is preachers who are struggling with their own humanity and integrity, all preachers and teachers of the Word would profit from it. It contains a lot of practical help for beginning and maintaining a preaching ministry marked by integrity towards oneself, towards others, and towards God.

Gary L. Shultz Jr.
Stanley Goetz espouses substance dualism, which holds that people are souls, distinct from their bodies (33). Goetz explains that this has been the majority view of Christians throughout church history and is the view that the biblical writers simply assume. The soul is a substance just as the body is a substance, and a human person is made up of both substances. Goetz claims that his view is a basic belief in light of the fact that he considers himself to be a simple entity, and since the body is a complex entity he cannot be identical with his body (44). While there might be problems with understanding exactly how the body and soul interact, this is not a problem for the view because it is not empirically based (53). Goetz also argues that libertarian freedom requires that a person have a soul (57).

William Hasker is also a dualist, but he argues for emergent dualism. This view differs from substance dualism because it claims that the soul emerges from the body instead of being created for the body. Emergent dualism believes that as a consequence of the configuration and function of the brain and nervous system the mind or soul comes into being, analogous to the relationship between a magnet and a magnetic field (78). This view establishes a close connection between the body and soul and prevents the two from being split apart from one another. The make-up of human beings is an issue that touches upon all other areas of theology and life, and there are several contemporary options. Green also points out that what one believes about this subject is impacted by how one understands the relationship between Scripture, science, history, and experience (32).


In Search of the Soul is the latest in a long line of “four-views” books, which aim to present arguments for different options in different areas of doctrinal debate. This book presents four contemporary views on the constitution of human beings: substance dualism, emergent dualism, nonreductive physicalism, and the constitution view. The book is edited by Joel Green and Stuart Palmer, professors at Asbury Theological Seminary. Each contributor is a Christian philosopher and offers an essay defending his or her view and a critique of the other three positions. Joel Green begins the book with an introduction into some of the critical issues surrounding the relationship between the soul, body, mind, and brain such as the difference between human beings and animals, human freedom, and life after death. The make-up of human beings is an issue that touches upon all other areas of theology and life, and there are several contemporary options. Green also points out that what one believes about this subject is impacted by how one understands the relationship between Scripture, science, history, and experience (32).

Nancey Murphy and Kevin Corcoran both argue for views of the human constitution that deny the presence of a soul. Murphy argues for a view that she calls nonreductive physicalism. This view not only denies the presence of a soul (dualism), but also denies that physicalism entails the absence of human meaning, responsibility, and freedom (hence, nonreductive) (115). Higher human functions arise not only from brain functions but also from human social relations, cultural factors, and God’s action (116). Murphy attempts to demonstrate how her view is compatible with human responsibility and then responds to some of the most pressing philosophical objections. Corcoran’s view is similar to Murphy’s in that he believes human beings are wholly physical. He calls his view the constitution view because he believes that human beings are constituted by our bodies without being identical with them (157). Instead of defending his view philosophically like Murphy, however, he chooses to defend it against theological objections (161). Corcoran argues that his view is compatible with postmortem survival and that it is able to support a robust ethic of life. He holds his view because he rejects dualism and animalism, and because he thinks it is able to account for Scripture (176).

The book ends with a practical essay by Stuart Palmer, in which he evaluates all four of the views in light of their compatibility with the Christian practices of hospital-
ity and forgiveness. He seems to conclude that all are faulty in some way, although he appears to slightly favor the physicalist views. This chapter is an appropriate end to the book in that it attempts to tie in the views with Christianity, but it still does not cover up the lack of biblical theology in the essays. The main flaw of the book is that none of the chapters really espouse a biblically based view. Readers are also likely to conclude that none of the essays exactly fit with a biblically-based view of the world. The essays are written by four philosophers, but as a book written by a Christian publishing house for Christians it should have been more explicitly biblical.

Despite the lack of biblical foundation, this book would be helpful to any intellectually-minded Christians concerned with matters touching upon the body and soul. The book introduces several important contemporary issues about the relationship between science and theology as well as the importance of a soul and its relationship to the body. It is interesting, challenging, and relevant. Laymen, students, pastors, and even scholars not well-versed in these issues would profit from these essays.

