

BOOK REVIEWS

On Defining Death. By Douglas N. Walton. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 189 pp., \$15.95.

The secular world is now prepared to talk of death in public, and many studies of the subject are appearing. This one is described as "an analytic study of the concept of death in philosophy and medical ethics."

At the beginning of his discussion the author quotes the ancient materialist, Epicurus, to the effect that since death is simply annihilation, man can be rationally freed from the craving for immortality. When he concludes the book he suggests that on a secular basis there is no reason to have any great fear of death—though he admits that this is not the way most people feel. Then he quotes the celebrated anti-Christian, Bertrand Russell, to the effect that death is simply the loss of individual being, and that is all there is to it.

So for the Christian this volume offers very little of value, unless he is a professional philosopher. Then it reveals the sheer logical difficulty of talking about anyone who is dead, since on the secular assumption we would be talking about a nonexistent. Thus it appears that unless one believes in immortality of some kind, even discussion of the dead may make no strict sense. In another area Walton shows the ethical importance of realizing the distinction between killing and letting die. In the former case, one acts to "bring about a state of affairs to 'ensure' its occurrence, to not allow possible outcomes that do not include that particular."

The overriding value of this study is to reveal the kinds of problems the secularist faces because for him all truth and knowledge must come from man alone.

Lloyd F. Dean

Community College of Rhode Island

Cultural Anthropology: A Christian Perspective. By Stephen A. Grunlan and Marvin K. Mayers. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1979, 309 pp., \$6.95 paper.

Designed as an introductory textbook in cultural anthropology for Bible colleges, Grunlan's and Mayers' book deserves an audience beyond the classroom. The authors' underlying rationale is one of Biblical absolutism and cultural relativism. In chapter after chapter they hammer home the point that anyone entering another culture, particularly a missionary, must be prepared to abandon his own cultural prejudices in order to communicate effectively.

In the mode of a traditional textbook this work provides a topic-by-topic survey of major issues in anthropology. Marriage and family, technology and economy, social control and government are among the topics dealt with. Where a Biblical observation is relevant it is interjected. Each of the 14 chapters is followed by a short bibliography and conceptually-oriented discussion questions. A helpful glossary and a lengthier bibliography at the end add to the attractiveness of this text.

It is perhaps the very standard textbook orientation of this work that provides its major drawbacks. In its effort to survey the entire field, sometimes the reader may feel that he is being barraged with point after point, example after example, without sufficient ties provided. Frequently it is difficult to see exactly how some examples are relevant to the point at hand. At other times there is no indication that some observations are incompatible with each other, as for instance the linguistic theories of Chomsky (p. 95) and Brown (pp. 97 ff.). One wonders whether a more unified approach, which perhaps sacrifices some detail or available content, might serve the student better. The all-important chapters on methodology and the relationship to the Bible, saved for last by the authors, might have provided an

excellent lead-in to a more centralized approach that truly does provide perspective. In defense of the authors on this point it might be observed that their writing reflects the presently prevailing fragmented approach to basic courses in higher education in general, and an instructor is always free to adapt a text to his needs and insights.

Such pedagogical shortcomings notwithstanding, this work is an interesting gateway to the complex field of cultural anthropology. It may be studied with profit by anyone whose sphere of activity includes cross-cultural communication. And what Christian worker, from the theologian in his study to the missionary in the jungle, is exempt from that demand?

Winfried Corduan

Taylor University, Upland, IN 46989

Salvation in African Tradition. By Tokunboh Adeyemo. Nairobi, Kenya: Evangel Publishing House, 1979, \$2.75.

The new secretary of the Association of Evangelicals of Africa and Madagascar has given us what is probably one of the most important religious books to be published in or about Africa in 1979, since it presents an evangelical viewpoint in an area long dominated by liberal writers. He has written of the relationship between traditional religious beliefs and the Christian faith. Adeyemo deals with the subject under the headings of knowing God, worship, sin, death and destiny, comparing what is taught by evangelical Christians and traditional African religions. As an African with a western education he understands both African religions and western thoughts on Biblical theology and is able to write with clarity on both. While the major orientation is West African so far as the traditional religions are concerned, the book is a must for missionaries throughout Africa, students in college and seminary missions courses, and anyone who finds himself needing to answer the questions of why we should preach the gospel to those who are "happy the way they are." He clearly holds that there is salvation in no other name than Jesus.

Garle A. Bowen, Jr.

Kenya, East Africa

Lust, the Other Side of Love. By Mel White. Old Tappan, NJ: 1978, 191 pp., \$7.95.

There are not many books on this subject. I am not quite sure what to make of this fact. In any case, the book is a nontechnical and often personal study of how the Christian can "powerfully and positively" combat it. White's analysis of the subject stresses the personal and interpersonal damage that lust produces rather than the moral wrong that it is. Its strength is in its sensitivity, but this is sometimes a weakness as well. This latter tendency is especially seen in the last half of the book. It is strange that one of his most important chapters ("How Should I Respond to Sexual Lust in Others?") is a free interpretation of John 8:1-12. In view of his commitment to the *NEB* elsewhere, one wonders if he has not found it necessary to appeal to the *KJV* because the *Textus Receptus* has the only Biblical passage that supports his noncondemnatory ideas.

W.F.L.

Greek to Me. By Cullen I. K. Story and J. Lyle Story. San Francisco: Harper, 1979, 340 pp., \$7.95 paper.

It is now well known that the transition from memorization skills to problem-solving skills is not automatic. Much depends on how the brain stores and retrieves information and on its recognition of categories of data for these purposes. If problem-solving skills are the ultimate goal of learning—that is, they take priority over memorization skills per se, which form a basis for them—then there has been a long-standing need in the field of elementary Greek grammars to attempt to stimulate learning in that direction. After what has obviously been much preparation in ministerial training, the authors now offer such a text.

Greek to Me carries this subtitle: "Learning New Testament Greek through Memory Visualization." Potentially one suspects that if this helpful visualization is indeed successful the brain will be aided in performing memorization skills, thus helping to bring problem-solving skills to the fore when they are needed. The authors concentrate on teaching NT Greek while incorporating the following didactic points. A system of visual memory aids in the form of humorous, penetrating illustrations (by P. A. Miller) take a familiar concept in everyday life and relate it to an unfamiliar grammatical concept. These memory aids sometimes introduce the student to characters like Norbert Nominative, Professor Oddity and Liquid Lemonary. The illustrations endeavor to make a mental imprint and convey grammatical meaning that will be more easily recalled by the brain than the image provided by rote methods. A system of known substitute words like "sub-junk in the oasis," with an appropriate illustration, attempts to form a link to the unknown word (subjunctive and long vowel endings *-ō*, *-ēs*, *-ē* in this case). These illustrations and substitute words may roughly parallel the use of lecture demonstrations in the teaching of scientific subjects where it is widely believed that the eye is often the shortest route to the brain.

To those of us not used to this scheme, which is here always neatly coupled with good and clear grammatical instruction, the system of memory aids could be off-putting. This would not be so, however, to the blank slate. In fact I strongly suspect that interest and motivation would be provoked in private study by this technique. Other positive features not found in standard texts are the consistent effort in vocabularies to always draw attention to English derivatives from Greek bases, the enrichment exercises with a spiritual touch (like 2 Tim 3:16 set to music), reading lessons taken from Justin Martyr and *Mart. Pol.*, and a focus on words with high NT frequency.

While not designed, I suppose, to completely replace Machen or Wenham, for example, the quality text by the Storys has a significant advantage in stimulation of vital mental processes. It can also be as easily adapted for complementary use with the indispensable Zerwick-Grosvenor. Overall it rates high marks in its own category and enters into a much-needed area. It would now be interesting to be able to see statistical data from controlled experiments with *Greek to Me* versus another text on set exams with equal ability groups, if proof is needed for its use in theological curricula and to help in preparing the next such effort.

Paul Elbert

132 Holgate Dr., Luton, Bedfordshire LU4 0XD

A Complete Categorized Greek-English New Testament Vocabulary. By David Holly. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1978, pp. xi + 129, \$6.95 paper.

In a day when various aids for the student of NT Greek appear regularly on the market, one may well greet the appearance of another with a certain degree of reserve. In fact, however, Holly's book brings together material from several different sources into one convenient handbook, and therefore it has a certain usefulness.

The book is divided into four parts. In Part One, all words occurring ten times or more are classified according to their types—that is, all words like *archē*, *-ēs* (feminine first declension) are grouped together, all words like *harpax*, *-agos* (guttural stem, masculine third declension) are grouped together, and so forth. Adjectives, verbs and prepositions are all variously grouped. Holly normally provides the frequency of occurrence according to his own count (following Moulton and Geden) and according to *Concordance de la Bible Nouveau Testament*.

In Part Two, Holly provides a list of words occurring fewer than ten times, arranged alphabetically according to descending frequency. In other words this section begins where Metzger's *Lexical Aids* leaves off, except that it gives a little more information in terms of classification and a little less in terms of mnemonic helps. In Part Three, Holly offers an alphabetical listing of proper names and proper adjectives.

The final and longest section of the book provides several different things: a general

alphabetical index of all words with their respective classifications and frequencies; critical notes concerning the frequencies; a list of words in Moulton and Geden but not in Nestle-Aland (unfortunately not the latest edition); a grammatical index of all words under their proper classifications (nouns, indeclinable nouns, Hebrew words, and so forth), complete with frequencies; a list of orthographic and accentual differences between Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich (unfortunately not the latest edition) and Moulton and Geden; and a complete list of the words occurring only in one book of the NT.

Holly's work has been handwritten but is legible without difficulty. This has obviously been a labor of love, and errors are surprisingly infrequent.

D.A.C.

The New King James Bible New Testament. Nashville: Nelson, 1979, VI + 407 pp., \$7.95.

The publication of the *KJV* of the Bible in 1611 was a momentous event in the history of the translation of the English Bible. Erasmus, by publishing his Greek NT in 1516, had laid the foundation for the translation of the NT in the languages of western Europe, and beginning with William Tyndale (1526) a golden age of the translation of the Bible into English was inaugurated. In rapid succession Coverdale's Bible (1535), Matthew's Bible (1537), The Great Bible (1539), The Geneva Bible (1560) and The Bishop's Bible (1568) appeared. The climax of this intense activity of Bible translation came with the publication in 1611 of the *KJV*. No one could have predicted its phenomenal success. For over 300 years it ruled supreme among English translations, having successfully fended off numerous would-be challengers.

During the last fifty years, however, the challenges have come thick and fast and have become more than the venerable *KJV* could handle, with the result that its position and prestige have been seriously eroded. Especially among young Christians, to whom its antique language is unintelligible and its literary style goes unappreciated, the *KJV* has increasingly fallen out of favor. For this large segment of the Christian Church the *KJV* has been replaced by the *TEV*, *NEB*, *NIV* or some other modern translation.

But there still exists a considerable segment of the Bible-reading public to whom the *KJV* is alone the Word of God. It is to this group that the *NKJB* will appeal.

The translators and editors of the *NKJB* have tried to preserve certain qualities of the *KJV*—"its worshipful form," its "lyrical quality" and its "accuracy"—while at the same time ridding it of its antiquated language. Another feature is its attempt to preserve the thought flow of the original. The order of words, phrases and clauses is seldom changed so that one can listen without difficulty to the public reading of either edition while following in the other. Also, the pronouns "thee," "thou" and "ye" are replaced by the simple "you" and "your," and "yours" replaces "thy" and "thine." All pronouns referring to God are capitalized. The verb suffixes "-eth" and "-est" have been entirely eliminated.

Several features of the format of the *NKJB* are worth noting: (1) Paragraph headings are used to identify subject matter. However, each verse is printed as a separate unit (as in the *KJV*)—a feature that militates against reading the Bible in thought or subject units. (2) OT quotations are printed in oblique typeface for easy identification. (3) Footnotes give the chapter and verse references of the OT quotes found in the text. The footnotes are numbered in the sequence in which they occur in any one book of the NT with the numbering beginning again with another book. Thus it is very difficult to move from the footnote to the verse in which the OT quote occurs. Why such a numbering scheme was adopted it is difficult to know. In addition to the footnotes to indicate sources of OT quotes, I found in my edition of the *NKJB* NT five other footnotes. At John 12:5 where the phrase "for three hundred denarii" is found, a footnote explains: "about one year's wages for a worker." The word "denarius" also occurs in Rev 6:6, and a footnote explains: "approximately one day's wage for a worker." But the word also occurs in Matt 18:28; 20:2,9,10,13; 22:19; Mark 6:37; 12:15; 14:5; Luke 7:41; 10:35; 20:24; John 6:7. No note occurs at any of these passages. Why? If a need existed for an explanation at John 12:5, then surely one was needed at Mark

14:5, which is the parallel passage, and at the other passages also where the word occurs.

At 1 Cor 16:22 where the words "let him be accursed" occur, a footnote explains: "Greek: *anathema*", and a footnote on "O Lord, come!" explains: "Aramaic: *Maranatha*." At 2 Thess 2:7 where the text, in referring to the restrainer, reads "He," a footnote gives the alternative "he."

These are helpful footnotes, but why they occur when there are scores of places where similar footnotes would be helpful to the reader and none occurs, I do not understand. No rationale for footnoting is evident.

The only textual-critical footnote in the entire NT of the *NKJB* is found at 1 John 5:7-8. Here the note reads: "The words from 'in heaven' (v. 7) through 'on earth' (v. 8) are from the Latin Bible, although three Greek mss. from the 15th Century and later also contain them." The passage in question is, of course, the famous *Comma Johanneum*, which got into the third edition of Erasmus' Greek NT as the result of a challenge. Since Erasmus could not find this passage in any Greek MS he excluded it from the first two editions of his Greek NT. He was chided for this since the passage contains strong support for the doctrine of the Trinity. Under pressure Erasmus agreed that if the passage could be found in a single Greek MS he would include it in his third edition. One was found, or—more probably—was custom-made. Ultimately this MS (61) proved to have been translated in the sixteenth century, one year after Erasmus' second edition appeared. Despite Erasmus' doubts about the validity of the MS, he kept his word and included the passage in his third edition. Since it is essentially Erasmus' Greek text (in its later editions) that underlies the *KJV*, it was by this means that the *Comma Johanneum* was inserted into it. That these words are spurious and have no right to be included in the text of our NT is clear on the basis of both external and internal evidence (see B. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary*, pp. 716-718).

It is curious that the note on the *Comma Johanneum* is the only textual note in the entire NT of the *NKJB*. The publishers in the Introduction refer to "growing concern among reputable New Testament scholars that the nineteenth-century text [the Greek text advocated by Westcott and Hort, and others] suffers from over-revision, and that the traditional Greek text is much more reliable than previously supposed. We have confidence, therefore, in presenting the New King James Bible, New Testament, without subjecting it to the strictures of the newer critical text." It is not the purpose of this reviewer to enter into the current debate concerning the Textus Receptus or traditional text. One can read the articles published in the pages of *JETS* during the past two years (see especially G. Fee, "Modern Textual Criticism and the Revival of the *Textus Receptus*," March 1978, and the "Response," "Rejoinder" and "Surrejoinder," June 1978; see also D. A. Carson, *The King James Version Debate* [Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979]). The producers of the *NKJB* have every right to follow the traditional text if they so please. But do they have the right, in view of the massive amount of work done by textual scholars during the past 400 years, to keep the reader in the dark about significant textual problems? In the *NKJB* there is no hint of any textual problems at Matt 6:13; Mark 16:9; John 7:58; Acts 8:37; Rom 8:1; etc., etc. The reader of the Bible has a right to know about these problems, and it is less than honest to keep him in the dark. It seems to me that it is more important for the reader to know that Mark 16:9-20 was not a part of the original gospel than it is that a denarius is "approximately one day's wage for a worker."

