

## Book Reviews

*Understanding Biblical Theology: A Comparison of Theory and Practice*. By Edward W. Klink III and Darian R. Lockett. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2012. 193 pages. \$17.99 (paper).  
doi: 10.1017/hor.2014.36

This is a valuable taxonomy of five major approaches to biblical theology. The objectives of the methods under consideration fall along a spectrum between history and theology, while the goals are directed at audiences situated between the academy and the church. Each of the five parts of this book has two chapters: a chapter that describes the approach, followed by a second chapter with a brief analysis of how the work of one scholar is illustrative of the approach. The five sections consider (1) biblical theology as historical description exemplified by James Barr, (2) the history of redemption represented by D. A. Carson, (3) worldview-story illustrated by N. T. Wright, (4) the canonical approach as developed by Brevard Childs, and (5) theological construction illustrated by Francis Watson. A conclusion includes a superb summary chart of the analyses of these five approaches appearing over four pages at the end of the text. Modest subject and author indexes follow.

The introduction explains how the authors seek to clarify the confusing differences among scholars who claim to be practicing biblical theology. These differences are identified, in turn, as varying ways to relate the Old and New Testaments, to adjudicate historical diversity with theological unity, and to incorporate or ignore noncanonical writings. Each of the chapters describing a method examines how that method considers (a) the task of biblical theology, (b) the use of biblical theology, (c) the scope and sources of biblical theology, (d) the hermeneutical approach of biblical theology, and (e) the subject matter of biblical theology. Moving through the text one finds that one method or one author's approach is often contrasted with others, which is helpful to solidify an understanding of the differences being stressed. At times, however, some may find the explanations overly repetitive and may discover a degree of redundancy in the explanations of categories.

While serious biblical scholarship crosses the spectrum of Christianity (Orthodox, Catholic, Anglican, Protestant), insofar as I am aware, only John J. Collins, who is mentioned in this study, is Catholic. Readers of *Horizons*

will be disappointed that Catholic scholars were not given more consideration. All the authorities profiled represent traditions that stem from the Protestant Reformation; three are British, two North American. In a study of how some concern for “the church” is a goal for all biblical scholars except those who consider biblical theology exclusively as historical reconstruction, one might ask whom and what the authors mean by “the church,” which they define by the Vatican II designation “people of God.” There is no real mention of how any of these approaches has a living impact on the church. For example, Sunday lectionaries (e.g., the Roman Catholic Lectionary and the Revised Common Lectionary) are designed as an expression of salvation history.

Despite these moderate concerns, it is really not this reviewer’s intention to take the authors to task for what they did not consider to include. I will affirm that this book should be part of every library supporting religious or theological studies. Although I do not believe this study will be accessible to most undergraduates, it will be extraordinarily helpful to graduate students in biblical studies preparing for qualifying exams. It will also be helpful to scholars who wish to clarify their appreciation of the various strategies of interpretation.

REGINA A. BOISCLAIR  
*Alaska Pacific University*

*The Eclipse and Recovery of Beauty: A Lonergan Approach.* By John D. Dadosky. Buffalo, NY: University of Toronto Press, 2014. xv + 255 pages. \$65.00.

doi: 10.1017/hor.2014.37

It is a rare treat to read a book with a title that so clearly captures the very purpose of the book. This book with this title does just that. For those whose eyes glaze over at the mention of Bernard Lonergan, John Dadosky is not one of those writers who muddies the waters by the use of Lonerganian language and a convoluted style. Dadosky *explains* things. Whether you agree with his conclusions or not, he is clear.

Right away, in the preface, he tells us why he is writing: “to propose an intellectual framework for recovering beauty in the West” (xi). Dadosky bases his research in Thomas Aquinas and Lonergan, convinced that others who have worked with the aesthetics of Thomas have not made the turn to the subject, perhaps fearing a Kantian influence. Calling himself a *metaphysician*, Dadosky sets out to “clarify and articulate a philosophy of beauty within Lonergan’s philosophy of intentional consciousness” (xii).

Dadosky sketches out his approach, convinced of Lonergan’s distinction from Kant, and equally convinced that “the eclipse of beauty ultimately