

BOOK REVIEWS

The American Pietism of Cotton Mather: Origins of American Evangelicalism. By Richard F. Lovelace. Washington, DC: Christian College Consortium (subsidiary of Eerdmans), 1979, x + 350 pp., \$9.95 paper.

A book about Cotton Mather ought not to be as ponderous as its subject, for in spite of his prolific literary output Cotton Mather is not dull. There is within him a passion for all life—natural and mystical. It is that enthusiasm that ought to be distilled from his often tedious tomes and passed on to us. Unhappily, the reader of this book will find that Lovelace has produced more tedium than passion. While there are glimmers of a more fervent style in these pages, overall the book plods through the spiritual life of Mather, and the reader needs to prepare to make haste slowly. One senses that Lovelace has approached his subject almost as a pretext—i.e., not to portray the romance of Mather's spirit but to promote an agenda for twentieth-century evangelicalism with Mather as a foil.

American Pietism is a revision of the author's 1968 Princeton Th.D. thesis ("Christian Experience in the Theology of Cotton Mather"). The major goal of the work is a rehabilitation of the oft-maligned Bostonian by tracing his internal spiritual experience along with his interaction with and influence upon the broad stream of evangelical pietism (continental, British and American). In other words, Lovelace has presented us with a specimen of Puritan "experimentalism."

Our author is sympathetic toward but not uncritical of his subject. The miscreant portrayed by nineteenth-century scholarship is in fact a tender, sensitive and compassionate pastor. Though zealous for Calvinistic orthodoxy, Mather possessed a catholic spirit in his close Christian bonds with other evangelicals (notably Francke and Spener). His efforts to promote greater evangelical unity in New England were a concrete expression of this evangelical ecumenicity (pp. 251-281). Mather was also active in promoting reforming societies designed to minister to the social needs of his neighbors. He was a vigorous advocate of missions that, Lovelace points out, was a by-product of his atypical premillennialism. Finally, Mather's theology exhibits the richness of treasures gathered from many veins of Christian tradition: Scripture, patristic, medieval and scholastic, Reformation and Counter-Reformation, English Puritanism, continental pietism. I would add that Mather is not exceptional in this regard. Almost all Puritans devoured the literature of the Church in an effort to mine treasures old and new.

Our author seeks to exonerate Mather of three stinging indictments. Perhaps the most damning is his involvement in the Salem witch trials. Lovelace shows that Mather, as well as the majority of his contemporaries in western civilization, believed in the reality of witchcraft and demonic influences. Hence his role in the Salem tragedy arose from principle, not opportunism. Lovelace adds the salient observation that Mather's demeanor throughout the lamentable affair was one of charity, not vengeance. Second, Mather is often accused of promoting Enlightenment principles, particularly in his ethical works. But Lovelace argues that Mather's use of reason is not attributable to the antisupernaturalism of the Enlightenment. It is the classic Puritan balance of reason and revelation. Lovelace is especially good in tracing Mather's abhorrence of Enlightenment rationalism and its theological offspring—unitarianism. Finally, Lovelace gives us a refreshing appreciation for Mather's Puritan activism in salvation. Against P. Miller, who finds Puritan preparationism (or "seeking") a telltale sign of creeping Arminianism, Lovelace argues that Mather has not departed from Calvinism in encouraging his hearers to do all within their unregenerate power to storm the gates of paradise. An activism in seeking was not regarded by the Puritans as antithetical to orthodox Calvinism—thus their evangelistic method.

Other commendable features of this book include the skeletal biography (pp. 9-28); the bibliographical essay (pp. 290-304, to which may be added the Banner of Truth Trust edition of Mather's *Magnalia Christi Americana*); the analysis of Mather's Christocentric preaching, in which he casts his congregation on the mercy of Christ; Mather's practice of personal piety, in which he fixed his own heart on the Savior; the theme of union with Christ in Mather, which anticipates much current Reformed Biblical theology (pp. 152, 155); the emphasis on prayer, study, family religion and social amelioration. Lovelace is not blind to the faults of his subject. Mather's egocentricity may be justly cited as well as the New England Puritan penchant for spiritual introspection. This custom of constantly taking one's spiritual temperature is rightly traced to the Puritan dilemma over assurance and the failure to remember what W. Perkins once urged—turn the eye out upon Christ, not in upon self.