The Introduction states that in order to "preserve the work of precision which is also the legacy of the original translators" care was taken to integrate "present-day vocabulary, punctuation and syntax wherever obscurity exists." According to this statement "lack of clarity" was the bench mark for change in words, punctuation and sentence structure (word order, etc.).

In the first chapter of Matthew I noted the following changes (in addition to changes in the pronouns, as already noted): "generation" to "genealogy"; "begat" to "begot"; brethren" to "brothers"; "on this wise" to "thus"; "espoused" to "betrothed"; "Ghost" to "Spirit"; "privily" to "secretly"; "fear not to take" to "do not be afraid to take"; "shall" to "will"; "a virgin" to "the virgin"; "which being interpreted is" to "which is translated";

“raised” to “aroused”; “had bidden” to “commanded”; “unto” to “to”; “knew her not” to “did not know her.”

Most of these changes are for the good. They clarify and update the English. But what of “begot”? This certainly is not a contemporary English word. And what of “did not know her”? The word order is straightened out (from “knew her not”), but that does not help the reader know what is going on. The expression “to know” when it refers to sexual intercourse is at best obscure and probably meaningless to most present-day speakers of English.

As one works one’s way through the *NKJB* NT it is not always clear what the principles were that guided the translators in making the changes. The dust jacket declares: “No verse has been omitted [from the original *KJV*, of course, which does not necessarily represent the best known Greek text of the NT]. No word has been changed unless the change genuinely improves the understanding of God’s Word for our time.” Despite such claims there are hundreds of mere stylistic changes—e.g., in the same passage noted above (Matthew 1), “fear not to take” to “do not be afraid to take”; “shall” to “will”; “raised” to “aroused”; and “unto” to “to.” These changes have nothing to do with “understanding.” They simply update the English style. On the other hand it is difficult to understand why such obvious examples of antiquated English style as “and it came to pass” (Matt 7:28; Mark 1:9; etc.) and “behold” used as an interjection (Matt 2:13; 4:11; etc.) are retained. Also, why was a word such as “mammon” (Matt 6:24) retained? The word simply is unintelligible to vast numbers of contemporary English speakers. The editors of the *New Scofield Reference Bible* had the good sense to change it to “money.” If one must retain such obscure words to “preserve” the *KJV*, it is too great a price to pay. “Propitiation” is retained in Rom 3:25 and 1 John 2:2. It also is an obscure word, but there is more justification for retaining it since modern translators have not been able to come up with an adequate replacement. Most translations have resorted to a phrase (“means of expiating sin” [*NEB*]; “means by which men’s sins are forgiven” [*TEV*]; “sacrifice of atonement” [*NIV*]) to translate the word.

As stated above, another feature of the *NKJB* is that the word order of the *KJV* is retained unless obscurity demands a change. In 2 Thess 2:10 the *KJV*’s phrase “with all deceivableness of unrighteousness” is changed to “with all deception of unrighteousness.” The change does clarify the word *apatē*, but the basic problem is not the individual meaning of the words but their order (syntax). The translators of *NKJB* refused to change the order and thus perpetuated the obscurity. The *NIV* nicely renders the phrase “evil that deceives.”

The *KJV* was truly a great achievement—probably the greatest translation the English language will ever see. But it is well over 350 years old. It is not possible to make it into an adequate translation for our time without destroying its unique characteristics. So why not allow it to die an honorable death? It served its day well. Now let the newer versions (especially those that faithfully render the Greek and Hebrew texts with clarity) take over.

Walter W. Wessel

Bethel College, St. Paul, MN

Judges/Ruth. By Arthur Lewis. Chicago: Moody, 1979, 128 pp., \$2.50 paper.

Lewis brings a wealth of geographical and cultural information to this contribution to the Everyman’s Bible Commentary (EBC) series. The frequent changes of scene in *Judges* and the general confusion of those days are made much more manageable for the student, who is provided with frequent maps and archaeological material.

Lewis gives some space to two of the thought-provoking issues raised in the text: the role and work of the Holy Spirit in the days of the judges, and the identity of the Angel of the Lord. He does not feel obliged to bring any novelty to his treatment, being content to raise the reader’s sensitivities to these points of discussion.

The EBC series is targeted for “the average church layman” and a devotional element

almost self-consciously surfaces from place to place. Thus Lewis points out that there is no mention that Gideon's men carried swords, and so every believer should learn the lesson of waiting for the Lord rather than pushing ahead in his own strength (pp. 50-51). Lewis is stronger in his observation that the theology of history that the book of Judges demonstrates is that "sooner or later lawlessness will bring disaster" (p. 18).

The section on Ruth is especially good. Lewis clearly explains the details of the legal situation and the customs that were in force. He observes that "God's providential hand can be traced in every detail of the story" (p. 114) and complements this theological generality with the detail of thoughtful comment.

Keith Ghormley

First Church of God, West Chester, OH

Ruth: A New Translation with a Philological Commentary and a Formalist-Folkloristic Interpretation. By Jack M. Sasson. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins, 1979, 292 pp., \$16.50.

In this book Sasson has presented us with a lucid and wide-ranging study of a number of aspects of the book of Ruth. Ably using his background preparation in the areas of ancient Near Eastern texts (having previously made several contributions to the field of Assyriology) and folklore (especially the work of V. Propp), Sasson casts fresh light on a number of passages in this brief but intriguing Biblical book.

Sasson's work is divided into five chapters of varied length. The first consists of a new translation of Ruth that is very readable, being of the "dynamic-equivalence" type. Marginal notations indicate the literary "functions" of the small plot units. These are based on Propp's model and are explained in greater detail in chap. 5.

The second chapter discusses the book as regards text, canon and liturgical usage. In the section on canon, the author presents the various divergent placements of Ruth within the order of the OT.

In his third and longest chapter, Sasson gives a very useful philological commentary. Each verse is treated in great detail, and various interpretations proposed by the author and other scholars, from the early rabbis to modern exegetes, are clearly presented so that an evaluation of each can be fairly made. It is refreshing to see that the author is not reluctant to say that the correct interpretation of some passage cannot be proven at this stage. While adequate discussion of this commentary is not possible here, several points will be picked up later.

The fourth section of Sasson's work is entitled "An Interpretive Synopsis" and is in the form of a brief "retelling of the tale," summarizing the previous discussions before proceeding to the next chapter in which Ruth is interpreted. Here the first stage is to show the need for a new approach toward understanding the literary genre of Ruth, as is evidenced by the lack of consensus among scholars as to how the book is to be interpreted. As has been mentioned, the approach that Sasson favors is that articulated by V. Propp, an expert in Russian fairy tales. As the author describes the approach, which is likely to be new to many readers of this journal, "Propp's interest is focused neither on a tale's characters, nor on the manner in which they are described, but on those elements of the plot which propel the narrative from one action to another." Propp calls these elements "functions." He next observes the position of each "function" within the chain of events that constitutes a tale. According to Propp's findings, there are only a limited number of "functions" in a folktale, their sequence is always the same, and all folktales have the same sequence. In light of these observations and a careful analysis of the "functions" of Ruth, Sasson shows that Ruth fits into the form of the folktale as studied by Propp. He does not wish to claim that Ruth is a folktale, however, since folktales were by definition once orally transmitted, and there is no evidence proving this stage of transmission for Ruth.

Sasson closes this subsection on genre by a quote from N. Frye's *Anatomy of Criticism* (pp. 247-248) that is worth repeating here. He writes: "The purpose of criticism by genres is

not so much to classify as to clarify . . . traditions and affinities, thereby bringing out a large number of literary relationships that would not be noticed as long as there were no context established for them." In other words, noting the formal similarities between Ruth and a folktale does not in any way reflect on the historicity of the events recorded in the work but rather on the literary quality of the piece as a work of art. This distinction is important because Sasson in no way wants to denigrate Ruth as an accurate witness to reality. He shows this at the very outset of his philological commentary where he discusses the translation of the first word of the book. He says: "We avoided translating with 'once [upon a time]' or 'long ago' lest it be assumed that an ancient audience perceived the opening as a mark of fiction."

Throughout his book Sasson presents a conservative regard for the MT as well as for the integrity of the book. The latter is shown, for example, by his well-reasoned argument that the Davidic genealogy at the end of Ruth is integral to the original text and is not a secondary appendix. This interpretation is supported by the "folklore" analysis of Propp in that one "folktale often sows the seed of another folktale. . . . [If so,] we might venture to explain why Ruth, unique in Biblical literature, actually *ends* rather than *begins* with a genealogy: From a Proppian perspective, *the genealogy of 4:18-22 actually begins the tale of Obed, rather than ends that of Boaz!*" It therefore serves somewhat like a catch-line on some other ancient Near Eastern texts.

The book's fifth chapter proceeds with a study of aspects of Ruth's narrative style including its poetry and word play. Following a look at the contexts of Ruth (social, cultural and political) in which, among other things, Sasson urges caution in trying to derive normative legal practice concerning marriage, redemption and the levirate from this nonlegal document, the author reviews several different approaches attempting to establish a date for the composition of Ruth. None of these meets with success. This, he proposes, is not a serious problem since the book that we have in the canon is now important because it has become a literary text. "For when such a text earns a place among other literary creations, it obviously responds to needs that transcend momentary gratifications." It is therefore more important to see a text's contexts and how it is used than to expend too much energy on finding a specific absolute date.

A review of this size is of course inadequate to touch more than lightly on a few of the many useful insights in this provocative book. Sasson's labors should prove beneficial not only to scholars and clergy but also to lay students of the Bible. All will surely gain a clearer understanding of the lives of these "common people who, unknowingly, achieve uncommon ends."

David W. Baker

Regent College, Vancouver, BC

Esther: Triumph of God's Sovereignty. By John C. Whitcomb. Chicago: Moody, 1979, 128 pp., \$2.50 paper.

The book of Esther has proved to be a puzzler for interpreters from the beginning: Why is there no reference to God, Jerusalem, the law, prayer, love or forgiveness? Whitcomb has made a useful contribution to the answers to such questions in this addition to the Everyman's Bible Commentary series.

It is commonly held that the nonreligious character of the narrative is a conscious device of the sacred author who sought to emphasize the hidden providence of God. Whitcomb also follows this line and sharpens the focus by pointing out the unmerited nature of God's supervision: Esther and Mordecai are "unobservant" Jews who evidence no concern for the name or plan of God and instead are motivated purely by cultural and national considerations. Whitcomb sees a parallel with the nation of Israel today: Even in unbelief they are the objects of God's providential care.

This work should find wide usefulness. It provides a good introduction with ongoing attention to Esther's historicity, chronology and background. Whitcomb will never be the

favorite of the modern negative critics he barbs so deftly. He interacts with C. Moore's AB entry and refers the reader to the more technical literature available.

Whitcomb does indulge in some spiritualizing and Christian moralizing now and then, which may distress some sensitive interpreters. And, like little pink marshmallows in the breakfast cereal, they do tend to interrupt the business at hand without adding anything substantive. But a few marshmallows never killed anyone, and the general student of the Bible will benefit from this largely nutritional fare.

Keith Ghormley

First Church of God, West Chester, OH

My Servant Job: A Discussion Guide on the Wisdom of Job. By Morris A. Inch. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979, 128 pp., \$2.95 paper.

Inch seeks the wisdom of the book of Job. In this change-of-pace book he contends that the value in Job is not in its perspective on pain and suffering but in its exploration of wisdom: How does our perspective on life affect the worth and quality of our lives? Thus Inch can start his discussion at the point where we might wish a commentator would get back to business and stick with the text. But Inch's business is to stimulate thought and response around the world views of the characters in Job. Each character (including Satan and God) is the beginning place for another chapter discussing a different approach to the questions of existence. Satan is a cynic, Zophar is bombastic and prejudiced, and Elihu pursues quick certainties.

Inch does well in the discussion format, and he brings a wide range of authors along for the moot. And like any really good discussion, its energy tends to carry it beyond the bounds of its proper territory. If you do not let that bother you too much, you may enjoy the energetic tour Inch leads through subjects that would normally surprise us in a work on Job. Does Job's response to his calamities really teach us, even by implication, that we are responsible for creation (pp. 29, 33-34)? Is God's challenge to Job in chap. 38 really a device to bring the patriarch closer to a healthy self-acceptance (pp. 89-93)? No matter. Where commentators fear to tread, Inch rushes in. He seeks the wisdom of the book of Job and may capture the sociology, philosophy and English majors in the back row.

Keith Ghormley

First Church of God, West Chester, OH

Daniel: An Introduction and Commentary. By Joyce G. Baldwin. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1978, 210 pp., \$7.95.

Baldwin has produced a very significant study of the book of Daniel that goes counter to the mainstream of British Biblical scholarship in the direction of historic conservatism. It is thoroughly worth studying for the sake of its well-reasoned refutation of many of the standard arguments usually advanced for the prevalent theory of a Maccabean date of composition and a spurious origin for Daniel as a pious fraud. The author cites many significant works by French and German scholars and makes good use of most of the British authors who have discussed the weaknesses of the regnant hypothesis. Her use of R. K. Harrison is rather minimal (considering the powerful case he offers for Danielic authenticity) and, apart from fleeting references to E. J. Young and a single article by B. Waltke, the only conservative American author she cites extensively is J. C. Whitcomb and his excellent monograph on Darius the Mede. She seems to be unaware of L. Wood's thorough and convincing presentation of the evidence for a sixth-century authorship in his *A Commentary on Daniel* (Zondervan, 1973). Nor is she acquainted with the excellent work of the Scottish scholar J. Urquhart, an important contributor to J. Orr's *ISBE*, who in his *Wonders of Prophecy* devotes considerable attention to the fulfillment of predictive prophecy and the literal accuracy of the time span indicated by the seventy weeks of Dan 9:25-27.

Nevertheless Baldwin has made out a most persuasive case for the authenticity of this

remarkable book and emphasizes that its program of redemptive history, set forth in the five-kingdom structure in chap. 2 and elaborated in chaps. 7, 8 and 11, is not successfully explained by the theory of a Maccabean pseudepigraph. In point of fact, the objective evidence of an earlier, separate Median empire that first captured Babylon in 539 B.C.—a feature absolutely vital to the survival of the 165-B.C. date—rests upon a foundation of sand. She comments: "We believe that the earliest Christian commentators were not mistaken in seeing the fourth kingdom as Rome, and the death and resurrection of Christ as the focal point to which chapters 2 and 7 were looking" (p. 67). Yet she fails to bring out the full implications of Daniel's interpretation (5:28) of the word play in *p^erēs*, the third word in the handwriting on the wall of Belshazzar's banquet hall. On page 125 she points out that the Medes were coupled with the Persians as joint conquerors of the Neo-Babylonian empire; while this comment is helpful enough, what she fails to bring out is that this emphasis on the Persians as embodied in *p^erēs*, coupled with the verbal form *p^erīsā* and the actual ethnic term *pārās*, furnishes an absolutely airtight case for excluding the possibility of an earlier, separate Median empire. Nothing could be clearer than that this Median power as represented by the second kingdom of chap. 2 is a mere figment of the imagination of rationalistic scholarship, desirous of avoiding the successful prediction of the Roman empire (beginning in 63 B.C.) as the fourth kingdom.

On the positive side, then, the author gives a good summary of the arguments upholding the accuracy of Dan 1:1 in dating Nebuchadnezzar's invasion in the third year of Jehoiakim (pp. 19-21). She demonstrates the historical accuracy of the references to Belshazzar, arguing on the basis of archaeological evidence uncovered subsequent to the rise of the pseudepigraph theory (pp. 21-23). She follows quite favorably the discussion of J. C. Whitcomb in identifying Darius the Mede with Gubaru, although she says nothing about the purely titular character of the name "Darius" itself—as indicated on page 1 of F. W. König's *Relief und Inschrift des Königs Dareios I* (Brill, 1938). Her discussion of the term "Chaldean" for a class of soothsayer priests makes some good points, even though it totally ignores R. D. Wilson's derivation of it from Sumerian *GAL.DU* (*Studies in the Book of Daniel: Series One*). Her treatment of the three Greek terms for musical instruments, and the nonappearance of any other Greek loanwords as quite incompatible with an early-second-century date, is very well done (pp. 29-35).