Gary L. Shultz Jr.

*Breaking the Idols of Your Heart: How to Navigate the Temptations of Life.* By Dan Allender and Tremper Longman, Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 189pp., $15.00.

Tremper Longman and Dan Allender have teamed up on another book. Anyone who has read their other material can expect a well-written, stylishly relevant book with engaging stories, biblical exposition and application. Their latest cooperative effort has the catchy title, *Breaking the Idols of Your Heart.* The subtitle, “How to navigate the temptations of life” promises a practical and contemporary treatment of universal problems that plague all of us. Allender provides the fiction and Longman the exposition. Both authors share the same biblical perspective that is interwoven throughout the book.

Longman, of course, is a well-known Old Testament scholar, who is not only a reputable academic, but also a gifted popular writer. It is his scholarly work on Ecclesiastes however, which caused me to have some interest in his latest book with Allender. *Breaking the Idols* is a popular level work on Ecclesiastes. Each chapter begins with a captivating narrative about an arrogant, unlikable stock analyst named Noah, his unappreciated wife Joan, and Jack, a confident home Bible study leader. The chapters skillfully weave in the teaching of Ecclesiastes with vivid, well-developed characters and then conclude with some biblical principles and penetrating application. The format is inviting. The flow of the story is interesting and at times very moving. As a pastor however, it was a little disappointing that the three pastors mentioned in the narrative are despicable men (46, 64, and 139). Joan’s father is a pastor, who is a verbally abusive, ego-maniac. Another pastor covers up a man’s sin of spousal abuse and alcoholism, telling the wife to trust God and submit to her husband. Jack’s pastor runs off with the secretary! At least one godly pastor with something biblical to say might have been nice.

In spite of being very well-written and engaging, there is an underlying fundamental flaw. The flaw is where Longman’s academic work on Ecclesiastes and popular-level work intersect, overlap, and come out in the book. Longman contributed the volume on Ecclesiastes in the well-known New International Old Testament Commentary series. Of secondary concern, Longman denies Solomonic authorship. This perspective is injected early in the narrative of *Breaking the Idols* (24-25). Although I disagree with this assessment, it seems to be the main-stream view, even among most evangelicals. There is a larger problem, however. Longman sees the Teacher (Qoheleth) as “clashing with other books of the Bible” (Longman, *The Book of Ecclesiastes*, [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998], 30). He sees the Teacher as representative of skepticism, armed with a theology that is basically unorthodox. In the commentary, Longman attempts to redeem the book by an “orthodox frame narrator,” who salvages the book’s canonicity and spiritual value by adding 1:1-11 and 12:8-15 (Longman, *Ecclesiastes*, 32-39). This two author view, the unorthodox teacher (Qoheleth) and the wise man (the orthodox frame narrator), also quickly makes its way into *Breaking the Idols* (25) through the vehicle of a home Bible study. It also unambiguously and significantly reappears in
the conclusion (171ff).

The book is indeed a gripping story with much helpful biblical insight. At times the narrative captures certain elements of Ecclesiastes beautifully. But the Teacher usually only gets things “right” when he espouses his skepticism and his skepticism only appears to be “right” in a world without God (e.g., 51-52, 72-73, 151-152). Although he may nail the frustrations of life with incredible accuracy, he has no answers. The narratives are brilliantly used to paint the skewed portrait of futility and emptiness, which, unfortunately, according to the book, is the only canvas and the only colors the Teacher knows how to use (e.g., 102, 176, 179).