We are indebted to Lovelace for this positive portrait of a godly Puritan. And yet I have one strong reservation about the work. It seems to me that too much dependence has been placed on Lovelace's own undocumented impressions for certain crucial points in the discussion. More's the pity, since Lovelace apparently immersed himself in Mather's published and unpublished works. An instance of this carelessness is Mather's alleged hyper-Calvinism. Lovelace defines hyper-Calvinism (p. viii) as that which exceeds the Geneva Reformer's doctrine of election and inability. (Historically the term hyper-Calvinism has been reserved for the doctrine that the unregenerate are to hear only legal conviction and terrors of judgment from the pulpit, not the free offer of the gospel.) But surely an estimate such as this would arise from Calvin's own evangelistic preaching method, especially from a comparison of Puritan preaching with Calvin's preaching. Yet not one of the four references to Calvin's works that I found in the footnotes is derived from Calvin's sermons. It appears to me that Lovelace has tried and convicted Mather (and the Puritans) without a shred of original evidence. In fact this attempt on the part of many modern scholars to drive a wedge between Calvin and the Puritans may be destined to founder. When scholars begin to work over the corpus of sermons from Calvin (even the sixteenth-century English translations now available from University Microfilms), they will find the great Reformer more "Puritan" than they first imagined.

Lovelace's book is a definite contribution, but the need to rehabilitate Cotton Mather from the portrait of Richard Lovelace will be a project for yet future scholars.

James T. Dennison, Jr.

Westminster Theological Seminary, Escondido, CA

John R. Mott, 1865-1955: A Biography. By C. Howard Hopkins. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980, 816 pp., \$22.50.

Extensive and sympathetic research, documented by no fewer than 1,368 footnotes, presents us with what may well be regarded as the definitive biography of a layman whose religious influence was enormous. Mott combined simple piety, personal evangelism, social concern and organizational genius to an extraordinary degree. Eugene Carson Blake considered him "the ablest ecclesiastical statesman and world Christian of his time. . . . The ecumenical movement would not have been ready for John XXIII if it had not been for the vision and work of John R. Mott."

Here was a man early possessed by a sense of destiny and mission. His great aim, repeatedly stated in thousands of speeches around the world, was "to make Jesus Christ known, trusted, loved, obeyed, and exemplified in the whole range of individual life and in all human relationships" (p. 625). As a youth, Mott was inspired by men like J. Hudson Taylor, J. K. Studd and D. L. Moody. A personal relationship to Christ, commitment to the missionary mandate, and the desire to do something for the world all combined to motivate his unusual career.

By 1900 Mott was already ringing the changes on the theme of "the evangelization of the

world in this generation." He urged, "Bring Christ within the reach of every person in the world, that he may have the opportunity of intelligently accepting Him as personal Saviour. . . . It is our duty to evangelize the world, because Christ has commanded it. His command to us applies to this, the one generation in all eternity for which we are responsible" (p. 232).

Through his leadership role in the YMCA, the Student Volunteer Movement, and the World Student Christian Federation he was instrumental in enlisting 20,000 in missionary service. His great goal was "to make Jesus Christ known, obeyed, and loved throughout the world" (p. 279). In pursuit of this objective, Mott planned, organized, traveled, lectured, wrote and raised funds tirelessly. He attracted the support of millionaires such as the McCormicks and the Rockefellers to advance the cause.

Eventually the movements he led were penetrated by the views of those who advocated the social gospel in the name of progressive Christianity. W. Rauschenbusch, J. H. Oldham and H. E. Fosdick all had a part in this process. So did W. R. Harper, whose Bible-study guides used by student groups occasionally betrayed their critical presuppositions. By 1930, Mott was in the vanguard of the movement that gave impetus to the Laymen's Foreign Missions Inquiry. Among the main conclusions of the influential report it produced were these: "The aim of Christian missions [is] to seek with people of other lands a true knowledge and love of God, expressing in life and word what we have learned through Jesus Christ. . . . Ministry to the secular needs of men is evangelism. . . . The time has come to set the educational and other philanthropic aspects of mission work free from organized responsibility to the work of conscious and direct evangelism. . . . The Christian will therefore regard himself as a co-worker with the forces within each such religious system which are making for righteousness" (W. E. Hocking, *Rethinking Missions* [New York: Harper, 1932] 326-327). Evangelicals like R. E. Speer perceived this development as a step in the direction of syncretism, although he did not consider his friend Mott as a syncretist.

In advancing the cause of world missions, Mott saw the necessity of furthering Christian unity. He declared, "Christ emphasized that the mightiest apologetic with which to convince the non-Christian world of His divine character and claims would be the oneness of His disciples" (p. 363). Therefore to promote the gospel it is necessary to promote ecumenism. Gradually the focal point moved from world evangelization to the unity of the Church. Mott was actively involved in ecumenical developments from the Edinburgh Conference of 1910 through that of Jerusalem (1928) and Tambaram (1938), leading to the establishment of the International Missionary Council and the eventual emergence of the World Council of Churches.