On the negative side, the handling of the chronological factors in regard to the prophecy of the seventy weeks leaves much to be desired (pp. 168-178). She rightly rejects the decree of Cyrus as the starting point for the 483 years (or 69 heptads), and she points up the difficulties of the date of Nehemiah's return in 445—which comes out to a date subsequent to the crucifixion (apart from a resort to a dubious theory of lunar years). But then she states quite flatly that "no other alternative seems possible" (p. 170) and fails to mention at all the one *terminus a quo* which comes out to the exact year of the appearance of "Messiah the Prince," A.D. 27. This is of course the date of Ezra's return in 457 B.C. with authority to present gifts from the king toward the equipping of the Jerusalem temple (Ezra 7), and also (it would seem from Ezra 9:9) authority to "build a wall in Jerusalem." The span of years between 457 B.C. and A.D. 27 (taking into account the one year gained in passing from 1 B.C. to A.D. 1) comes out to exactly 483 years. Yet the reader is given no hint of this in the commentary. Rather, the author resorts to a vague theory of the symbolic value of numbers—even though no scholar yet has been able to demonstrate what that symbolic value might be. The same technique is used in connection with the 1290 days and 1335 days in 12:11-12 (p. 210), for which a perfectly plausible explanation is possible in view of the time factors indicated in the book of Revelation.

Despite the criticisms, however, this reviewer wishes to emphasize the value of this modest volume and the worthwhileness of combing through its quotations and references to modern European and British scholarship (for the author makes excellent use of K. Kitchen's vigorous argumentation in D. Wiseman's *Notes on Problems in the Book of Daniel*) and

the occasional discussion of recent archaeological discoveries that further imperil the Macabean date hypothesis.

Gleason L. Archer

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

Old Testament Theology: A Fresh Approach. By Ronald E. Clements. John Knox, 1978, 214 pp., \$18.50.

The work deals primarily with problems of methodology in the formulation of an OT theology. The "fresh approach" suggested by the author is one that gives a narrower role to historical criticism. It removes OT theology from its subordinate position as a branch of historical criticism and gives it the status of a branch of theology inviting the theologian to bring structure and systematization to the discipline.

This work, written from a liberal viewpoint, questions the value of a solely historicist approach in OT studies and witnesses to the sterility and ineffectiveness of historicism as the sole means of determining the meaning and significance of the message of the OT for today.

In this regard the work is somewhat similar to B. Childs' recent work, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*. Not only do Clements and Childs place historicism in a lesser role than it has been placed, but they affirm the importance of the finalized form of the canon in determining the message of the OT.

In chap. 1, "The Problem of Old Testament Theology," the author takes up the familiar debate among OT theologians regarding the proper methodology for OT theology. He concludes that OT theology must be about the religious ideas to be found in the OT but warns that the task of systematizing these ideas is extremely difficult. He points to the fact that "other ages" have not found it easy to formulate a unified OT theology.

Clements goes on in this chapter to discuss the origins of OT theology. The reader will not find an extensive survey of the literature here, but this is clearly not the intent of the author. He discusses briefly the contributions of Semler, Eichhorn, Gabler and G. L. Bauer and presents a critique of Gabler's distinction between Biblical theology and dogmatic theology. One of the chief weaknesses in Biblical theology, according to Clements, is that its concern to determine how a concept was understood in a particular age does not give adequate attention to the fact that the original concept is in some sense still true today. This timelessness, Clements argues, is what makes the statements of the Bible "theology" and not simply religious ideas (p. 6).

Clements affirms the usefulness and importance of the historical-critical method. He states: "To abandon it (historical criticism) now would certainly be to throw away one of the most important tools of scholarship which we possess, and which it has taken almost two centuries to develop" (p. 11).

There are two major contributions made by historical criticism to the fashioning of an OT theology, according to Clements: the establishment of the correct meaning of a text, and the canonical form of the OT literature. With regard to the former, Clements means that a valid Biblical theology will make note of the usage and development of the great Biblical themes throughout the various stages of their development in the OT and NT. As to the latter, Clements follows Semler in his understanding of the formation of the canon and its role in shaping an OT theology. Because of the historical process that lies behind the now static shape of the canon, one cannot speak of "single interpretations" but must probe behind the canon to study the theological concepts of the OT in their literary setting.

At the same time, however, the canon in its final form must be regarded as of great importance in OT theology. It is this sacred canon that is understood to be a word of God and hence authoritative. It is this authoritative nature of the canon that makes OT theology possible.

A basic aspect of Clements' approach is his contention that the writing of an OT theology should "explore that part of the biblical heritage which Jesus and Christians share in common" (pp. 19-20). This concept should lead to a re-examination of the usual approaches to OT theology. OT theology should be concerned with "living faith," not simply a history of ideas. It should concern itself with the significance of the OT for the modern world and not simply with the ancient Hebrew cultures. One should be wary of fitting the religious ideas of the OT into a framework, for this may result in circularity. Rather, one should "trace the broken lines of unity where the Old Testament draws them" and note their connection "with the more firmly drawn lines which later ages have found there" (p. 24).

In chap. 2, "Dimensions of Faith in the Old Testament," the author discusses the various collections of literary material in the OT and states that if we are to understand the nature of faith presented by them and go on to formulate an OT theology we must first observe important features of their background.

Clements asserts that the Pentateuch and the prophets contain material with "no clear pattern of order between materials of a late and an early date" (p. 28). Nor can we trust the ascriptions of authorship to be found in the OT. Clements goes so far as to state that "in no case can we regard a prophetic book as having been penned by its prophet-author" (p. 29). We thus cannot construct a theology of the OT by attempting to discover the theology of specific authors of books of the OT. Any such attempt leads to "risky hypotheses" and away from the real nature of the OT literature, which is a reflection of "the faith of the whole community, a message about God and his people, Israel" (p. 30). A tension thus exists in any attempt to write an OT theology. It is a tension between the literary form of the OT writings and the necessity for systematization of the ideas found in that literary form. Clements contends that both these aspects must enter into a formulation of an OT theology.

In chap. 3, "The God of Israel," Clements traces the concept of God in its religious history from its origin in traditions of the ancient Near East, and from its expression in the literary anthropomorphisms of the OT, to its more universalistic and theological expression with its emphasis on the uniqueness of God. Even the cult was theologized to the extent that static elements of cultic worship took on a more subjective significance. It is this universalism that is true theology, for it makes statements about God that are true today and that are not limited to the narrow confines of one nation.

In chap. 4, "The People of God," Clements concludes that Israel's role as "the people of Yahweh" went beyond a mere nationalism. Thus Yahweh was not a God whose reputation was tied into one nation. He discusses Israel's election, noting that the monarchy, the sanctuary and the land served as visible signs of Israel's status as an elect people.

Chapter 5, "The Old Testament as Law," discusses the nature of Torah. He states that the OT is "built up around the Mosaic *tôrâh*" (p. 119) and concludes that the concept of covenant is a central concept in the OT.

Chapter 6 is titled "The Old Testament as Promise." In this chapter Clements deals with some of the difficulties in the interpretation of prophetic prediction. He points out that historical criticism has made the OT prophets heralds of doom rather than proclaimers of hope. He asserts that the NT interprets no OT text, to which it appeals for hope, in the way in which it was originally intended (p. 150). But this is not an imposition on Scripture because the present shape of the canon, with its distinctive ordering of various types of literature, has made possible a broader kind of exegesis as the various literary types have been given new associations in the canon. Clements says, for example, that "the association of certain psalms with prophecy has allowed these psalms to be treated as prophecy" (p. 153).

This work has a number of strengths. It represents a worthy attempt to deal with the problems that historical criticism creates for the OT scholar and acknowledges that the historical-critical approach has tended to lead to the neglect of other studies. It seeks to lift OT theology to a more important place in the theological disciplines. It gives greater attention to the literary form of the OT than is often given, and from that form it draws universal principles that help to provide us with a theology in the true sense. It gives an important

role to the NT understanding of the OT as well.

Yet there is a tension pervading Clements' work that is not satisfactorily resolved. The tension exists between the original intent of the author in a given passage and the way in which that passage was understood by later generations. Clements freely acknowledges the departure of the NT writers from the original intent of the OT in the area of hope and asserts that the finalized form of the OT canon places the OT writings in a different light, so that they may have been interpreted differently by the later Jewish community. Does this not create two levels of truth? Do we not have a theology ultimately shaped by the mind of man? Has Clements succeeded in lifting theology beyond the realm of the history of ideas? The author affirms the activity of the Spirit of God in the unfolding history of the OT but does not satisfactorily deal with the disparity between authorial intent and the different understanding of the later community.

Theology is more than the universal relevance of religious ideas. It is truth about God. The bridge between the history of ideas and theology is crossed only when the matter of authoritative truth is given the foremost attention.

Thomas Edward McComiskey

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

Jews and Christians in Dialogue: New Testament Foundations. By John Koenig. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1979, 185 pp., \$7.95 paper.

An expansion of a series of lectures originally delivered at the Princeton Seminar on Jews and Judaism in 1975, the volume under review serves as timely prolegomena reading to all current Jewish-Christian dialogue.

Koenig writes as "a Christian to Christians" (p. 9). His aim is to explore the foundational NT documents relevant for contemporary Jewish-Christian dialogue. What makes Koenig's work especially valuable, however, is that he focuses on those statements from the NT that reflect antagonism directed to Jews and their religion. Since most of these hostile-sounding words come from the lips of Jewish writers, Koenig argues for use of the term "anti-Judaism" rather than "anti-Semitism" as descriptive of these statements. After discussing many of these difficult texts, the author concludes that "the New Testament as a whole, when understood historically, offers more resources than obstacles to those who value Jewish-Christian dialogue today" (p. 137). Indeed, in a convincing way Koenig demonstrates how Jewish Jesus and the NT authors are. He thus makes the Christian reader vitally aware of his Jewish heritage and his "Gentile indebtedness to it" (p. 153).

The task of the author is greatly aided by an effective use of summary conclusions at the end of each chapter, the final chapter serving as a summary synthesis-application for the entire book. In addition, a seven-page index of Biblical references along with a helpful, up-to-date selected bibliography is found at the end of the volume.

In the first of seven well-outlined chapters Koenig deals with the attitude of Jesus toward Jews and Judaism. Here he depicts Jesus as a first-century Galilean Hasidic healer (p. 20). In Koenig's view the Judaism of Jesus' day allowed for a great deal of diversity. Hence differences with rabbinic authorities over interpretation of Torah and certain Jewish practices would not lead to official condemnation. The repentance and salvation Jesus declared was "of and within Judaism" (p. 36). In sum, Jesus upheld the sanctity of the temple, the election of the Jewish people and the authority of the Jewish Scriptures.

Koenig's work is particularly helpful in clarifying certain places in the synoptic tradition that too often have unnecessarily become points of contention in Jewish-Christian dialogue. For instance, he questions the massive generalization today that equates "Pharisee" with "hypocrite" (p. 24). In addition he points out that in the gospels the term "repentance" never means converting to a new religion but rather "returning to the God whose mercy is already proclaimed in the traditions and institutions of Judaism" (p. 28).

Unfortunately, in several places where Koenig seeks to "level out" and explain some of

the "anti-Judaic" rough spots in the NT narratives he appears to have undercut a high view of Biblical authority. For example, Mark is described as a "fallible human being subject to the contingencies of his own history" (p. 80). Thus, Koenig argues, Mark reads the abrogation of the kosher laws (see Mark 7:14-23) into Jesus' ministry (p. 81). This Gentile and anti-Judaistic viewpoint, states Koenig, "is almost certainly an error" (p. 76). In a similar vein Koenig describes the fourth gospel as a "layered document," following R. E. Brown's theory that the composition of the book took place over a rather long period of time. Koenig further points out that a literal reading of the fourth gospel has led to all kinds of anti-Semitic actions directed toward Jews in that this gospel is largely a polemic against Jews and Judaism, a description of the painful break between the Church and Judaism. Thus Koenig suggests that we must come up with criteria for distinguishing "levels of authority" within the fourth gospel (p. 136). Here Koenig raises a key point in Biblical interpretation and authority: that seemingly ubiquitous question of a "canon within a canon."

Taking his lead from K. Stendahl (*Paul Among Jews and Gentiles*), Koenig argues that the theological climax to the book of Romans is chaps. 9-11, a "watershed" in Paul's theology (p. 53). To Koenig these chapters are pivotal to Jewish-Christian dialogue in that if one argues that Paul treated the law as obsolete—being replaced by Christ—then a careful study of this pericope from Romans will be found to point to an eventual reconciliation between Israel and the Church. God has not abandoned his elect people and replaced them with a "new Israel." (Koenig argues that none of the 67 distinct references to Israel in the NT is used to describe the Christian Church; rather, the term denotes empirical Israel [p. 13].) The hostility between the Church and Israel will some day be resolved in God's own inscrutable way (Rom 11:33).

In this day of evangelical-Jewish dialogue, Koenig's volume is well worth a careful reading. It is bound to prove insightful and provocative in pointing out the vast amount of common ground and Biblical heritage that Christians and Jews actually share whenever they meet face to face.

Marvin R. Wilson

Gordon College, Wenham, MA 01984

The Words of Jesus in our Gospels. A Catholic Response to Fundamentalism. By Stanley B. Marrow. New York: Paulist, 1979, pp. vii + 152, \$4.95.

The essence of Marrow's book is portrayed in the subtitle. Fundamentalism, according to the author, is a literal and inerrant approach to Scripture. It operates in a "descending order"—i.e., "the Word of God comes to a human author who gives it form and expression, and the believer accepts it for what it is, the infallible Word of God" (p. 26).

This approach to the Word of God, claims Marrow, is more inadequate than it is erroneous. It simply does not take all the human factors such as authorship, canonicity and translation into consideration. Basically "it fails to recognize that the Bible is a literary document and cannot be exempt from the ordinary rules of literary criticism" (p. 55). An alternative approach is to see the Word of God in an "ascending order" of events. Here "the community of believers accepts the writings of certain individuals as sacred to them and eventually comes to regard them as the Word of God. It is, in other words, the faith of the community that gives these writings their privileged place. It is only after reflection that the community can say . . . that these writings are 'the Word of God'" (p. 26).

Readers of this provocative little volume will recognize a healthy utilization of the insights of *Traditionsgeschichte* in this alternative approach. Chaps. 2 ("The Words of Jesus") and 3 ("The Living Word") are particularly helpful in illustrating this procedure. The author simply wishes to show that God chose ordinary human beings with selective and fallible memories, with creative understanding and intelligence, to communicate his revelation in Jesus Christ. The fundamentalist approach is unable to deal with and to understand the discordant views, opposing claims and variations within the gospels or to appreciate the process of selection, modification and adaptation of Jesus' sayings on the part of the believing community.

Marrow also finds the fundamentalistic approach inadequate when it comes to textual, transmissional and canonical questions. A history of these issues shows that Jesus' words were not remembered entirely or perfectly. Even a translation of the original languages involves human explanation and interpretation. To be consistent, the author believes that this "descending view" must be willing to grant divine inspiration to textual critics, copyists, translators and interpreters, as well as to the original prophet or apostle (p. 30). The fundamentalistic approach results in a docetic view of Scripture—i.e., it denies its human component. It is puzzling, states Marrow, why Christians who believe that God became man and was subject to all the limitations of human existence should feel the need to "exempt the world of God from such limitations" (p. 31; cf. also pp. 135-136).

Chaps. 4-7 deal with the presentation of Jesus as found in the four gospels. Here the author draws on recent scholarly insights and presents what he believes to be the uniqueness of each evangelist. While there is not anything particularly new about his conclusions, it is important that his methodology illustrates and exemplifies his approach that the Bible came to be regarded as the Word of God in an ascending and not descending order.