It is this overall view of Ecclesiastes represented in Breaking the Idols that is troublesome. The two-author/two-perspective view of Ecclesiastes is not that uncommon. But usually the book is seen as some form of on-going debate between a skeptic and a believer. Michael V. Fox rightly objects, “If the author considered it important that we recognize that another person is speaking this or that sentence, he could have let us know. But he does not” (A Time to Tear Down and a Time to Build Up, A Rereading of Ecclesiastes [Grand Rapids; Eerdmans, 1999], 20). Longman’s two-author perspective however pushes a little harder than that. Everything between the introduction and epilogue is the skeptic, spouting his canon-clashing heterodoxy. This is how Ecclesiastes is presented in the book, doing no insignificant harm to its inspired value. There are no answers in Ecclesiastes; there is only the futility and despair of life. Ecclesiastes is used in Breaking the Idols as a foil. The Teacher is actually pictured as recommending the “Novocain numbing pleasures of life” because he really doesn’t have any answers (99-102).

Longman’s and Allender’s view of Ecclesiastes sets up an inescapable antithesis between the wise man and the skeptic. The skeptic views life under the sun as life without God. Longman says, “he wrongly restricted his views to life under the sun” (179). The wise man eventually gets us past this godless view with the last few verses (e.g., 171, 176). This dialectic view of the book ends up diminishing the power of the book of Ecclesiastes as a whole. This “foil” view is a convenient way to get around enigmatic and troublesome statements. Although I certainly recognize that every interpreter must make sense of the many “problematic statements,” if we simply pigeon-hole all of the abrasive, gritty, “unorthodox” sounding statements into the category of “secularist” or “skeptic” we run the risk of missing the life-changing significance of Ecclesiastes.

The Teacher is a wisdom shock jock, who despises the easy answers, and will not let platitudes cover up the tough things in life. He is too complex to simply be a skeptic. He knows full well that life is not predictable. He knows full well the monotony and twistedness of reality. He would have known how to deal with Noah the stock analyst, Joan the unappreciated wife, and Jack the legalist. The Teacher’s observations are harsh and they sound despairing. His methods raise eyebrows. But there is a method to his madness, and his instruction is sound and God-centered, although unconventional. It is not merely “This is what life looks like without God, under the sun. Get God in your life, life above the sun, and all will be well.”

It is here where we have to listen carefully to Qoheleth. Breaking the Idols takes the hebel (“vanity”) sayings and the “under the sun” sayings and relegates them to meaninglessness and life without God. That is the Teacher’s assessment. Life is meaningless, “It is all meaningless” (162). This nihilistic insight is what he has to offer. But A. B. Caneday is right when he says, “Qoheleth’s world and life view was not fashioned according to a natural theology restricted to the affairs of men ‘under the sun’” (“Qoheleth: Enigmatic Pessimist or Godly Sage?” in Reflecting with Solomon, Selected Studies in the Book of Ecclesiastes [ed. Roy Zuck; Grand Rapids: 1994], 107). Certainly the unbelieving worldview is meaningless, but Qoheleth’s point is not necessarily to always equate an unbelieving worldview, or life without God, with “under the sun” or hebel. The believing worldview obviously has ultimate meaning, but that does not negate the hebel that we all observe, experience, and grapple with.

When Qoheleth observes life, he sees the constancy and frustration of hebel. When he instructs us about life, he points us to God. Fearing and trusting God does not make hebel any less hebel, but it gives us a rock to stand on and a viewpoint from which we can actually enjoy this crazy, tran-
sient life! Qoheleth’s worldview and theology stand as a great antidote to nihilism, utopianism, hedonism, and skepticism. The antidote is by no means sourced in a Pollyanna view of life and suffering. He will have none of that! It is rooted in a sovereign God, who is in control, even when we do not see how. His antidote succeeds where the antidotes of the culture utterly fail! Although this is where Longman and Allender often end up, it is not through a consistent view of Ecclesiastes that they get there.

Longman and Allender deal with many contemporary and relevant issues biblically and practically. Unbiblical perspectives on such potential idols as power, relationships, money, pleasure, spirituality are skillfully exposed. I found many Christ-centered truths powerfully stated. The story itself is an effective attention-getting vehicle to communicate truth. Noah, Joan, and Jack finally get out of life under the sun and enter that life with God above the sun. In other words, they abandon the skepticism of the Teacher and get to the faith of the wise man. I believe that this incorrect antithetical view of Ecclesiastes robs us of the message of Ecclesiastes.