Toward the end of his life Mott expressed "grave reservations about a world body not motivated by missions, and fears that the World Council might swallow the International Missionary Council" (p. 689). Subsequent events more than justified his fears, and their sobering record provides both the World Evangelical Fellowship and the Lausanne Committee for World Evangelization with many points to ponder.

Mariano Di Gangi

Ontario Theological Seminary

Van Til: Defender of the Faith. By William White, Jr. Nashville: Nelson, 1979, 233 pp., \$4.95 paper.

This book is a delightful account of the life of Cornelius Van Til. As with most great men, an understanding of his life is almost a prerequisite to a full understanding of his theology. This is especially true of Van Til.

From his birth in the Netherlands in 1895, through his early boyhood and the move to America in 1905, to his college days at Calvin and graduate study at Princeton, we are given a glimpse of the personalities who most influenced Van Til's early development. His exposures included his parents (good Dutch Calvinists), A. Kuyper, L. Berkhof, W. H. Jellema,

G. Vos, C. W. Hodge, R. D. Wilson, O. T. Allis, J. G. Machen and H. Bavinck.

Van Til graduated (Ph.D.) from Princeton in 1927. He spent one year in the pastorate and one year back at Princeton, and in 1929 he moved to Westminster Theological Seminary. His life has been intertwined with Westminster ever since.

The last half of the book is a series of vignettes from Van Til's life. There does not seem to be any particular rhyme to the choice of these snapshots. But since White has known and studied under Van Til for a number of years the personality of Van Til is shown in each brief chapter.

Since this book focuses on the life of Van Til there is no in-depth presentation of his thought in philosophy, theology or apologetics. Pieces of his position are given in the chapters on his writings and on his critics. In the two appendices are an outline of his apologetic (written by Van Til) and a position paper he gave in 1969 outlining the state of affairs in the theological world.

Anyone looking for a discussion of Van Til's thought or a secondary textbook in apologetics must look elsewhere. But someone who desires to understand the personal elements behind Van Til will enjoy this book.

Steven Clinton

International School of Theology, San Bernardino, CA

Every Thought Captive. By Richard L. Pratt, Jr. Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1979, xi + 142 pp., \$3.95 paper.

For evangelical apologetics Cornelius Van Til is a monumental figure who merits the most serious consideration. Unfortunately for us all, many aspects of Van Til's system have been misunderstood both by his foes and his followers. The precise meanings of key concepts, presented as they have been in the terminology of idealistic philosophy, have eluded readers. Several attempts to clarify his "consistent Reformed apologetics" (e.g., B. Ramm, *Types of Apologetic Systems*, 1953; R. Rushdoony, *By What Standard?*; J. S. Halsey, *For a Time Such as This*) have failed to defog evangelical perceptions of the position.

Richard Pratt has written a manual to help ordinary people engage in apologetics along the lines of Van Til's approach. In the process he has translated the philosophical terminology of Van Tillian apologetics into everyday language. *Every Thought Captive* succeeds where other works have failed in this enterprise.

Designed to serve as a "study manual for the defense of Christian truth," the book provides thirteen lessons (to fit the standard Sunday-school quarter) plus a chapter illustrating the superiority of this apologetic methodology. In addition to conversational terminology, Pratt includes diagrams to illustrate the more difficult concepts and concludes each chapter with review questions.

In the opening chapters (1-5) the author summarizes the basic ingredients of the Christian position. In the process he clarifies Van Til's distinction between Creator and creature and explains the need for recognizing the changes in man from his creation, through his fall, and after his regeneration. He proceeds to summarize central points in Christian and non-Christian epistemologies and to contrast them with one another (chaps. 6-7). Pratt enumerates requisite attitudes and actions of a believer who would defend his faith effectively (chap. 8).

Before introducing his methodology, the author examines and criticizes weaknesses in popular evangelical apologetics (chap. 9). His two major objections are that the popular position maintains an un-Biblical view of human reason and mistakenly seeks to prove Christianity point by point. Here the reader meets Van Til's opposition to "autonomous" reason and "block house" methodology.

Pratt then proposes his basic structure of a Biblical defense (chap. 10). Apologetics, he insists, is not to be separated from evangelism. To defend the gospel entails the declaration of the gospel. The Christian is to employ a twofold justification of Christianity: arguments from (1) truth and from (2) folly. Here is Van Til's "reasoning by presupposition" in popu-

lar terminology. "Argument by truth is basically answering the non-Christian objections and questions about the credibility of Christian claims from the Christian or biblical perspective" (p. 86). Pratt shows how the Christian employs evidence from Scripture, the external world and personal experience. He further explains how the Christian develops the non-Christian presuppositions to demonstrate that those are self-defeating and cannot lead to truth.