The Words of Jesus in Our Gospels is a volume worthy of commendation and is very timely, considering the recent debates on inerrancy, etc. On some issues Marrow speaks not only for Catholics but for a significant number of evangelical Protestants who have similar problems with fundamentalism (cf. James Barr's *Fundamentalism*). However, the author is guilty of many generalizations, assumptions and misrepresentations. By stressing the "human" process he tends to forget the "divine." If fundamentalism can be charged with a docetic view of Scripture, could it be that Marrow's alternative leads to a heresy of another kind?

In spite of some obvious weaknesses it is not difficult to agree with the imprint on the back cover, which states: "This is a very valuable book for college students, teachers of religion, bible study groups, theology students, adult education courses, and the intelligent Christians who know that the unexamined faith, like the unexamined life, is not worth living."

Arthur G. Patzia

Bethel Theological Seminary, St. Paul, MN

The Vision of Matthew: Christ, Church and Morality in the First Gospel. By John P. Meier. New York: Paulist, 1979, pp. vii + 270, \$5.95 paper. *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew.* By Robert E. Obach and Albert Kirk. New York: Paulist, 1978, pp. iv + 296, \$4.95 paper.

These two publications both deal with Matthew, but their concerns and emphases are rather different. The *Commentary* by Obach and Kirk is a study guide to Matthew, designed for the Roman Catholic diocese of Memphis. The lay orientation is amply attested by the simple prose, attractive line drawings taken from the *Good News Bible* (as is the text of Scripture) and the brief glossary at the end of the volume. It is quite uncluttered with footnotes. Designed to be used over an eight-week course of studies, the book is a welcome sign that there is an increasing interest in lay Bible study among modern Roman Catholics.

There is a mild use of modern critical orthodoxy. For example on 16:17, where Jesus tells Peter that his insight into who Jesus is came by revelation from the Father, the authors comment: "From every indication of the Christian Scriptures, the recognition of the complete identity of Jesus did not come until after His death and resurrection. What we have here, then, is an instance in which Matthew reads the post-resurrection belief of the Church back into the ministry of Jesus" (p. 175). Some readers of Matthew may think of another possibility.

The other book, Meier's *Vision of Matthew*, is an intriguing attempt to link modern ethical questions with a critical study of Matthew. At the technical level Meier disputes the thesis of J. D. Kingsbury to the effect that the crucial title in Matthew's Christology is "Son of God." Meier thinks "Son of Man" is no less central and that the heart of this gospel

is not Christology per se but the bond between Christ and his Church.

The second pole of the book is generated by concerns springing from *Human Sexuality*, a report (1977) submitted to the Catholic Theological Society of America. Meier is upset that there is not more solid exegesis and theological reflection in the report, and his book is in part an attempt to meet this need.

The book is divided into three parts. Part 1 introduces Matthew and his gospel. The stance taken accepts the moderate conclusions of contemporary critical orthodoxy. "Remodeling" is the term Meier uses for the changes Matthew had apparently made on his sources, and redaction criticism is the means of retrieving them. Part 2 is a running commentary on the gospel with the express purpose of showing the nexus between Christ and the Church. Part 3 then turns to crucial moral questions, focusing first on Matt 5:17-20 and then on 5:21-48.

The book deals with fairly technical questions at a level the proverbial well-read clergyman can grasp. But this, of course, means that some things are seriously oversimplified. One of the biggest weaknesses of the book, I think, is that it is really two books: It does not hang together very well. But perhaps we should not complain about getting two for the price of one.

D.A.C.

Jesus, Politics, and Society: A Study of Luke's Gospel. By Richard J. Cassidy. Orbis, 1978.

Despite the title, this is not strictly a study in Lukan redaction criticism. While the first chapter introduces the reader to Luke both as theologian and as historian, Cassidy seems merely to wish to establish that Luke is a relatively reliable historian even when he is handling theological themes: He particularly emphasizes that Luke's geographical and socio-political material is well handled and sometimes more precise than that of his sources (e.g., Luke's correction of "king" to "tetrarch" in describing Herod: Mark 6:14; cf. Luke 9:7).

In the chapters that follow, Cassidy is usually careful to say that he is concerned with Luke's portrait of Jesus and that he is not specifically claiming to speak of the historical Jesus. This would suggest that he is interested in the distinctively Lukan cast of mind and in what can be deduced (from Luke's handling of the socio-political material) about the *Sitz im Leben* of the third gospel. In practice, however, Cassidy shows little or no concern for such issues: His work evinces little interest in Luke's redactional activity (outside the footnotes) and he does not try to relate what he says to Luke's historical setting, nor does he interact extensively with scholarship on the third evangelist.

So what is the purpose of his enquiry into Luke's picture of Jesus' socio-political stance? It is, I suspect, that he believes (as does the reviewer) that Luke's Jesus is the real Jesus, even though he is aware that many do not share this belief and that he cannot prove it to them (cf. pp. 85-86)—and he wants, above all, to tell us something about the real Jesus' socio-political stance without having to write a burdensome tradition-critical monograph raising all the hoary questions of authenticity with respect to each pericope.

Cassidy covers his subject in four chapters. In chap. 2 he first analyzes Jesus' concern for the poor and the socially oppressed, and then he turns to Jesus' attitude toward riches. He remakes the widely accepted point that Luke portrays Jesus as critical of hoarded wealth and as encouraging the sale of "surplus possessions" for the benefit of the poor. In chap. 3 he ranges more widely to demonstrate that Jesus called for a pattern of social relationships based on humility and on service of others and that Jesus strongly opposed physical violence while nevertheless being aggressively assertive on political and social issues.

Cassidy's fourth chapter explores Jesus' relationship to his political rulers: Jesus was clearly openly critical of Herod (13:31-33) and of the chief priests (cf. 19:47; 20:9-20). Further, the material in chap. 3 shows that he would have opposed the Roman pattern of life, particularly in its policy of military domination and its self-enrichment at the expense of subject peoples. Jesus' answer on the question of tribute (20:23-25) Cassidy takes to mean that all things belong to God (even Caesar's affairs), and so Caesar's rule may be crit-

icized in the light of God's will for social order. In chap. 5 Cassidy briefly analyzes Luke's account of the trial and death of Jesus. His silence before Herod and Pilate is interpreted as radical criticism of the power systems for which they respectively stand.

A final chapter draws the threads together into a thesis: Jesus was politically assertive, and his beliefs were as dangerous for the Roman state as were those of Gandhi for the British empire. That this is not Luke's view (as is clear from the way Luke stresses that Pilate and Herod found Jesus innocent—a fact that Cassidy observes) shows where Cassidy's true interests lie.

There follow three appendices on the social matrix of Judea (containing little original material) and one on Conzelmann's interpretation of Luke's socio-political portrait of Jesus.

M. M. B. Turner

London Bible College

Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums: Redaktion und Tradition im Nicht-Markusstoff des dritten Evangeliums. By Joachim Jeremias. MeyerK.; Göttingen: Vanderhoeck und Ruprecht, 1980, 323 pp., DM 60.

Appearing posthumously, this volume stands as a fitting tribute to the commitment to methodological thoroughness and the painstaking attention to detail that characterized the long and productive academic life of this outstanding scholar. The book is the fruit of Jeremias' initial preparations for a now never-to-be-written full-scale commentary on the third gospel. Jeremias was convinced that only a thorough study of Luke's use of language would enable the separation between tradition and redaction, which he considered basic to any attempt to speak of Luke's theology. He was critical of redaction-critical works on Luke that had not laid adequate foundations.

Jeremias takes as fundamental the common authorship of Luke and Acts, and Luke's use of Mark. He pursues his work without appeal to any other literary-critical hypotheses. For reasons not clear to this reviewer he restricts his attention to what he takes to be the non-Markan blocks of the gospel: 1:5-4:30; 5:1-11; 6:20-8:3; 9:51-18:14; 19:1-27, 39-44; 21:34-38; 22:14-24:53.

Six criteria are listed on the basis of which Jeremias separates traditional material from Lukan redaction: A word, word group or syntactical construction is likely to be pre-Lukan if (1) it is seldom or never used independently by Luke, (2) it is widespread in the Markan material or consistently avoided by Luke, (3) a Lukan usage with the same or similar content is available, (4) a Semitic background is clearly recognizable, (5) it is restricted to the non-Markan section of the gospel, and/or (6) it can be demonstrated from other NT books to be a traditional Christian manner of speaking. Jeremias stresses the cumulative nature of the evidential value of these criteria.

The body of the book consists of a detailed and carefully-argued laying out of a verse-by-verse identification of traditional and redactional components. A cross-referencing system minimizes repetition of information and argument.

The work is not designed to reach general conclusions. Nevertheless, Jeremias does offer a number of observations about the tendencies that emerge from the study: (1) Within the infancy narratives, the birth narrative for Jesus is particularly marked by Lukan redaction; (2) when editing a text, Luke frequently allows to stand on its first occurrence what is to him a less desirable expression, only to alter the form of expression when it recurs; (3) Luke has redacted the tradition much less than is normally assumed—in fact, he has interfered less with the non-Markan materials than with the Markan; (4) the redactional activity is normally restricted to the making of stylistic improvements, which he does even in quotations from the LXX; (5) Lukan editorial activity is to be noted particularly in what we might call the framework material of the gospel; (6) by contrast, with the words of Jesus Luke is hesitant about introducing even minor stylistic improvements.

In a book of this scope one might have hoped for a synthesis presenting the major fea-

tures to emerge about Luke's use of language, but this is not provided.

Inevitably a book of this nature cannot escape criticism. The present reviewer would like to register concern in three areas.

1. The work appears to be clearly biased in favor of the tradition. This bias emerges at the outset when Jeremias restricts redactional elements to those that exhibit a specifically Lukan use of language. Surely Luke's own use of language is influenced by the tradition: We need to reckon with the possibility of Lukan ideas expressed in traditional language, especially in view of the frequently repeated judgment that Luke was capable of a great flexibility of style and adapted his style to suit the different phases of his account. A bias in favor of the tradition is also evident in particular arguments. To give an example, on pp. 17-18 Jeremias maintains that the reference to Judea in 1:5 is traditional. The information adduced shows that (1) where the broader meaning of Judea is used inaccurately—i. e., historically anachronistically—we are dealing with Lukan redaction; and (2) where the narrower sense is used correctly, Luke is reproducing the tradition. Neither of these observations supports an attribution to tradition of the use in 1:5 of Judea in the broader sense and correctly. Indeed, apart from other considerations it would be more reasonable to regard Luke as responsible for all the uses of Judea in the broader sense, including that in 1:5.

2. The work drives an unfortunate wedge between tradition and redaction. This suggests a return to an earlier understanding of redaction criticism that maintained that an evangelist was only to be heard in the material that was exclusively his own production. Such an approach ignores Luke's declared intention (1:1-4) of being a servant of the tradition and runs the danger of leaving us, as can be the case with the use of the criterion of dissimilarity, with only the eccentricities of our figure (and even these not properly understood, since loosed from the controls of the wider tradition).

3. The methodological tidiness of Jeremias' approach may be more attractive than realistic. The nonuse of literary-critical hypotheses provides an appearance of objectivity, but it may also be considered as a failure to take into account an important part of the evidence for identifying tradition and redaction in Luke. Similarly, Jeremias' separation between Luke's thought and language and the restriction of his concern to the latter may deprive him of an important tool for identifying Lukan redaction. A certain circularity of procedure, while it is not methodologically tidy, may provide for the most balanced and comprehensive assessment of the evidence. Given the parameters set for the study it is not surprising that Jeremias concludes that the changes that Luke introduces are essentially stylistic.

Despite these limitations, Jeremias' study provides us with an extremely useful reference tool for all who find themselves involved with questions of Lukan language and redaction.

John Nolland

Regent College, Vancouver, BC

The Gospel of John in Christian History: Essays for Interpreters. By J. Louis Martyn. New York: Paulist, 1979, pp. vii + 147, \$4.95 paper.

More than ten years ago Martyn wrote a little book called *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel*. The book enjoyed wide influence among Johannine scholars and was recently published in a revised edition. In that book Martyn argued that small units of material can be identified as referring to the historical Jesus (at the *einmalig* level) but that most of it uses the story of Jesus to describe the conflict between Church and synagogue in some major city of the empire toward the end of the first century. Others of course had been saying this in general terms for years, but Martyn sought to establish the point on a literary basis, taking as his starting point the miracle of John 9.

This present book brings together three essays by the same author, all of them published elsewhere. Only the second essay has been substantially rewritten. The first essay argues that the fourth evangelist used a source with an Elijah Christology but that the evangelist changed the source to provide a Christology of eternal preexistence. He is therefore respon-

sible "for the disappearance from subsequent Christian thought of the identification of Jesus as the eschatological Elijah" (p. 53). In the second chapter Martyn attempts, on the basis of studying several chapters of the Pseudo-Clementines (a translation of which is found in the appendix), to reconstruct something of the history of the persecution in the Johannine community and to delineate the accompanying traditions. In the final essay Martyn outlines what he takes to be some of the main turning points in the history of the Johannine community.

Martyn writes with rare grace and clarity. His work is always provocative. Yet it must be said with regret that Martyn is a gifted scholar whose speculative hypotheses reveal more about his fertile imagination than about the texts on which he comments. He is able, for instance, to assign with remarkable confidence this snippet or that to the early period, middle period or late period of the Johannine community's history as he reconstructs it and to build new speculations on the shoulders of his earlier speculations. Detailed challenge is not possible here, but it is remarkable that no Christian has ever read John's gospel this way before. Perhaps the Holy Scriptures are an esoteric group of secret writings after all, badly in need of a twentieth-century key even to begin to understand them.

D.A.C.

John the Gospel of Life. By D. George Vanderlip. Valley Forge: Judson, 1979, 144 pp., \$5.95 paper.

Vanderlip has been writing in the area of Johannine studies for some years. Now he has written a brief commentary on the gospel of John. In ten graceful chapters he surveys the fourth gospel paragraph by paragraph, delineating the major themes with an eye open to modern application. Pitched at the level of layman or pastor, this little book deserves wide circulation.

No doubt the brevity of this commentary disqualifies the book when it comes to a close study of a host of historical and theological questions. Vanderlip tends to weave his way with literary agility around such questions, focusing exclusively on the major themes. But that is not necessarily a fault. If he does not comment with precision on many interesting trees, he does give us a very useful outline of the forest.

D.A.C.

Songs of Heaven. By Robert E. Coleman. Old Tappan: Revell, 1980, 159 pp., \$6.95.

Here is another gem from the pen of Coleman, who offers 14 meditations on the "songs" of the book of Revelation. With each one he combines simple but telling exposition, thoughtful illustration and analogy, frequent allusion to the Church's hymns, and a warm heart. This is devotional literature at its best. The book deserves to become a classic and will certainly refresh many a saint. *Songs of Heaven* will restore the joy of the Lord to you and tune your heart and mind to sing with the choirs of the King.

D.A.C.

What Is New Testament Theology? The Rise of Criticism and the Problem of a Theology of the New Testament. By Hendrikus Boers. Guides to Biblical Scholarship; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979, 95 pp., \$3.50 paper. *The Past, Present, and Future of Biblical Theology.* By James D. Smart. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1979, 162 pp., \$7.95 paper.

Both of the works here reviewed are nontechnical treatments of the same general topic, but they differ significantly in approach and purpose. Boers attempts to introduce the serious NT student to the science of Biblical theology by surveying its historical developments and by analyzing a few representative works. Smart's book is an impassioned response to those scholars who have announced, or even encouraged, the demise of the so-called Biblical theology movement.