The Teacher teaches us to live life to the full, in the midst of hebel, before the face of God! The Teacher shows us where not to go to get answers. And although he does not supply us with all of the answers, he shows where to find consolation and joy. He could have helped Noah and Joan navigate through the temptations of life without minimizing the harsh realities of life. He would have shown Noah that life, including his labor and marriage, were not achievements but gifts from God to be enjoyed. He would have also taught them where to put their hope when life does not make sense. Noah and Joan end up in the right place, trusting God without having all the answers. But Qoheleth, rightly understood, would not have simply articulated their frustrations and kicked their idols, he would have lead them to a life of faith, joy, and fear in God. Qoheleth, not merely the wise man (the frame narrator), has much more to teach Noah and Joan and all us than Longman and Allender give him credit for.

Brian Borgman
Reno, Nevada


I was very excited to see this title because I firmly believe we need to reconsider our view of pastoral ministry in light of Scripture. Thompson makes clear in his opening chapter that he shares this concern. He states well the problem in our churches of lacking a clear, biblical vision of the role and purpose of pastoral ministry. (9)

“Despite the pressures that often come from the church and society to define the minister’s role in pragmatic terms as the maintenance and growth of the institution, the answer to the question of ministerial identity... is a theological one” (11).

This is a welcome and helpful book, simply because Thompson addresses this issue head on. He examines Romans, 1-2 Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians and 1 Thessalonians taking seriously Paul’s role as a pastor of these churches and seeking to understand the pastoral vision that directs these letters. Such a study is very profitable and is a large portion of what I do in my own class on pastoral ministry.

At this point, it will be useful to point out some disagreements with Thompson. He basically works
from a more critical standpoint. His choice of letters to examine reflects his uncertainty about the Pauline authorship of other letters in the canon. He also has been convinced by the New Perspective on Paul. This informs much of his reading of Paul and leads to places where I disagree with him. However, it would be a shame to dismiss the book because of these disagreements. In spite of these limitations (in my opinion) there is much of value here.

Thompson finds that Paul’s pastoral ambition is not simply seeking converts or amassing crowds but in building communities of faithful believers. Paul’s vision is inherently corporate, not allowing for our typical emphasis on personal growth without reference to the maturing of the community itself. Thompson’s points can probably best be made with a list of quotes.

In every instance in which Paul declares his pastoral ambition, he indicates that the success or failure of his work will be determined only in the end, when he will either “boast” of his work or realize that his work has been in vain. The eschatological horizon is a central feature of Paul’s pastoral ambition.... His pastoral vision is therefore corporate and eschatological (22).

His initial evangelistic work is therefore only the beginning of a process that will not be complete until the end of time. His work will be successful only if his congregations live out the consequences of the gospel through transformed lives and are fully transformed at the coming of Christ. Thus all theology is pastoral for Paul (24).

His existence is intertwined with that of the congregation (41).

The success of his ministry rests on the transformation of the people (50).

The ultimate goal that Christ be formed among the Christians is the center of his pastoral theology (70).

Paul’s work is not only to evangelize but to participate in the transformation of the community (91).

In the fourth place, Paul’s pastoral theology is ecclesiocentric and eschatological. Ministry is not done in isolation, and the goal of the pastor is not only the well-being of the individual. The goal of ministry is to ensure that individuals discover the resources for transformation within the community and that corporate well-being is the goal of the pastor. The eschatological dimension is important insofar as we direct our corporate priorities toward the ultimate goals, recognizing that eschatology places all of the issues of congregational life in perspective. The church has seen a glimpse of the end of the narrative, when it will be transformed into the image of the Son. To be engaged in ministry is to work with God toward this goal (118).

The ultimate test for the effectiveness of our ministry cannot be measured by the standards of our culture or our peers but by whether our work survives the test (156).

To build a church on the basis of the satisfaction of consumer tastes is to retreat to the self-centeredness of the old aeon (157).

The worship service is not intended to appeal to individual consumer tastes but to build a lasting community (161).