This chapter is the heart of *Every Thought Captive* and the most valuable in the book. It popularizes Van Til's methodology of presuppositionalism and also converts his continuity-discontinuity discussion into simpler terms of certainty-uncertainty. Pratt's chart on p. 96 depicts a suggested structure for a Biblical apology and is most helpful.

In chaps. 11-13 Pratt provides samples of his apologetic methodology as it encounters specific objections about God, Christ, Scripture, man, the world, and the need for faith. Here he is specific and clear in his argumentation and demonstrates by repetition the system he proposes. The Biblical concepts and references he introduces as evidence will prove helpful to the apologist.

The author is admittedly dependent upon Van Til, whose difficult concepts he communicates in breezy popular terms. On the whole, Van Til's system does not suffer. Pratt's use of Scripture is more extensive than that of Van Til and, despite an occasional excursion into eisegesis (e.g. Gen 2:7, p. 19), is both sound and stimulating. The book is arranged in an order appropriate both for teaching and for learning, except that a final summary chapter would have provided the reader a greater sense of literary completeness.

"If this manual earns its standing on the bookshelf," Pratt writes at the outset of his book, "it does so because it is intended to be thoroughly biblical in its approach and popular in its presentation" (p. x). In this reviewer's opinion, *Every Thought Captive* has earned its standing—and for those very reasons.

David A. Dean

Berkshire Christian College, Lenox, MA 01240

Ezra and Nehemiah: An Introduction and Commentary. By Derek Kidner. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1979, 175 pp., \$7.95.

Derek Kidner has again shown his ability to provide the student of the Bible with sturdy, sensible commentary and information in this his latest contribution to the Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries. He leads his reader through the material in these much-discussed books with the steady hand of one with a firm grasp of the scriptural content, the critical questions and the extra-Biblical historical background of the period.

The brief introduction gives a good historical overview of the Near Eastern world of the period as well as calling attention to some of the themes found in the two books. These thematic clues are especially helpful to the pastor as he sermonizes. Kidner has chosen to shift treatment of the involved questions of authorship, date, sources, language, chronology and other topics usually covered in an introduction to the appendices, where they receive ample attention.

In 42 pages of the familiar handy-sized Tyndale format Kidner marches us through Ezra, providing a useful tool for text-open work. He is especially strong in his understanding of the author's design in the choice of detail and construction. Much helpful information is left to the footnotes, which are ever-present without being overpowering in length or number. Especially good is Kidner's treatment of the various lists and totals with their problematically dissimilar parallels elsewhere in Ezra-Nehemiah. Without resorting to any forced oversimplification to solve the difficulties, Kidner offers a variety of traditional observations ("numbers were the bane of copyists") graced with the good sense not to overstretch a solution.

Kidner does some of his best work in his passing comments pointing out the weaknesses of the documentary hypothesis' connection of Ezra and "P". Kidner's contribution is not so much in the area of novel argument (the documentary school has been blasted quite com-

pletely before this). But he does not fall into the emotional abuse of the men of the higher-critical stand that too many conservative writers exhibit as they descend to the level of ridicule and name-calling in their attacks. Kidner gives the skeptics a cool and measured look and then comes down squarely with logic and orthodoxy on the side of the Biblical author.

Nehemiah is given slightly more space than Ezra, and again Kidner shows an able hand at his work. He traces the events of narrative that marks Nehemiah with one of the most memorable characterizations in the Bible.

A third major division of the commentary is devoted to the excellent appendices. These six sections, almost as long as the entire section on Ezra, treat the thornier and more-disputed topics of the text. Indeed some of the best reading of the commentary is found here and is worth a brief overview.

Kidner makes quick work of the designation matter (Ezra = Esdras B = Esdras I), the primary historical sources behind the books, and the languages employed. He takes a bit longer look at the authorship question, rejecting the theory that the Ezra-Nehemiah compiler was the "Chronicler." He surveys the solutions variously offered concerning the identity of Sheshbazzar and slightly favors the view that Sheshbazzar was a foreign official over the view that Sheshbazzar was Zerubbabel's official name. The third appendix is devoted to sorting through the extra-Biblical material bearing on Ezra-Nehemiah from Josephus and the Elephantine papyri. Josephus is shown to be too weak on chronological matters to be taken seriously as a threat to the canonical sequence.

The last three appendices should make any honest skeptic-critic pause to reconsider his position. A full twelve pages (a fair amount of material, by proportion) is given to the question of chronology: Ezra-Nehemiah or Nehemiah-Ezra? Kidner sketches the discussion of the "difficulties" with the Biblical order and then deals in turn with the four apparent anomalies that prompt the rearrangement of events in much of the critical literature. Kidner's conclusion: "The canonical books . . . present no problems to compare with those that beset their alternatives" (p. 158).