Boers is at his best in describing and assessing the work of J. P. Gabler, whose clarity of conception was indeed "lost in the subsequent developments and was never again equalled" (p. 25). Very valuable also is his analysis of two strikingly different approaches, those of A. Schlatter (whose work still needs to be fully appreciated by evangelicals) and R. Bultmann. The popular character of this book inevitably leads to oversimplification, but some of it should have been avoided. For example on page 17 Boers represents the Reformation as a clean break with tradition, although a fair reading of Calvin demonstrates the inaccuracy of such an interpretation (cf. T. H. L. Parker, *John Calvin: A Biography*, p. 131). Even more irritating is his sweeping condemnation of post-Reformation orthodoxy as a return to unbiblical scholasticism (pp. 20 ff.). This alleged sharp discontinuity between the Reformation and all that preceded or followed it is of course a very common accusation, but not for that reason less disturbing. Besides, it inevitably affects one's evaluation of the rise and development of Biblical theology. Elsewhere Boers tends to overstate himself. For example, in making the very valid point that inconsistencies in expression should not be considered weaknesses (unless one's criterion is a tightly logical system), he states that "it is well known that Paul's writings are *full of logical contradictions*" (p. 80; italics mine). At any rate, the author plays down too much the systematic element in Paul's thought.

Most puzzling of all, however, is Boers' decision to devote more than a fourth of the book (pp. 39-66) to the work of Wrede and Bousset, while at the same time all but ignoring more recent and extremely influential approaches. In particular, although the useful annotated bibliography includes works by Cullmann, Jeremias and Kümmel, a student could go through this book and never find out about the eschatological perspective of these and other scholars. Moreover, Boers overlooks (deliberately?) the significant pioneering work of G. Vos as well as the recent contributions of conservative scholars like H. Ridderbos and G. E. Ladd.

These substantive criticisms notwithstanding, Boers does succeed admirably in laying bare the conceptual issues involved, and this is a good enough reason to recommend the book as a text for introductory courses. The alternative would be G. Hasel's survey (*New Testament Theology: Basic Issues in the Current Debate*), a work which, while more balanced and comprehensive, seems to me less perceptive of the "basic issues."

It is more difficult to assess Smart's discussion of contemporary trends. On the one hand, it would be foolhardy to ignore the wisdom of this mature scholar. Indeed his personal insights into American Biblical scholarship, his well-known views on the role played by presuppositions, his insistence that historical and theological interpretation cannot be divorced from each other, his sorely needed complaints against too sharp a division between the departments of OT and NT in seminaries (p. 20), his appreciation for systematic theology (p. 142)—these and other features make a reading of the book worthwhile.

On the other hand, having myself profited greatly from some of Smart's previous work I must enter a note of disappointment with this particular book. Its thesis—largely an attack on the views of B. Childs, J. Barr, G. E. Wright and others—required a well-documented, scholarly treatment. Unfortunately the author wanted to reach ministers and laypersons through the same medium, and it was no doubt this consideration that led to the decision not to use footnotes. There is, of course, nothing sacrosanct about footnotes, but some alternative systematic means of documentation was necessary. Instead he gives numerous summaries and paraphrases of other scholars' views, sometimes even verbatim quotations (e.g., pp. 69, 79, 139-140, 153), unaccompanied by page references. The popular style leads to unnecessary repetition, loose logic (at worst, *ad hominem*, as when he castigates Barr for not writing exegetical commentaries, p. 31, then again p. 148), and sweeping criticisms (J. G. Machen "assumed that he had destroyed the validity of historical criticism," p. 53—has Smart read Machen's "historico-critical" works on Paul's religion and on the nativity stories?). As a result, one fears that the book will not be taken seriously by many who ought to listen to the author's concerns.

Smart casts his net rather widely, and we have space to consider only one matter of substance—namely, his basic irritation with scholars who speak of Biblical theology as a move-

ment, popular in America during the 1950s and early 1960s but now behind us. Biblical theology, he responds, is not a movement (the few scholars involved in it during those years differed widely among themselves, p. 23) but an aspect of Biblical scholarship that has its roots in Calvin (p. 49), was revived by K. Barth (pp. 62 ff.) and is indispensable "if the Scriptures are to be heard in the church and the world" (p. 48). Smart writes in the hopes of counteracting the serious confusion evident in contemporary scholarship, but at times one wonders to what extent the argument is over words. Readers may be puzzled, for example, by his recognition that the major critics of "biblical theology" are themselves doing "biblical theology" (e.g., p. 36).

I would not suggest, of course, that the discussion is purely a matter of semantics. We need to appreciate, however, that the term "Biblical theology" is used in at least five different senses: (1) any (systematic) theology that seeks to be true to the Bible—an "unscientific" definition that nevertheless springs most naturally to the mind of a lay person; (2) the actual message (or messages) of the Biblical writers—though scholars are not agreed whether the term "theology," which implies a coherent system, is appropriate here; (3) a distinctive discipline, midway between exegesis and systematic theology, that concentrates on (2); (4) historico-critical exegesis that includes the theological dimension, normally by the use of (3); (5) a twentieth-century, Barth-inspired trend that, among other things, emphasizes (4). Smart himself, who uses the term in sense (4), refuses to allow sense (5) even though the latter is a very natural metonymy arising from the former. Opponents of the twentieth-century trend (or "movement") have not always been careful in defining their terms. To the extent that this sloppiness has created confusion, correction is obviously needed. I am less sure that the present book will help to clear the air.

Under the surface of these semantic disputes, however, there lies a fundamental, substantive difference. Smart is deeply troubled with the low view of Scripture evinced by at least some of his foes. He never expresses his concern that explicitly, but it is there all the same. One is therefore not wholly surprised to read a few complimentary (even if somewhat inaccurate) words about evangelicals (pp. 154-155). What the author fails to appreciate is that insofar as he believes that responsible historical criticism is tied to an admission of Scriptural fallibility, to that extent he himself has abandoned the only consistent means of preserving what he wishes to preserve.

M. Silva

Westmont College, Santa Barbara, CA

Book of Bible Lists. By J. L. Meredith. Minneapolis: Bethany Fellowship, 1980, 287 pp., n.p.

The cover describes this book as a "collection of Bible facts in list form." That is just what it is: a book of 223 lists organized under twenty categories. The author, a writer of technical electronics manuals, is noted as being thoroughly familiar with the Bible in that he has read the OT 16 times and the NT 34 times. In coming to his task with obvious relish, he intends that his lists "entertain, interest, fascinate, stimulate and, most of all, educate" those who find the Bible to be dull reading. In so doing he hopes that the reader thus interested will begin to understand what God has done for his creation.

The lists themselves are composed of short quotations from the *KJV* or paraphrases of longer passages. They are not intended to be exhaustive. Indeed, the author requests that his readers submit suggestions for further lists to be incorporated in later editions. The categories under which they are organized range from those concerning commandments or promises to those involving numbers or names or "Bible treasures."

The obvious criticism of such a book is that it is superficial. The kingdom of heaven is presented by means of 18 references, most of which are sentence summaries of parables. (Interestingly, the kingdom of heaven is included in the miscellaneous list of "other things.") Eighteen verses from Proverbs 30-31 occupy approximately twice as much space

as the 39 names of Jesus. The six sins of David show little reflection on the character of Israel's second king. Ishmael's assassination of Gedaliah is not mentioned in "Murders in the Bible." And so on.

On the positive side one may say that the author could well catch the interest of people oriented to such things as television game shows—people who would not otherwise be attracted to reading Scripture. One would certainly hope so. The Church already has too many whose notion of thinking God's thoughts after him is that of being aware of the shortest verse of the Bible or its longest chapter or the 19 kings who ruled Judah.

Glenn Wyper

Ontario Bible College, Willowdale, Ontario M2M 4B3

The Bible in Its Literary Milieu: Contemporary Essays. Edited by John Maier and Vincent Tollers. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979, 447 pp., \$12.95. *Understanding the Bible: A Reader's Guide and Reference.* By Stephen L. Harris. Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield, 1980, 391 pp., n. p.

These two books, both of which come from outside those circles normally associated with Biblical scholarship, may be taken as evidence of increasing interest in the academic study of the Bible in this country. Beyond this, however, the two have little in common other than that they were assigned to the same review and both deal with the Bible, albeit in widely varying ways. As the volume by Maier and Tollers is certainly the more significant of the pair, it is accorded pride of place in this review.

Compiled by two professors of English at the State University of New York at Brockport, *The Bible in Its Literary Milieu* is an extremely wide-ranging collection of 25 essays, originally published between 1957 and 1974, by noted Biblical and literary scholars. The essays deal with various aspects and problems concerning the literary criticism of the Bible. While noting the historical differences between the "criticism of literature" and the "literary criticism of the Bible," the editors believe that in recent decades there has been a convergence of interests on the part of Biblical and literary scholars, who now share three important concerns: (1) recovering the "original" meaning of a text—what it meant when first written; (2) identifying the final intention of the author or editor of a text as it now is; and (3) the problem of history—the distance between the original author and the contemporary reader. Intended to introduce students of both the Bible and literature to the study of these common concerns, the book may be viewed as "a primer in 'approaches to the study of literature' with a focus on one major work with a strongly historical character—the Bible."

Strictly speaking, only the final group of six essays deals with actual "literary" approaches to Biblical texts. In an effort to introduce the student to other factors and concerns with which a critic must reckon, preliminary sections dealing with "The Word," "The Context," "Textual Criticism" and "Literary Forms and Literary Influence" have been included. There is a general introduction, the chapters are prefaced by brief introductory essays, and each article is preceded by preliminary editorial remarks that serve to orient the reader to the writer's specific focus or concern.

The chapter on "The Word" is designed to enable those whose ability to view the Bible as literature is hindered by the concept of the Bible as Scripture to appreciate the "human side" of the process of writing the Bible. It begins with an essay on "The Psychology of Inspiration" by L. A. Schökel. N. Frye discusses a "Theory of Archetypal Meaning: Apocalyptic and Demonic Imagery," while J. Lindblom and D. N. Freedman write on "Symbolic Perceptions and Literary Visions" and "Pottery, Poetry, and Prophecy: An Essay on Biblical Poetry" respectively.

The second section attempts to delineate some aspects of the cultural, political, social, religious and theological context in which the Biblical writers lived and wrote and which must be taken into account by literary critics. W. C. Kaiser, Jr., in "The Old Promise and the New Covenant: Jeremiah 31:31-34," and J. J. Collins in "History and Tradition in the

Prophet Amos" offer divergent views of the relationship of the prophets to tradition. S. B. Frost writes on "Apocalyptic and History," W. F. Albright on "The Antiquity of Mosaic Law," W. O. Walker on "The Origin of the Son of Man Concept as Applied to Jesus," G. E. Wright on "What Archeology Can and Cannot Do," S. Mowinckel on "The Method of Cultic Interpretation" and R. Klein on "Aspects of Intertestamental Messianism."

B. J. Roberts' essay on "The Old Testament: Manuscripts, Texts and Versions" in chap. 3 is excerpted from *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, volume 2, while B. M. Metzger's contribution on "The Practice of New Testament Textual Criticism" is condensed from his *The Text of the New Testament* (second ed., 1968). Finally R. M. Frye in "The Bible in English" provides insight into the approach of the *KJV* translators.

The fourth chapter, "Literary Forms and Literary Influence," finds S. N. Kramer writing on "Sumerian Literature and the Bible," while W. G. Lambert provides "A New Look at the Babylonian Background of Genesis." Roger Cox contributes an insightful essay on "Tragedy and the Gospel Narratives." The last essay, "Biblical Poetry and Homeric Epic," is by W. Whallon.

In the final chapter the essays selected represent six different types of "literary criticism." The approaches utilized by S. Van Tilborg in "A Form-Criticism of the Lord's Prayer" and N. Perrin in "Redaction Criticism at Work: A Sample" are apparent. "Rhetorical criticism" is the subject of J. Muilenburg's famous essay, "Form Criticism and Beyond." K. Burke's contribution on "The First Three Chapters of Genesis" is an example of "logological criticism." "Phenomenological criticism" is represented by J. Macquarrie's "Symbolism Case Study: Light as a Religious Symbol," while E. Leach's disquisition on "Genesis as Myth" is illustrative of "structural exegesis"—a transdisciplinary approach to literature that is receiving an inordinate amount of attention these days.

The essays themselves, all written by competent scholars, are generally excellent, clearly written for the most part and almost always intrinsically interesting. Readers of *JETS* will find a considerable number of them to be of interest, though not always as the editors intended. Since most of the essays written by the Biblical scholars in the group of contributors are probably better known than the others, in what follows attention will be given to those written by the literary critics.

The essay by R. Cox deserves special notice. In challenging the widespread notion that Christianity and tragedy are antithetical he argues that apart from the concept of undeserved but necessary suffering—the essence of tragedy, in his opinion—the gospel itself is meaningless. Careful readers of this essay will find it difficult not to come away with a deepened appreciation of the gospel and increased respect for the skill of the gospel writers.

Schökel investigates the relationship of divine inspiration to the materials, the intuition, and the execution of a literary work by its human author(s). His problem is not "how can inspiration be human" (i.e., nonmechanical or undictated) but "how can human activity be inspired?" Strongly defending and yet interpreting as broadly as possible the official Leonie definition of inspiration, Schökel distinguishes between "the various degrees of commitment with which the authors make their affirmations, down to and including those cases in which, while in the process of achieving a practical goal, they utilize statements without being completely committed to their speculative validity" (p. 28). In all, this essay is a sophisticated attempt to reconcile a "high" view of inspiration with the results of modern critical views of the OT.

The essays by Burke, Macquarrie, Leach and N. Frye will certainly be provocative, possibly eye-opening and probably of little use to those engaged in the exegesis of historical texts. To mention but one point: The ahistoricity of the approaches employed in these essays is deeply disturbing. The contingent aspect of God's dealings with humanity, rooted in and through history, not outside of or unrelated to it—i.e., that which sets apart Biblical faith from other faiths—is in danger of being neglected or even lost.

The introductions and headnotes to the essays are generally satisfactory, though they do not attain to the level of the the essays themselves. The "General Introduction" and that to chap. 2 are the best, accomplishing well their intended purposes. The introduction to the

section on textual criticism, however, is rather brief, too general and not always accurate (e.g., the term "Apostolic Fathers" is not another name for the "NT Apocrypha"). This and other minor items (e.g., the unusual use of *Sitz im Leben*, p. 103; the misleading description of Kaiser and Collins as "dispensational" and "covenantal" theologians respectively, p. 106; the meaning of "apocalyptic" in Greek, p. 134) betray the hand of one not fully at home in an adopted field. Though such errors will not mislead the scholar, students—the intended audience, apparently—could be confused by them. I suspect that teachers not familiar with the issues raised in this book will find it more useful than will students seeking an introduction to the subject.

The editors, nevertheless, are to be commended for their efforts to bring together Biblical and literary critics. Not infrequently Biblical critics, both liberal and conservative, have and do suffer from too narrow a focus and a lack of awareness of current research in related fields of study. Greater attention on the part of Biblical scholars to the work of literary scholars like R. M. Frye (cf., e.g., "Metaphors, Equations, and the Faith," *TToday* 37 [1980] 59-67) can only benefit the discipline. As for the present volume, those not acquainted with "literary" approaches to the Bible will find these essays to be quite an eye-opener, at least in terms of what can be done with (or to!) Biblical texts.

Understanding the Bible, written in an artificial-sounding "comparative-religions" style by a humanities professor at California State University in Sacramento, "aims to give the reader clear and convenient access to the Bible's basic teachings." Part 1—"Questions Readers Ask About the Bible"—deals with such matters as the age and original languages of the Biblical books, manuscripts and translations, and the canon. Part 2 handles not only the canonical OT but also extra-canonical works: apocrypha, pseudepigrapha and QL. Part 3 covers the period between the Testaments, the NT and the "Christian Apocrypha." A 70-page glossary of characters, terms and concepts, an appendix on major archeological discoveries, and an index complete the volume.