Thompson is profoundly right on these points and our churches desperately need this message.

Lastly, Thompson’s arguments for the place of the community in Paul’s thought are often rooted in the New Perspective take on justification. However, this is not necessary. Paul clearly states the importance of the community of faith in Christian living (e.g. Ephesians 4). Thompson is right in critiquing an unhealthy individualizing tendency in American Christianity, but he is incorrect in ascribing this problem to a certain view of justification (Calvin and Luther for example are keenly aware of the necessity of the church in Christian living).

With my disagreements, this is a valuable book. More needs to be done in examining Paul’s letters (all of them) for what they tell us about pastoral ministry, but this is a welcome addition to the conversation.

Ray Van Neste
Union University
“what has changed from the first edition?” One will note that the number of editors has decreased as has the number of chapters. Missing from the 2d edition are David Gordon’s analysis of the genre of 1 Timothy, Harold O. J. Brown’s “The New Testament Against Itself: 1 Timothy 2:9-15 and the ‘Breakthrough’ of Galatians 3:28,” and the two appendices, Daniel Doriani on the history of interpretation of 1 Timothy 2 and Scott Baldwin on ancient Greek literature. As I understand it, the publisher wanted a smaller volume. I am sorry to see Doriani’s piece, particularly, left out of the second edition. I imagine it was among the more controversial pieces, but it is extremely valuable.

The second edition contains one new piece, “What Should a Woman Do in the Church? One Woman’s Personal Reflections,” by Dorothy Patterson. Furthermore, the second edition moves to end notes rather than footnotes, which is unfortunate.

The essays that remain from the first edition were, and continue to be, the heart of the book, and we are blessed by having them in updated form with interaction with the work of the last ten years. Yarbrough’s assessment of the hermeneutics involved seems to me not to have garnered the attention it deserves.

This is a reprint (with editing by Joel Beeke) of Alexander’s A Brief Compend of Bible Truth originally published in 1846. Alexander was the first professor at Princeton Theological Seminary where he served as a distinguished scholar and pastor-theologian. As Beeke and J. M. Garretson state in their preface,

Entrusted with the responsibility for organizing the seminary curriculum and implementing the seminary’s goal to provide spiritual leadership through sound learning and vital piety, Alexander became the fountainhead of Princeton’s influence on American Presbyterian churches in the first half of the nineteenth century (vi).

In other words Alexander established the tradition that was followed by C. Hodge, A. A. Hodge, B. B. Warfield and others leading to the point where Princeton was the bastion of orthodoxy exerting a powerful influence for good to many denominations.

This volume was written by Alexander to summarize the main doctrines of Christianity for “plain, common readers.” It is not therefore to be compared to other comprehensive systematic texts. Rather it is a great example of the important task of explaining the faith to the people in the pews. The fact that today this book would seem very deep to many in our pews is a reminder of our need to do more to explain doctrine to our people. There is value in speaking to the scholarly guild but there is even more value in teaching the church to know fully the basis of her faith.

This volume today will serve as a good resource for pastors and lay people. Alexander does not argue novel things in his brief chapters; rather, he provides an example of capturing the salient points in brief space. He often uses illustrations that will be helpful today. Baptists will of course differ with his discussion of baptism. His discussion of the Lord’s Supper is very helpful, however. In a day when Communion is so little appreciated Alexander articulates well the value of the Supper for us. After arguing for frequent observance he writes,

The value of the Lord’s Supper is incalculable. It is admirably adapted to our nature. It is simple, its meaning is easily apprehended by the weakest minds. It is strongly significant and impressive. It has been called an epitome of the whole gospel, as the central truths of the system, in which all the rest are implied, are here clearly exhibited. And it ever has been signally blessed to the spiritual edification and comfort of the children of God. They, therefore, who neglect this ordinance, do at the same time disobey a positive command of Christ and deprive themselves of one of the richest privileges which can be enjoyed on this side of heaven (189).

This is a useful book. Reformation Heritage Books has done the church a service in reprinting it.

Ray Van Neste
Union University