The fifth appendix addresses the discussion of the identity of Ezra's book of the Law: Was it really something ancient from Moses or, as the modern critic holds, was it a late Babylonian composition? Not surprisingly Kidner brings a great weight of argument to the conclusion that it was the Law Moses was given by the Lord.

The final appendix examines Ezra-Nehemiah as history. Is there really good reason to explain the widespread skepticism directed toward the historical reliability of these books? Does the record really include such improbable and unbelievable elements as to provoke the sober scholar's disbelief? Kidner cuts to the heart of the matter and answers that "the roots of this scepticism lie elsewhere and much deeper, namely in pentateuchal criticism as generally practised . . . One can either accept [Ezra's] confirmation of the Pentateuch's antiquity, or else conclude, with the majority of the scholars whom we have sampled, that Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah (and the Pentateuch itself) are what the New Testament would bluntly call 'cunningly devised fables' (2 Peter 1:16, AV). One should resist the temptation, I suggest, to put the matter more gently" (pp. 173-174). This analysis demonstrates Kidner's respect for and knowledge of the text that is the foundation of the whole commentary. It will be a welcome addition to the library of anyone who works with and respects the Biblical text, whether his sphere of labor is the classroom or the pulpit.

Keith Ghormley

First Church of God, West Chester, OH

The Psalms: Structure, Content, and Message. By Claus Westermann. Translated by Ralph D. Gehrke. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1980, 136 pp., \$4.95 paper.

With the appearance of this monograph, a synthesis of Claus Westermann's lifelong study of the Psalter has been made available to the English reader for the first time. The author's purpose is to introduce the nonspecialist to the modern form-critical approach to the Psalms. Accordingly he avoids any reference to the prominent figures in recent scholarly

discussion, even though he is heavily dependent on the work of Hermann Gunkel.

In an introductory section (pp. 5-29) Westermann discusses the nature of Israelite worship, focusing on the significance of the Psalms in the Bible as well as their origin, collections, superscriptions and notations, poetic form, and types and genres. Here he stresses his distinctive contribution—namely, that the two dominant types of Psalms (lament and praise) are not primarily literary or cultic categories but are an expression of the basic “rhythm of joy and sorrow” (p. 25) that characterizes mankind’s relationship to God. Thus although the Psalms “arose out of the worship of Israel” (p. 12) they were not specifically written for the cult, as Mowinkel had maintained. The brief treatment of “the collections of the Psalms” contains most of the insights first presented in his 1962 essay “Zur Sammlung des Psalters” (now reprinted in *Lob und Klage in den Psalmen*, Göttingen, 1977), while the remainder of the introduction follows familiar lines—that is, the superscriptions are late and nearly worthless (thus it is uncertain whether David wrote any of the present Psalms, p. 20); Hebrew poetry displays three types of parallelism (for a recent, convincing rejection of Lowth’s categories see James Kugel, *The Idea of Biblical Poetry*, Yale University Press, 1981).

The heart of the book presents Westermann’s description of ten different types of psalms. For the first five, which include the community and individual psalms of lament and of narrative praise and the hymn, he discusses the texts, the accompanying liturgical action, the structure and an example. The variety of the remaining “genres”—creation, liturgical, royal, enthronement and wisdom psalms—suggests the lack of objective criteria for distinguishing psalm types: Is it a matter of structure, theme, alleged cultic usage, or even terminology? The categories follow those of Gunkel for the most part, except that Westermann prefers “psalm of narrative praise” to Gunkel’s “psalm of thanksgiving,” arguing that “our word *thank* has no corresponding word” (p. 26) in Hebrew. (This objection may be simply a semantic quibble. There is no Hebrew phrase for “narrative praise” either.) Westermann contrasts his relabelled type with the “psalm of descriptive praise” (Gunkel’s “hymn”), though admitting that narrative praise sometimes “changes into descriptive praise” (p. 77). He briefly treats Psalm 119, Psalm 90 and “The Psalms and Christ” (in which he abandons messianic prophecy for “a more profound and comprehensive” anchoring of the Christ event in the OT, p. 27). The content of the book is the same as that of the German original except for three useful appendices—“Collections of Psalms,” “Main Types of Psalms” and “Abbreviations”—which have been added to the English edition. A select bibliography of works in English for further study has been substituted for one in German. The translation is for the most part accurate and lucid, only occasionally marred by such obscure renderings as “similar integrating coherences” (p. 42).