The stated purpose of the book is "to provide a direct and useful means of learning what the Bible actually says—as opposed to what people have said and written about it." Further, while not attempting a complete analysis "it does endeavor to inform the reader of the scope and trends of modern scholarship" (p. xi). These are laudable goals. The actual results, however, are very disappointing.

The book is not without good points: Table 1 sets out the contents of the Masoretic, LXX, Roman Catholic and Protestant Old Testaments in a helpful fashion, numerous maps and tables of events clarify the historical backgrounds, and it is very good to have the noncanonical OT and NT material discussed. But such points are insufficient to overcome a number of sometimes serious shortcomings.

These include matters of fact (e.g., the apostolic fathers are not part of the NT apocrypha), content (e.g., why 43 pages on extra-canonical OT books and only one and a half on the QL?), and bibliography (often too brief and outdated; most frequently mentioned are *IB* and *IDB*). Most troublesome, though, is the treatment of the "trends of modern scholarship." The book is a classic example of the "modern scholars say" approach. Seldom is indication given of the range of scholarly opinion on various controversial points (cf., e.g., on 1 Corinthians, p. 269). The positions expressed are often superannuated—e.g., the treatment of Pentateuchal sources is pure Graf-Wellhausen JEDP, now some eighty years out of date. Or, the only reason given for thinking that Matthew is nonapostolic is that it draws heavily on Mark, written by someone who was not an eyewitness of Jesus' career—an old chestnut best left without comment. Nuanced statements about critical issues are notable by their absence, resulting in misleading impressions. Frequently inadequate or even no reasons are given for why "modern scholars" say what they do. In this reviewer's opinion, such an approach is inadequate in an introductory college text. It is doubtful that readers of *JETS* will find occasion to use this book.

Michael W. Holmes

Princeton Theological Seminary

The Book of Leviticus. By Gordon J. Wenham. R. K. Harrison, general ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 362 pp., 1979, \$9.95.

This book by Wenham is a worthy addition to NICOT. Wenham, a well-known and competent scholar, has given us a commentary that is more than a reference book giving verse-by-verse exposition. Because of the size and purpose of his commentary an extensive analysis of the critical views on the composition and dating of Leviticus is not given, but what is said is well said and helpful. It might have been added that the Wellhausenian view, still held in part, suffered from a basic ignorance of the history and cult practices of the surrounding cultures as now known.

On textual questions he discusses the MT, Samaritan Pentateuch and LXX, giving the palm to the MT. This view is not supported by examples that would be beyond the purpose of the book, but reference is made to B. K. Waltke's "Samaritan Pentateuch and the Texts of the Old Testament" in *New Perspectives on the Old Testament* (ed. J. B. Payne) and to articles by D. N. Freedman and others. He shares Waltke's conclusion that the Old Palestinian text from which the LXX and Samaritan Pentateuch were derived was a text modernized in the fifth century B.C. This conclusion seriously questions the late composition of the Pentateuch as held by critical scholars.

Dealing with some key questions in Leviticus he discusses at length the terms "holy," "clean" and "unclean" and concludes that "cleanness is the normal condition of most things and persons" (p. 19). Clean things can be sanctified for sacred use or can be polluted and become unclean. He holds that "theology not hygiene" caused diseased persons to leave the camp (p. 21). He claims that uncleanness is contagious but admits that unclean animals do not pollute. He forgets that their carcasses do pollute both ceremonially and hygienically. It is possible to hold that the laws of cleanliness are indeed basically hygienic, but of course in a theocracy they are reinforced with religious sanctions. On this, more later.

On the effect of sacrifices he seems to say that they merely "undo the effects of sin and human infirmity." On the succeeding page (p. 28) he goes further and better in discussing *kipper*, "atone." Here he affirms substitutionary sacrifice for sin.

In discussion of the five main types of sacrifices he concludes that the function of the burnt offering "was to atone for man's sin by propitiating God's wrath." The cereal offering "was a gift by the worshipper to God." The peace offering "was a meal in which God's presence was recognized as specially near . . . , a particularly joyful occasion." The sin offering he calls the "purification offering" and seems to downgrade it somewhat by saying that its main purpose was to remove pollution (p. 96). This hardly seems to exhaust the meaning of the great ritual of the sin offerings given on the day of atonement (Leviticus 16). The trespass or guilt offering he rightly calls the "reparation offering." It has clear parallels with the sin offering, but the witness of Isaiah 53 is noted and reparation offering is called basically substitutionary. Of course it also includes reparation for the offense, be it against man or God.

The institution of the priesthood is treated in Leviticus 8—10. Wenham observes properly that this is history that is not separate from the laws but "provides a setting for the laws" (p. 129). It actually gives the details of the anointing of Aaron and the beginning of worship first recorded in Exod 40:12-16, 34-35. The treatment is helpful. The present writer feels that here and in some other places too much is made of the structure of the three chapters. Is the structure so artistic and intentionally parallel, or is chap. 9 simply reporting Aaron's first sacrifices, which were rather naturally similar to those Moses offered at the ceremony in chap. 8? The parallels with the sin of Nadab and Abihu are not impressive.

In the opinion of the writer the section on uncleanness, Leviticus 11—15, is the weakest in the book—though this is probably because the writer holds the view that uncleanness is primarily a hygienic matter. Wenham discusses briefly the four main views: that the distinctions of clean and unclean are arbitrary, that they are a foil against surrounding pagan practices, that they are hygienic, and that the clean animals named are symbolic of righteousness. Wenham follows a fifth view—that of M. Douglas, a social anthropologist—that

cleanness is recognition of wholeness and normality. An effort is made to apply this to the matter of diseases as well.

Extensive critique is not in place. Why lambs are more normal than pigs is not clear. Mice and lizards are said to be not normal because they "swarm, that is, they dart hither and thither in unpredictable fashion" (p. 178). Surely it is more logical to think that mice, bugs, and so on are unclean because they carry disease. The case is much clearer if the hygienic view is held. Pigs, carrion birds, mud burrowing fish, snails, and so forth all carry parasites, which are a special plague in the Near East. Bugs, mice, rats, flies and mosquitoes carry disease, and since these caused serious uncleanness if they got into food the Hebrew housewife would keep a clean house that would help protect against disease.

As to "leprosy" Wenham is right that it is not real leprosy (Hansen's disease). But he makes it too tame to limit it to psoriasis, favus and leucoderma. The scourges of man until recently were fever diseases with skin eruptions—such as measles, small pox, scarlet fever, and so on—that run their course in about two weeks. The only treatment for these until recent times was quarantine, which the Levitical law effectively supplied. Indeed Wenham unconsciously uses the word "quarantine" to refer to houses with mildew (p. 211).

The treatment of chap. 16, the day of atonement, has a number of good points. He holds that the *kapporet*—*KJV* "mercy seat"—is so named because of its connection with atonement (p. 229). He notes that the special and plain garments worn by the high priest symbolize his servant position before God. But his emphasis is that the ritual cleansed the tabernacle instead of emphasizing that it was an atonement for the sins of the nation. The first part of the ritual (vv 11-14) tells how Aaron is to kill the sin offering for himself and his household and sprinkle its blood at the *kapporet*, the "atonement place" (*NIV*). The action is aimed only at atoning for the priests' sins. The people's sin offering is treated likewise, and here cleansing of the tabernacle and its furniture is included but the emphasis is on atonement for the sins of Aaron, his house and all Israel (v 17). This is further emphasized in the powerful symbol of the escape goat, which will "carry on itself all their sins to a solitary place." The symbolism seems explicit for the atonement of and removal of sin. Wenham's fine summary of the NT usage underlines this thought. It is too bad that after criticizing the view that the escape goat is dedicated to a demon of the wilderness, Azazel, he translates it as Azazel and quotes Hoffmann to the effect that whether Azazel means the mountain of destruction, the sin destroyed, or the evil angel who is bribed, in any case it means "that sin is exterminated from Israel" (p. 235). The demon idea is based mainly on late rabbinic and Jewish literature and is a very unworthy idea to impart into this sacred ritual.

One point may be raised on the treatment of chap. 17. Wenham translates the first clause of v 3 as follows: "If any Israelite kills" (*šāḥat*). He concludes that no domestic animals could be slaughtered at home. This raises a problem with Deut 12:15, which specifically allows slaughtering at home. Wenham feels that the Leviticus law was for the wilderness and that Deuteronomy was for Canaan. But he admits that *šāḥat* can mean "sacrifice," and indeed in practically every other place in Leviticus it does mean "sacrifice." It surely is better to hold that Leviticus 17, like Deuteronomy 12, emphasizes the law of the central sanctuary (long before Josiah), where sacrifices must be made but butchering may be done at home.

Wenham's treatment of the so-called holiness code (chaps. 18—26) has many good features. His outlines help us see the interrelationship of these chapters. He sets out the prohibited degrees of marriage in 18 and remarks that 20 covers much of the same material, adding the penalties to be given, but that 18 is apodictic law and 20 is casuistic law. This point is of interest today, when the apodictic law is said to come from Hittite covenants and the form of case law from legal codes. Here the differences in form agree with a difference in meaning.

As often, Wenham gathers truth for the NT Church from his treatment of the rules for the priests (chaps. 21—22). He draws a forceful parallel between the high priest who could not defile himself for his father or mother's funeral and the NT disciple (Matt 8:21-22) who should put Christ above all.

The remainder of Leviticus has miscellaneous matters well treated by Wenham, among them the annual feasts, which are called rules for the "laity" (the regulations for the priests are in Numbers 28—29), and rules for care of the lampstand and provision of the "Bread of the Presence" (chap. 24). The case of blasphemy by a man of mixed parentage gave the occasion for clarifying the law with regard to aliens. Wenham treats well the *lex talionis*, a rule for judges that the Pharisees twisted into a maxim for personal conduct. Then comes the jubilee year with its remarkable provisions for land reform. Wenham notes that it keeps a good balance between the monopolistic tendencies of the rich and a thoroughgoing communism where all property is in state hands. In Israel the land was God's. The people were tenants—"pilgrims and strangers"—as we must be too.

In the treatment of the blessings and curses of chap. 26 he discusses the covenant form of the chapter, comparing it to Deuteronomy 28 and drawing lessons for the NT Church. His bibliography (strangely hidden on pp. 37-44) and notes are very good. At this point, however, the work on covenants by M. Kline, *Treaty of the Great King*, should have also been mentioned.

Wenham has done us all a service in giving a careful and thorough treatment of a book that includes details strange to our worship today, and he helps the Christian reader by relating the ancient directions for Israel's priests to the NT Church with its priesthood of all believers.

R. Laird Harris

Covenant Theological Seminary, St. Louis, MO

God at Work in Israel. By Gerhard von Rad. Translated by John H. Marks. Nashville: Abingdon, 1980, 223 pp., \$6.95 paper.

Most readers of *JETS* know Gerhard von Rad as a theologian whose major works have shaped the course of contemporary OT Biblical theology in a way perhaps unparalleled by any other scholar. Most do not know him as the preacher, however. This stimulating collection of 19 essays and public lectures serves to illustrate the proper integration of a lifetime of academic pursuit of theological truth with its practical application to the man on the street. The result is a rare blend of simplicity and profundity, of the successful and necessary symbiosis of meaningful human existence and its theological assumptions.

The topics range from "How to Read the Old Testament" to "The Mystery of Old Testament Israel" and "Psalm 90." They are not of equal help and value, perhaps, but each article provides at least one creative starting point from which the sensitive reader may enrich his thinking. For example, in the essay "Naaman: A Critical Retelling" von Rad deals with the Syrian's request to take a load of Palestinian soil back to Damascus. Elisha's acquiescence to this "unspiritual" request, von Rad points out, must be seen in the prophet's awareness that there is no division of the world into material and spiritual parts and that religion is not limited only to the spiritual. Naaman, he says, asks for the soil as a temporary expedient, an insulating layer from onrushing heathendom. The Christian faith also has made use of a load of holy ground in the form of hymnic styles, language, buildings, symbols and liturgy—all, von Rad reminds us, as a mark of the Church's distinction from the profane world.

Redaction criticism is, of course, evident in practically everything von Rad says concerning early Israel's history. As is well known he lifts the Joseph story from its Pentateuchal and patriarchal context and views it as a wisdom piece from a much later provenience. While this may be disturbing from a methodological standpoint, von Rad's insights into the emotional and psychological aspects of the narrative are extremely sensitive and helpful. His article "The Story of Joseph" is well worth considering in any preaching or teaching of the life of Joseph.

The most important contribution von Rad makes through this compendium, perhaps, is

his implied insistence that a proper theology underlie one's complete structure of thought and life. One may not (and need not) accept von Rad's own theology in order to validate this premise, but one cannot come away from von Rad easily without seeing the intrinsic value of theological underpinning for authentic Christian understanding and experience.

Eugene Merrill

Dallas Theological Seminary

A History of Israel. By John J. Davis and John C. Whitcomb. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1980, 542 pp., \$14.95.

As the subtitle "From Conquest to Exile" indicates, this history treats the period from Joshua through the destruction of Jerusalem at Babylonian hands, a period of about 800 years according to the authors' conservative chronology. The reason for such unorthodox *termini a quo* and *ad quem* for a history of Israel is to be found in the fact that this volume is a composite of three earlier publications by the authors, each of which dealt with a limited span of history. It is obvious that this diminishes the value of the book as a textbook for the entire course of Israel's history. One wishes that the authors had completed and included sections that would provide both a beginning and an end to the story. Perhaps that will be done at a later time.

Nevertheless, Davis and Whitcomb have provided now in more convenient form a reference work that will without question be of great benefit to all but specialists in the field. Its commitment to the proposition that the OT record should speak for itself in matters historical as well as theological is commendable. While admitting that the history of Israel is recorded in the OT selectively and with religious objectives in view, the authors refuse to concede the bifurcation between *Historie* and *Heilsgeschichte* demanded by most contemporary OT revisionist historians. They take the record at face value and with good control of the Biblical and non-Biblical data reconstruct the fuller background of Israel's internal and international affairs in such a way as to clarify the OT texts for modern readers. On the whole the work is reliable and reflects an awareness of the best of OT and ancient Near Eastern scholarship.

This endorsement must be tempered somewhat by the fact that Davis and Whitcomb apparently have utilized or interacted with very little recent publication in the field. Startling by their omissions are the works of Fohrer, Weippert, Herrmann, de Vaux and, especially, Hayes and Miller. Even granting that all three original publications that make up their history preceded most of these works, they suggest in a preface that they are not just reprinting these but updating them. This surely requires at least bibliographic updating as well. In fact, however, nothing is listed after 1970.

This is not to say that the book is completely outdated, however, for it expressly does not attempt to combat negative or alternative positions but only to present in a clear and concise way the Old Testament's own historical witness. It succeeds in doing this thanks to the lucidity of style, copious use of photographs and drawings, and the very evident reverence brought to the sacred text by these scholars, from whom we have come to expect such high standards.

Eugene Merrill

Dallas Theological Seminary

Israel's United Monarchy. By Leon J. Wood. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979, 362 pp., \$12.95.

There can be no doubt that this posthumous product of the devout and prolific pen of the late Leon Wood will for a long time be the definitive statement of Israel's history in the late eleventh through the tenth century. With characteristic thoroughness Wood has examined every detail of Israel's national experience, always against the ancient Near Eastern milieu in which it took shape. He takes the testimony of the ancient historiographers literally and seriously. They may have been writing theological history indeed, but they were writing history. If there is any flaw in Wood's approach it is in his neglect of the theological

aspect of the story. Was the monarchy established just to satisfy the demands of the people or even just to fulfill the prophecy of Deuteronomy 17 concerning a future king? Surely there is something profoundly significant about human kingship in Israel as a reflection or model of the great theocratic purposes of God.