The value of this little volume is difficult to assess. The introductory section offers little that cannot be found in a standard commentary or OT introduction. The main portion of the book is as valuable as the individual reader deems the form-critical enterprise as a whole to be. Much of the scholarly “bite” of Westermann’s careful analyses, such as are found in *Lob und Klage in den Psalmen*, has been lost in the author’s effort to simplify his presentation. In the same process numerous illustrations of the subjectivity of the form-critical method are left exposed, stripped of their supporting arguments: Pure forms are by definition early while “mixed” forms are always late (p. 27). The emotional reversal that marks the conclusion of many laments can only be accounted for by the assumption that the priest responded to the suppliant with an “oracle of salvation” (p. 56). (One might question whether “lament” is even an appropriate label for these confident prayers of the distressed.) The community psalm of narrative praise “had great significance throughout Israel’s entire history, but has barely been transmitted to us in the Psalms” because the present collection is postexilic, completed when “Israel as a nation no longer experienced such deeds of salvation” (p. 49). The Psalter contains only one real pilgrimage song, Psalm 122, but “we can certainly assume that collections of pilgrimage songs once existed, to which all sorts of other songs were later added” (p. 104). One might conclude that Westermann’s dictum that “an individual psalm can be adequately understood only in the con-

text—in connection with the group to which it belongs” (p. 29) often involves interpreting it in the light of a fabricated liturgical setting and a rigid structure for which few if any “pure” examples can be found. Nevertheless the awareness that certain psalms share similar formal elements can prove quite helpful in illuminating the creativity that each individual psalm composition displays.

Despite these reservations one must acknowledge Westermann's skill in analyzing the Psalms and his sincere effort to make the Psalter live on as the hymnbook of the Church, as well as Gehrke's service in making this work available in English. The scholar, however, may find it a rather disappointing distillation of Westermann's important contributions on this subject.

Richard Schultz

Yale University, New Haven, CT

Prophecy and Persuasion. A Study of Isaiah 40-48. By Yehoshua Gitay. Bonn: Linguistica Biblica, 1981, xii + 242 pp., DM 25 paper.

This is the 14th monograph of the Forum Theologiae Linguisticae under the editorship of Erhart Güttgemanns. The Forum is a series of works that attempt to integrate linguistics and theology, as indicated by its subtitle “Interdisziplinäre Schriftenreihe für Theologie und Linguistik.” The present work is a Biblical study in light of classical and new rhetoric. Its publication will give new life to rhetorical criticism.

The reviewer had the privilege to attend a related lecture, “Rhetoric and Prophetic Address,” given by the same author in the Conference of the International Society of the History of Rhetoric held in April 1981. In that lecture Gitay illustrated his approach with the first chapter of Isaiah.

Rhetorical criticism was initiated as a movement in OT studies by James Muilenburg in the late 1960s. Muilenburg wanted to remedy the weaknesses of form criticism by giving primary consideration to the literary features or structure of the Biblical text. But he and other Bible scholars who follow the movement have not, as Gitay points out, really freed themselves from some of the questionable presuppositions of form criticism. Their approach generally tends to be static. They use style as a functional device for determining the literary unit and its structure but fail to perceive rhetoric as the pragmatic art of persuasion (p. 27). Gitay takes seriously the idea that the rhetoric of a prophet has a pragmatic goal: to persuade his audience of his divine message.

The study has two main parts besides a brief introduction and a conclusion. The first part presents the theoretical side of the study. It includes three chapters, the first of which reviews and evaluates the two current literary approaches bearing on the questions of determining the literary units and of analyzing the organization of Isaiah 40-48 as a whole. Gitay insists that one's answer to these questions will determine his understanding of the text. The first approach regards Isaiah 40-48 as addresses delivered orally. Hence the collection is made up of small units that once existed independently (Gressmann, Köhler, Begrich, Mowinckel, et al.). The second approach considers the collection to be the product of a planned writing activity and thus composed of large units (Muilenburg, Westermann, Morgenstern, Kaufmann, et al.). Gitay criticizes both approaches for failing to appreciate the pragmatic goal of prophecy and for failing to see rhetoric as the art of persuasion that explores the mutual relationships among the author (speaker), his address and his audience.

In the second chapter of the first part Gitay outlines his approach, which follows basically the framework and terminology of classical rhetoric complemented with the insights of new rhetoric. He emphasizes the rhetorical situation—i.e. the situation that produces the discourse, the speech act context. He argues that rhetorical criticism should focus on the “literary work as communication.” Hence “in utilizing rhetorical criticism as an interpretive tool, one is no longer focusing only on the meaning of the text, but also on its *effect*” (p. 42). In other words the emphasis is on the analysis and evaluation of the persuasive force of

the discourse, not just on the formal literary features or structure. Thus before starting his rhetorical analysis of Isaiah 40-48 Gitay carefully describes in the third chapter of the first part what he considers to be the context in which the rhetoric effect of these addresses took place. The discussion includes the historical background of the prophet's speeches and the political and spiritual condition of the exiles (Gitay dates the whole section to the sixth century but before the fall of Babylon.)

The second part of the book is a rhetorical analysis of Isaiah 40-48. The whole text is divided into ten rhetorical units—e.g. chap. 40 has two units. Gitay's procedure for the analysis of each unit is as follows: First, he explores the rhetorical situation of that unit, including an explanation in light of rhetorical perspective why the boundary of the unit is so determined. The explanation is supported by discourse analysis. Next he examines the issues of invention—i.e. the kinds of appeals (rational, emotional, and ethical) through which the prophet attempted to reach his audience. Following this examination he studies the way in which the discourse is organized. Here the study attempts to discover the logical arrangement of the discourse that would normally follow the order of introduction, thesis, confirmation, refutation and epilog. Finally he analyzes the stylistic devices used in the discourse by the prophet to attract and persuade his audience. In his discussion of style Gitay has demonstrated that he has a high sensitivity to the sounds and word-play of the Hebrew text. For each of the rhetorical units his analysis closely follows the above format.

Throughout his study of Isaiah 40-48 Gitay has a high regard for the MT. Seldom does one find in his analysis assertions that certain MT readings are to be considered interpolations. His attention is on the overall persuasiveness of the discourses. Thus he concludes that the first rhetorical unit (40:1-11) is a response of the prophet to the religious despair of the exiles; the second unit (40:12-31) is a response to the people's fear that the new political development has no relation to their condition; the third unit (41:1-19) is a continuation to the previous response and an affirmation that the military and political success of Cyrus will benefit Israel; the fourth unit (42:1-13) is a response to the people's hesitant attitude about their role in this critical political hour; etc. Even after a lengthy discussion on stylistic devices of the discourse Gitay seldom forgets to return to the examination of its rhetorical effect.

Gitay's rhetorical approach fits better with prophetic literature than other types of literature in the OT, since the rhetorical situation of prophetic addresses is easier to be identified than, e.g., the rhetorical situation of wisdom literature. But Gitay's approach to prophetic rhetoric needs to be used with an understanding of the problem existing between the horizons of the exegete and the text. What an exegete has is the Biblical text, while the rhetorical situation is something inferred. He must be on guard that the persuasiveness of the discourse is not just his own feeling for the text. In other words the rhetorical effect that he attributes to the original context is not to be confused with the effect on him by the text. Gitay admitted in the conference on rhetoric in April 1981 that the Biblical text presents greater difficulty for analysis than the Greek literature because of the limited resources of the former. The principles of classical and new rhetoric, however, have provided Gitay with a certain degree of freedom from arbitrariness. Along with his careful treatment of the evidence Gitay has made an important contribution to the understanding of prophetic rhetoric and particularly of the meaning of Isaiah 40-48.

Evangelicals may not agree with Gitay's dating of the Isaianic addresses to the exilic period, but much of what he discusses is relevant. The people's fear of political turmoil and their skepticism about God's action in history also existed in the pre-exilic age. We can be benefited not only from Gitay's important insights on rhetorical criticism but also from his stimulating rhetorical commentary on Isaiah. We all know that grammatico-historical exegesis insists that proper exegesis must take into account both the linguistic and the extralinguistic elements of the text. Few books, however, have illustrated systematically how the latter—i.e. the historical—are to be explored. Gitay's study has shown us one of the ways we can go. His rhetorical approach on Isaiah 40-48 is a good example of how prag-

matics, syntactics and semantics can properly relate to each other for a better understanding of the Biblical text. This book should be read by all serious Bible students.

Alex Luc

University of Wisconsin, Madison

Through Peasant Eyes: More Lucan Parables, Their Culture and Style. By Kenneth E. Bailey. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980, 187 pp. *The Parables of Jesus.* By Simon Kistemaker. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1980, 301 pp., \$10.95.

In 1976 Kenneth Bailey published *Poet & Peasant: A Literary-Cultural Approach to the Parables of Luke*. This book had its genesis in his experience as a village literacy teacher in Egypt and later as a minister and teacher in Lebanon, Syria and Iraq. He became convinced that contact with Middle Eastern peasant culture provided a significant resource for understanding the parables of Jesus. Discovering that cultural assumptions concerning personal behavior and relationships in first-century Palestine persist in isolated communities today, he began to investigate the oral culture of contemporary peasant communities as a tool for recovering the nuances of the parables. Examination of Syriac and Arabic versions extending from the second to the twentieth centuries exposed him to the distinctive character of oriental interpretation of the parables. When he became alert to the importance of poetic structure as a vehicle for memorable statement he found a literary key that enabled him to locate the climactic center of a parable. Patient analysis of poetic structure disclosed the turning point in a parable and made him alert to the literary pattern of words and phrases. These insights were matured in a study of four of the parables and two related poems in Luke's travel narrative (9:51-19:48). The freshness in the approach was widely recognized as an advance in parable interpretation.