In addition to the plausible and sometimes ingenious suggestions he makes in integrating and fleshing out the bare-bones information that often frustrates the student of this period of history, Wood is careful to draw appropriate moral and spiritual applications to present-day Christian living. Anyone who has attempted to preach OT narrative literature will appreciate how difficult it is to use that material in a sound hermeneutical way to address contemporary need. The author has done this and done it well. Preachers of Samuel and 1 Kings 1—11 will profit from many of the suggestions Wood makes in this respect.

Though this book fails to interact with the views of critical scholars—not a deficiency in light of its intent—it is certain to be very useful as a reference tool for college and seminary students. The work that constructs a history of the period on sound methodological grounds and as a response to historical skepticism remains to be written.

Eugene Merrill

Dallas Theological Seminary

The Two Horizons: New Testament Hermeneutics and Philosophical Description with Special Reference to Heidegger, Bultmann, Gadamer, and Wittgenstein. By Anthony C. Thiselton. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980, 484 pp., \$22.50.

Hermeneutics today is not merely the application of rules and interpretation to the text to determine its meaning. The big problem facing hermeneutics is the gap that exists between the Biblical writers and the interpreter, removed many centuries in time from the original text. With this separation comes a problem in understanding, for the whole cultural context of the interpreter is quite different from the author's. This has given rise to the concept of horizons: the idea that in order to be understood the Biblical limits of thought must overlap with those of the interpreter.

This endeavor has led contemporary interpreters to weigh carefully the question of presuppositions or preunderstandings. The mindset, the assumptions, the basic frame of reference governs what one perceives or, in this case, finds in the text being interpreted. But inquiry concerning presuppositions is actually the domain of philosophy. Consequently the interpreter of the Bible must be thoroughly conversant with both the content and background of the Biblical text and the methodology and content of philosophy.

In this book Anthony Thiselton, senior lecturer in Biblical studies at the University of Sheffield, has attempted to evaluate the contribution of philosophy to understanding of the hermeneutical task, to garnering the meaning of parts of the NT, and to enlarging the interpreter's own self-understanding. He has examined in considerable depth the thought of four theologians or philosophers: Heidegger, Bultmann, Gadamer and Wittgenstein.

The book is organized into three parts. In part one—introductory questions—he seeks to justify the role of philosophy in hermeneutics, examines the underlying hermeneutical problem of the two horizons and of the NT and preunderstanding, and takes a preliminary look at the four thinkers involved. In part two—broader issues in NT hermeneutics—he treats the questions of hermeneutics and history, hermeneutics and theology, and hermeneutics and language. Part three is a much more in-depth scrutiny of the four thinkers (with two or three chapters devoted to each) as well as the relationships among their respective systems.

Thiselton concerns himself immediately with the question of why one should bother with philosophy. In particular, the fear has often been voiced that the use of philosophical concepts and categories corrupts an otherwise "pure" understanding of the Biblical writings. This rests on the idea that hermeneutics consists of formulating rules of interpretation. Unfortunately, however, this approach unconsciously presupposed a particular answer to the question of how any understanding, even a preliminary one, was possible. In other words even the objection to the use of philosophy in Biblical interpretation is itself a par-

ticular philosophical stance, or at least rests on one. Hermeneutics, if it is really to accomplish the task of understanding the text, must wrestle with the role that philosophy plays in the process.

To pursue this question of philosophy's contribution to hermeneutics, Thiselton has chosen four leading thinkers. His choice of this particular group has been made because each is a giant who has had a great influence on twentieth-century thought. Further, each is concerned with philosophy as philosophical description—although by description each means something a bit different from each of the others.

The discussion of each of these four men contains several components, which may be noted by examining his treatment of one of them: Bultmann. There is an analysis of the influences helping to produce his view or of the sources from which his ideas stem. One entire chapter is devoted to "The Ingredients of Bultmann's Hermeneutical Concerns Prior to Heidegger's Philosophy." Here Thiselton notes the influence of theological liberalism through Bultmann's teachers, Harnack and Herrmann. In addition, however, he also sees an indebtedness to the neo-Kantian philosophers Cohen and Natorp. He sees in Bultmann a fusion of neo-Kantian epistemology (which represented significant modifications of Kant's thought) and of nineteenth-century Lutheranism, which in turn was quite different from Luther's thought as formulated in the sixteenth century. In addition Bultmann was affected by the history-of-religions school and current Biblical scholarship, as well as dialectical theology. A further chapter notes the contribution to Bultmann's approach of the ideas of Heidegger, W. Dilthey and R. G. Collingwood. In the process of comparing themes in Bultmann's system with motifs in the writings of other men, Thiselton does considerable exposition of the structure of Bultmann's own ideas.

After this comparative analysis Thiselton then devotes a full chapter to an examination of "Bultmann's Hermeneutics and the New Testament," giving specific examples of Bultmann's interpretation of Biblical passages. Here he points out how Bultmann's preunderstanding affects his interpretation of the Biblical text. For Bultmann the idea of preunderstanding constitutes merely a starting point that must be corrected in light of the text. It is the specific elements feeding into this thought that result in certain possibilities being excluded in interpreting the text. Thiselton says: "*What makes Bultmann foreclose in advance certain possibilities of interpretation is not his hermeneutical theory as such, but the theological response which he makes to the legacy of Neo-Kantian thought*" (p. 284). It is not his hermeneutical theory but rather the application of it in practice that leads him astray.

To read Thiselton's book is to discover a veritable gold mine of material. He has read widely, and at times his bibliographical knowledge is almost overwhelming. He also engages in detailed analysis of the thought of the philosopher or theologian being examined. He has particularly pursued the search for origins of ideas and systems. And he has done a good job of showing how the particular presuppositions affect the process of interpretation. His commentaries and evaluations are careful, balanced and penetrating. He has managed to bring together a profound understanding of philosophical issues and a broad and deep knowledge of NT scholarship.

Thiselton is an independent thinker, unafraid to differ with widely-held theories when he feels the evidence lies elsewhere. For example, one approach to the understanding of Heidegger points out the similarity of his thought to that of Husserl. Thiselton, however, notes differences between the two that are so fundamental as to suggest that "the attempt to approach Heidegger from the standpoint of Husserl raises more problems than it solves" (p. 145). Thus he is genuinely an interpreter of these men rather than a mere compiler of opinions about them.

All of this is not to say that there are not shortcomings in this book, however. For one thing, the criteria of evidence for establishing influence on a man's thought are not clearly or thoroughly enunciated. Neither association with another thinker as a student or colleague nor similarity of thought guarantees influence. His basis for accepting the idea of the neo-Kantian influence on Bultmann is summarized as follows: "We are convinced, however, by the case put forward by Johnson, and find it corroborated in writings of Bultmann

above and beyond the passages which Johnson himself cites" (p. 210). It would have been helpful if the evidence had been spelled out and the conclusions demonstrated.

Further, there is a sense in which he may have attempted to do too much. The expositions are quite complete and tend to stand without much interconnection with one another.

One might wish for a more complete conclusion by Thiselton. As it stands we are given four illustrations of the employment of philosophy in dealing with the problem of the two horizons. The reader is left somewhat to his own resources in formulating a solution to the problem.

This is not a book for the novice. For one willing to make the considerable effort of grappling with the serious problems of hermeneutics, however, there is a wealth of information and insight.

Millard J. Erickson

Bethel Theological Seminary, St. Paul, MN

Kingdom Living Here and Now. By John MacArthur, Jr. Chicago: Moody, 1980, 191 pp., \$8.95.

Kingdom Living Here and Now presents expository studies of the beatitudes (Matt 5:1-12). Its strengths are a dependence on a wealth of Biblical knowledge and a contemporary freshness. Originally preached, these studies still communicate in the immediacy of a clear spoken style. This enhances the urgent call for decision to which each is directed.

MacArthur sets the direction of his studies by identifying in an introductory chapter, "Examine Yourself," the basic need of his audience: "easy believism." Echoing the same concern that produced in an earlier generation the studies by D. Bonhoeffer on the sermon on the mount, *The Cost of Discipleship*, MacArthur contends that the Christian faith was meant to be lived. The sermon on the mount, and especially the beatitudes, gives the pattern for that living. A second introductory chapter provides the historical and theological contexts for understanding the beatitudes. Also included is a basic definition of blessedness—"happiness"—and a number of reasons for studying this particular portion of the sermon on the mount.

The major portion of the book consists of chapters each devoted to a different beatitude. MacArthur explains the beatitude by defining with extensive Biblical background each of the key words in the saying. His definitions often anticipate potential misunderstandings of a word. For example, the author's discussion of Matt 5:4—"Happy are the sad . . ."—begins with a description of the different types of sorrow in the Bible. Then he focuses on the sorrow indicated here, the godly sorrow that leads to repentance. At the conclusion of each study MacArthur lists practical steps for appropriating the quality described and a checklist for discerning whether one is already manifesting it. A concluding chapter contains an impassioned plea for the reader to complete his self-examination and determine to have his life exhibit the reality of the beatitude characteristics.

The chief strengths of the book are MacArthur's careful meditation on the meaning and contemporary application of each beatitude and his perception, in their order of presentation, of a pattern of progress in the Christian life. He has a good command of Biblical content and can marshal appropriate Biblical examples to illustrate his points. Two weaknesses in the book as a whole are a failure to give equal attention to the benefits promised in each beatitude and a failure to consistently place the beatitudes' teaching in the context of Jesus' teaching and Matthean theology. Instead of using Pauline thought to begin and warnings from Hebrews to close the book, MacArthur would have achieved more coherence if he had drawn the same material from Jesus' teaching. In minor matters MacArthur mixes Greek and Hebrew on pages 60-61 by not indicating whether OT examples are drawn from the LXX or the MT. He consistently contends that the intensive pronoun *autos* has an exclusive use in the beatitudes (e.g., "they *alone* shall be comforted"). While an exclusive sense is possible, the more natural sense is resumptive. The pronoun serves to refer with more or less emphasis to the immediately preceding subject (Bauer-Danker-Gingrich, p. 122).

Kingdom Living Here and Now will be of use to the preacher both as a model for Biblical

preaching on a familiar and difficult passage and as a resource for personal reflection. The volume with its twelve chapters could also serve as a text for a series of studies for a home Bible study or an adult Sunday-school elective.

William Larkin

Columbia Graduate School of Bible and Missions, Columbia, SC 29203

The Family and the Fellowship: New Testament Images of the Church. By Ralph P. Martin. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980, 142 pp., \$4.95 paper.

The chasms of time and culture are too wide to attempt an uncritical translation of first-century Church structures into a twentieth-century milieu. Yet the modern Christian community is in desperate need of establishing norms that will restore order and meaning to its often fragmented and chaotic existence. Martin's *The Family and the Fellowship* is thus a timely and relevant publication. Martin has helped span these chasms by asking of the NT texts: "What is the meaningful model of the church for today's world?" (p. 122).

Written with the conviction that the Church has a fundamental role to play in God's design, Martin's intention was to produce "a simply composed yet fairly comprehensive summary of what the New Testament has to say about selected themes of the church" (p. 11). The book achieves its objectives with a straightforward and lucid explication of the key elements in ecclesiology: the origin of the Church, the NT concept of "fellowship" (*koinōnia*), the "spiritual gifts," the diversity of the early Church's ministry, the sacramental life of the Church, and the relation of the Church to the world. Three examples serve to demonstrate Martin's task.

First, the concept of "fellowship" was central to the Church's self-awareness. If *koinōnia* is defined as "taking part in something with someone," the question arises as to the appropriate emphasis: that which is shared, or the sense of sharing? According to Martin, "invariably the stress falls on the privilege which comes to us as we join with other Christians in participation in 'objective realities'" (p. 36). Thus, today as then, "whatever else the church is called to be it is essentially 'the community of the risen Lord'" (p. 23).

Second, although the Church as a sociological entity assumes various roles or "models" (depending on its social setting) there is an ever-present need to refer back to the predominant Biblical images for evaluation and correction: the temple of the Lord (center of worship), the body of Christ (Christ's agent to the world), the family of God. The latter is the most profound, for "the church at its best reflects all that is noblest and most worthwhile in human family life: attributes of caring and mutual regard; understanding of needs, whether physical or of the spirit; and above all the sense of 'belonging' to a social unit in which we find acceptance without pretence or make-believe" (p. 124).

Third, and to this reviewer an especially constructive point, the question of ecumenism is discussed in light of John 17. Unity will be achieved not with the eradication of denominational distinctives but with the expression of "a common purpose and a shared goal" (p. 91). "'Mission' is thus the order of the day," and doctrinally the irreducible minimum of agreed truth is Christological and soteriological: "Is he confessed and believed as 'true God, true man' and is he that sole saviour of the world and its exalted Lord?" (p. 95).

Although the work demonstrates Martin's acumen in the historical and critical disciplines, the entire study is written with a view to application to the modern situation. This little volume is recommended for informed laypersons, as a supplementary text for college-level seminars on the doctrine of the Church, and for ministers who are grappling with the question of what the Church should be in a modern pluralistic society.

Robert W. Herron, Jr.

Rice University, Houston, TX 77001

The Centrality of the Resurrection. A Study in Paul's Soteriology. By Richard B. Gaffin, Jr. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1978, 155 pp., \$4.95 paper.

This technical monograph began life as a Westminster Theological Seminary Th.D. dissertation in 1969. In it Gaffin focuses on the theological significance of Christ's resurrection in Pauline soteriology. But his concerns are just as much methodological as theological.

Traditional Reformed theology has placed the center of Paul's understanding of the accomplishment of redemption in Christ's atoning death and has located the heart of his understanding of the application of redemption (i.e., the *ordo salutis*) in the doctrine of justification by faith. This twofold structuring of Paul's theology of redemption, because of its almost exclusive interest in Christ's sacrifice and man's justification, assigns no significant, redemptively functional role to Christ's resurrection. Indeed this event is usually portrayed in terms of its evidential value, as the initial phase of Christ's exaltation and as assuring the application of redemption wrought by his death.

Following the pioneering work of G. Vos and H. Ridderbos, Gaffin argues that we should approach and structure Paul's theology the way Paul did—in terms of the history of salvation (*historia salutis*) rather than in terms of the application of salvation (*ordo salutis*), as is more traditional. This historical-redemptive structure of Paul's theology must be ours as well if we are to deal faithfully with his thoughts. Likewise, our theological method of approaching Paul must be Pauline. And Paul's theology is structured redemptive-historically in terms of the culmination of redemptive history, divine promise, and eschatological salvation in the death and especially the resurrection of Christ. This latter event is the central event of redemptive history, since it inaugurates the eschaton, God's new world order and soteric realm.

Part one of this book deals with methodological considerations raised by this relatively new approach to Pauline theology. Paul is seen as a theologian whose systematic orientation is revealed in the eschatological infrastructure that qualifies and unifies his theology as a whole. He wrote from the redemptive-historical perspective of one who looked back on the event of the resurrection while awaiting the return of the Lord. Therefore because they share a common redemptive-historical framework and perspective, Paul's interpreters are engaged with him in the common hermeneutical enterprise of interpreting God's acts in Christ as they culminate in the resurrection. Paul's interpretation is primary and necessary, while ours is secondary and derived from his. His is inspired, inerrant and revelatory, while ours is not. Ours seeks to make more explicit the structure, meaning and significance of his.

Part two investigates the basic structure of Paul's doctrine of the resurrection and the centrality it has in his soteriology. The theme that governs Paul's resurrection theology is the unity of the resurrection of Jesus with that of believers. The resurrection of believers includes their past existential as well as their future bodily transformation. Terms such as "firstfruits" (1 Cor 15:20 ff.; Rom 8:23) and "firstborn" (Col 1:18) highlight the inseparable and necessary relation between Christ's resurrection and the future resurrection of believers. As "firstfruits," Christ's resurrection is both the representative beginning of the resurrection of believers and the actual beginning of that general event. His resurrection and ours are two temporally distinct episodes of one theologically unified event. Because Christ rose, believers necessarily will rise (1 Cor 15:12-19) for there is an organic cause-and-effect relation between these two events. As "firstborn," Christ is a member of the general group that God will raise, the first to experience resurrection, the one whose resurrection inaugurates the new world order and therefore the one who is pre-eminent in status and supreme in authority over the entire group who will live in the new age. Both as "firstfruits" and as "firstborn" Christ's specific identity is that of the second or eschatological Adam, the representative of the new humanity whose resurrection inaugurates, symbolizes, anticipates and guarantees the future resurrection of those who belong to him.

But the believer has already been raised with Christ. We already experience the life of the new age (cf. Eph 2:5-6; Col 2:12-13; 3:1; Rom 6:3 ff.; Gal 2:19-20). We have been exis-

tentially transformed dispositionally, behaviorally and noetically. This transformation occurs because of Christ's resurrection on the one hand and our faith on the other. It consists in enjoying the quality of life and type of existence characteristic of the new age that his resurrection inaugurated. Therefore our existential experience of transformation properly can be referred to as "resurrection" or as "being raised with Christ" and as such anticipates and is organically related to our future bodily resurrection. The present Christian experience of salvation is eschatological in nature, quality and direction.

The Pauline category "union with Christ," reflected in the phrase "in Christ" or "raised with Christ," underlies the texts referred to in the preceding paragraph. Whatever Christ has experienced the believer will experience. Because Christ has been raised to a new pneumatic mode of existence, so has the believer been raised. And in the case of sinful believers—unlike Christ—this pneumatic mode of existence transforms us dispositionally, behaviorally and noetically. To have experienced resurrection is to have died to sin's power in our life on the one hand and to have been given the pneumatic power of Christ on the other. Resurrection with Christ is existentially transforming. The believer's present pneumatic mode of existence is dependent on and a function of Christ's past resurrection and continuing resurrection mode of existence. So the Christian's life is a resurrection life. In fact it is Christ's resurrection life. Indeed it is no longer I who live but the resurrected Christ who lives in me (Gal 2:20).

Christ's past redemptive-historical resurrection is temporally, factually and conceptually separate from my present existential experience of resurrection. But the former is the necessary condition for, the constitutive principle of, and that which entails the latter. For as the second Adam, Christ was raised as the representative of and therefore on behalf of the elect who were, according to Gaffin, mystically united with Christ in his death and resurrection.

The tension between having been raised with Christ but not yet in bodily form exists because though Christ has been raised he has not yet returned to consummate his redemptive eschatological work. Therefore, redemptive-historically speaking, Paul portrays the age to come both as present and as future. Christ's resurrection inaugurated the eschaton—and, when raised existentially, the Christian experiences the life of this new age. Christ's return will bring the eschaton to full fruition—and, when raised physically, the Christian will experience the life of that age in perfect fullness.

God in his role of Father raised Jesus his Son who was passive in this event. Christ's passivity was a function of his identity as the messianic second Adam who represents the new people of God as their "firstfruits" and as the "firstborn" from the whole group of God's people who are to be raised. Since we will not raise ourselves, neither did the second Adam, our representative. In raising him God vindicated him in his messianic, Adamic identity.

Though Paul nowhere specifically says the Spirit raised Christ, this is a clear implication of passages such as Rom 8:11. Therefore the believer presently lives by means of and in terms of the Spirit, just as in the future he will live in a new resurrection body by means of and in terms of the Spirit. The Pauline association between "Spirit," "power," "glory" and "life" also points toward seeing the instrumentality of the Spirit in Christ's resurrection as well as toward a definition of the nature of the resurrection body. But "Spirit" cannot be reduced to "power"—the cause to the effect—so that we understand "Spirit" as an impersonal power. The Spirit is a divine powerful Person.

Part three further develops the theme of the resurrection of Christ in Paul's soteriology by focusing on the relation between Christ's resurrection (redemption accomplished) and the realization of redemption in the believer's experience (redemption applied). Therefore in this section the resurrection of Christ is related to the key soteriological categories of justification, adoption, sanctification and glorification.

First, 1 Cor 15:45; 2 Cor 3:17; Rom 1:3-4 and Acts 13:33 are examined in order to show the theological significance of the resurrection for Christ in his identity as the second Adam. At and because of his resurrection the mode of Jesus' existence as the second Adam

was so decisively transformed by the Holy Spirit, and the creative life-giving work of the Spirit was so closely associated with the Messiah whose resurrection inaugurated the new age, that Paul said, "The second Adam became a life-giving Spirit" (1 Cor 15:45). At the resurrection God "declared (him) the 'Son-of-God-with-Power'" (Rom 1:4) because thenceforth he both possessed and was thoroughly qualified by the eschatological gift of the Holy Spirit to enable him as Messiah successfully to rule as Lord. By means of the Spirit the resurrected Messiah creates the new age and, therefore, gives life to the dead. So the pneumatically contextualized, redemptive-historical event of Christ's resurrection is the necessary condition for, the occasion of, and the means by which the pneumatically contextualized and redemptively-historical event of the creation of the new age, with the accompanying resurrection of believers, occurs. So the believer's experience and existence are pneumatic and therefore eschatological, since the believer's life is a function of Christ's. Since the Spirit is transforming the Christian into Christ's image—a process that presupposes our past resurrection and is to be completed at our future resurrection—and since Christ enjoys a pneumatic, eschatological life, sanctification is the process by which we experience more fully this pneumatic, eschatological life of Christ.

Second, Gaffin focuses on the resurrection as the redemption of Christ. At his resurrection, Christ as the second Adam was redeemed insofar as he was delivered or saved from the power and curse of death. Though Christ's resurrection declared him to be God's ontological Son, it also marks God's appointment or adoption of Christ as second Adam to be his messianic Son (cf. Rom 1:4; Acts 13:33; Phil 2:6 ff.; Rom 8:23). Jesus' resurrection and exaltation in the realm of Spirit, the heavenly order, the new age, is his vindication or justification (cf. 1 Tim 3:16) in the light of his guilt-bearing role as second Adam condemned and punished in the flesh. To have remained in the power of death would have been a denial of his perfect righteousness and thereby of the efficacy of his obedience. "Consequently, the eradication of death in his resurrection is nothing less than the removal of the verdict of condemnation and the effective affirmation of his (Adamic) righteousness" (p. 122). It is his justification as last Adam (cf. Rom 4:25), our firstfruits. Therefore his resurrection is instrumental in and the necessary condition for our justification (Rom 4:25; cf. 1 Cor 15:17). Furthermore Christ's resurrection is his sanctification insofar as the resurrection separated him from the old eon where he was exposed to sin's power and within the realm of sin's dominion to the new where sin's power and rule do not exist (cf. Rom 6:1 ff.). The sanctification of Christ does not refer to ethical renewal but to the redemptive-historical, eschatological concept of a definitive break with the life of the old eon and a correlative entering into the life of the new. Finally, passages like 1 Cor 15:42 ff.; 2 Cor 3:17-18 and 4:4-6 "show that the pneumatic transformation experienced at Christ's resurrection involves the final and definitive investiture of his person with glory" (p. 126). Christ's resurrection is his glorification as well as his adoption, justification and sanctification. "In view of the solidarity between Christ and believers, in particular, the constitutive nature of the former, the direction of thought is that justification, adoption, sanctification, glorification as applied to believers are derived from the significance of the resurrection for Christ" (p. 127) and are categories used to expound the meaning of Christ's resurrection.

Third, we are treated to an investigation of the meaning of the existential resurrection of the inner man, of the Christian experience of being united by faith with the resurrected Christ (cf. Eph 2:1-10; Col 2:12-13), a metaphor for which is, perhaps, "regeneration" (cf. Titus 3:5), though traditional Reformed theology places regeneration prior to faith. Paul expressed this concept of existential resurrection with the terms "made alive," "raised" (with Christ) and "seated" (with Christ in the heavenlies; cf. Eph 2:1 ff.; Col 2:12-13) and related it functionally in terms of cause and effect with sanctification, with living the Christian life, a life like that of the resurrected Christ. So Christ's resurrection has "the broadest possible soteriological dimensions" (p. 129) for the believer who by faith has been joined to the resurrected Christ. What is true for Christ as resurrected is true for those united with him by faith. Therefore: "Everywhere Paul speaks of the believer's justification, adoption, sanctification, glorification (or any of the other benefits connected with these), there the more basic, underlying consideration is resurrection with Christ, that is (existential) union with Christ as resurrected. Whenever he deals with the application of redemption to the individual believ-

er, there the controlling factor is (experiential) involvement in Christ's resurrection and fellowship with the exalted Christ" (p. 129).

So, then, Paul's soteriology is unified in terms of the solidarity between the resurrection of Christ and that of the believer. The justification, adoption, sanctification and glorification of the believer are not separate, distinct acts but different facets of and exponential of the one act of incorporation with the resurrected Christ. Therefore justification and sanctification (whether as definitive act or as continuing process) are correlative and functionally and conceptually interrelated though distinct aspects of the one act of existential resurrection with Christ. The declaratively forensic as well as the existentially transformational aspects of Paul's soteriology are both functions of faith union with the resurrected Christ. So union with the resurrected Christ by faith, not justification by faith, is the central motif of Paul's applied soteriology. Justification is the most prominent aspect of this motif. And because the future bodily resurrection of the believer is organically inseparable from the past experience of existential resurrection, Paul can speak of justification, adoption, sanctification and glorification as future experiences as well as past ones (cf. Gal 5:5; Rom 8:23; Phil 3:21).

Three principal differences appear between Gaffin's understanding of the structure of Paul's soteriology and the traditional *ordo salutis*. First, "the traditional *ordo salutis* lacks the exclusively eschatological air which pervades the entire Pauline soteriology" (p. 137). Second, "unlike the traditional *ordo salutis* Paul explicates the inception of the application of redemption without recourse to the terminology of regeneration or new birth understood as 'a communication of a new principle of life'" (p. 138). And third, unlike the traditional *ordo salutis* Paul does not conceive justification, adoption, sanctification and glorification as separate acts but as distinct aspects of a single act. And this implies that "in Paul's soteriology there is a correlation between Christ as life-giving and the sinner as life-receiving" (p. 142). The initial act of saving faith and the sole soteric act of being joined existentially to the resurrected Christ are temporally, logically and causally coincidental. Regeneration is not an act that precedes saving faith on the one hand and existential union with the resurrected Christ on the other.

This work merits the widest possible audience, though it is designed to address the Reformed theological community in particular. Evangelicals of all theological persuasions will be challenged by and may have their understanding of Paul's soteriology "reformed" by this book. And this may well apply to the author himself, if his remarks on the meaning and significance of baptism in Rom 6:3 ff. are to be taken as definitive of his views on that issue in general. For he notes that baptism is baptism into Christ (Rom 6:3) and that "baptism signifies and seals a *transition* in the experience of the recipient, a transition from being (existentially) apart from Christ to being (existentially) joined to him" (p. 50). Indeed, he notes, those who have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ (pp. 50-51; cf. 1 Cor 12:13). Given the author's belief that saving faith is a necessary condition for experiencing union with Christ (cf. pp. 141-143) and that baptism is a sign and seal of such union, it follows that saving faith is a necessary condition for baptism. Those whose theology is defined by and expressed in terms of the traditional Reformed confessions will, if persuaded by this argument, have difficulty in maintaining their pedobaptistic views.

John J. Hughes

Westmont College, Santa Barbara, CA

A Grammatical Analysis of the Greek New Testament. By Max Zerwick and Mary Grosvenor. Volume II, Epistles-Apocalypse; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1979, xxxv + 778 pp., \$13.50.

Since the appearance of Volume I in 1974, many students of the NT have awaited this final volume of Miss Grosvenor's English adaptation and revision of Zerwick's *Latin Analysis philologica Novi Testamenti graeci* (Rome, 1966³). Contemporary reluctance to work through details of Zerwick's Latin edition coupled with the input of Grosvenor's own exper-

tise have made these volumes standard fare for English readers. Indeed, as one of those who in past years have profited from hours spent with Volume I, it is a pleasant duty to note that Volume II proves to be a continuation of the both excellent and compact grammatical and philological comment available in its predecessor.

Both volumes, superb examples of the bookmaker's art with attention to detail, begin with a quote on the title page from St. Theresa of the Child Jesus: "If I had been a priest I should have made a thorough study of Hebrew and Greek so as to understand the thought of God as he has vouchsafed to express it in our human language." The purpose to be served here then is aptly stated in Zerwick's preface—namely, "that the Greek text of the New Testament will not remain exclusively a tool on the desks of a decreasing number of specialists, but will become a living power in the hands of theologians, of preachers of The Word, of directors of Bible discussion circles, and finally in the hands of those who pray in private from the Word of God" (p. iii).

Although Zerwick died in 1975, Miss Grosvenor (daughter of a medical missionary to China and collaborator for twenty years on Lampe's *Patristic Greek Lexicon*) has carried on with the help of others at the Pontifical Biblical Institute to complete her nine years of work on the project. As before, the analysis is preceded by a glossary of grammatical terms and contains cross-references throughout to paragraphs in Zerwick's *Biblical Greek* (English translation; Rome, 1963). It is clear that the devoted labor of these authors has placed future generations of students—beginners and scholars—in their debt when it comes to brief analytical word-by-word comment on the Greek text (Aland *et al.*, third edition) and its meaning.

Paul Elbert

132 Holgate Drive, Luton, Bedfordshire, LU4 OXD, England

Inerrancy and Common Sense. Edited by Roger R. Nicole and J. Ramsey Michaels. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1980, 203 pp., \$5.95 paper.

The present work consists of articles written by members of the faculty of Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary. Richard Lovelace, professor of Church history, argues that "total inerrancy" is not at all a modern concept but has been normative in Christian orthodoxy from early times. He pleads, however, for unity and cooperation with Christians who prefer a view of "limited inerrancy." In an incisive essay, NT scholar J. Ramsey Michaels suggests, among other things, that the older concept of "verbal inspiration" is more adequate than that of "inerrancy." A third article, by the well-known theologian Roger R. Nicole, seeks to define the nature of inerrancy by paying due attention both to the Biblical teaching and to the phenomena of Scripture.

The other essays in this volume address several specific issues. Douglas Stuart, associate professor of OT, discusses textual criticism with special reference to the difficult problems that arise in Jeremiah and in the books of Samuel. R. C. Sproul, visiting professor of apologetics, deals with the assumptions of "the analogy of faith" and concludes that "a person's hermeneutic reveals his view of Scripture more clearly than does an exposition of his view" (p. 134). Associate professor of theology John Jefferson Davis discusses the perplexing question of the antiquity of man and argues that "Scripture gives accurate and truthful information about science and history, but in a form appropriate to its own purposes" (p. 159). Gordon D. Fee, professor of NT, argues that the debate over inerrancy must be kept at the exegetical level and that more attention must be paid to such hermeneutical issues as "cultural relativity." The final article, by visiting professor James I. Packer, explores the implications of Biblical inerrancy for the interpretive tasks of preaching.

According to the editors' introduction, the purpose of this collection is to show that one may combine a firm belief in inerrancy while adhering to common sense. It soon becomes apparent that what they mean is: We wish to take our stand somewhere between Fuller Theological Seminary and Harold Lindsell. Over against the position represented by at least some faculty members at Fuller, the present book affirms that Scripture is infallible in *all* that it teaches, not only when it directly addresses matters of faith and practice. Over

against Lindsell, the authors wish to avoid "contrived interpretations" (p. 183).

Articles on a controversial topic cannot but be controversial themselves. Indeed, numerous questions arise upon reading this particular volume. Generally speaking, however, one must applaud the efforts of these scholars to articulate their positions irenically yet frankly. If not successful in every respect this collection of essays should nonetheless help its readers come to a clearer understanding of the contemporary issues. And nowadays any volume that tends to clarify rather than to muddle the doctrine of inerrancy must be regarded as an exceptional contribution.

M. Silva

Westmont College, Santa Barbara, CA