In his more recent book Bailey extends the cultural-literary approach to ten more parables and poems unique to Luke. Apart from the initial chapter, devoted to Luke 7:36-50, the parables selected for analysis are also located in the Lukan travel narrative. The treatment of the material, however, is less technical than in the earlier book. There Bailey had presented his perspectives on parable interpretation in dialogue with others engaged in the current scholarly debate concerning a proper methodology for penetrating the parables. Here Bailey writes as one who has lived, worked and worshiped within the Middle Eastern Arab Christian community of faith for nearly thirty years. His primary concern is the recovery of the vitality and dynamic of the Biblical text when read from a Middle Eastern perspective. He is not interested in the redactional question of how Luke uses or shapes the material in the service of his own theological concern to meet particular needs within a local community. Bailey's examination of the parables as Palestinian stories set in the ministry of Jesus is informed by the assumption that the evangelist's reuse of the material for his own theological purposes does not significantly obscure the original intent of the material. The goal of Bailey's inquiry is the determination of that intent through the recovery of the original Palestinian setting, along with the timeless theological content, by means of cultural and literary analysis.

The treatment of the parable of the two debtors (7:41-42) well illustrates Bailey's general approach. The importance of the setting of the parable within a tightly constructed theological dialogue (7:36-50) is recognized. An analysis of the concentric symmetry in the arrangement of the dialogue demonstrates that the parable is the central element in a literary unit consisting of seven "scenes." Each of the scenes is analyzed in order to recover the Middle Eastern cultural details assumed by the text. Bailey draws heavily on the Arabic commentary of Ibn al-Tayyib, an Iraqi Christian scholar of the eleventh century, and the Syriac commentary of Ibn al-Ṣalibi, who lived in the twelfth century. Corroborative references to the Palestinian Talmud and earlier Jewish sources demonstrate that these medieval commentators correctly understood the Palestinian perspectives of the text. The analysis of the parable itself turns on literary structure. Retrotranslation of the Greek text into Galilean

Aramaic exposes the word-play used to heighten the density of the language and its dramatic impact. The discussion of the entire unit is rounded off with the identification of the decision/response the original listener (in this case, Simon the Pharisee) was pressed to make and the detailing of the cluster of theological motifs that comprise the impact of the parable. Throughout these studies Bailey is concerned to display Jesus as theologian. In the present case it is sin and forgiveness that receive clarification through the parable in its setting.

The analysis ignores form-critical or redactional concerns. Its value is in the attention to the detail of Palestinian village culture and to the translation of Syriac and Arabic source material that would be inaccessible to most students of the parables.

Simon Kistemaker states that he wrote to meet the need of the theologically-trained pastor who wishes to consult an evangelical book comprising all of the parables of Jesus and most of the parabolic sayings in the synoptic gospels. An examination of the notes indicates a broad acquaintance with significant discussion of individual parables in articles and monographs published in English, French, German and Dutch. The technical details, however, are properly relegated to the footnotes. Moreover, the book is so clearly written that it provides a suitable introduction to the parables for Christians who have not had theological training.

The book is prefaced by a brief introductory unit in which Kistemaker clarifies his understanding of the different forms of parables in the gospel tradition and sets forth the principles of interpretation he has followed. Forty brief units then take up the parabolic utterances of Jesus in the order they would be presented in a standard synopsis. The text, printed as it would appear in *Gospel Parallels*, is the NIV translation. Brief parabolic sayings, like those concerning salt (Matt 5:13 par.), the burglar (24:42-44 par.) or the farmer and the servant (Luke 17:7-10) are treated in cursory fashion (three pages each). More complex parables, like the sower (Matt 13:3-8 par.) or the lost son (Luke 15:11-32), receive more thorough treatment (up to fourteen pages). In the case of the sower Kistemaker discusses the setting, design, interpretation and application of the parable. When parallels exist in Scripture or in Jewish or hellenistic sources they are brought to the reader's attention. In some instances (e.g. the watchful servant, Mark 13:32-37/Luke 12:35-38) related parables are treated individually within a single unit. In short, the book provides a brief, helpful introduction to the parables of Jesus by calling attention to their setting and interpretation and by tracing their implications for Christian life and practice. The ample footnotes constitute an invitation to further study and reflection.

Kistemaker's book differs from Bailey's in scope and format. The breadth of scope in *The Parables of Jesus* inevitably means that the attention to detail that distinguishes Bailey's treatment is less evident in Kistemaker's handling of the same material. Bailey, for example, devotes 24 pages to his literary and cultural analysis of the parable of the good Samaritan (Luke 10:25-37). Kistemaker allows 11 pages to set forth the text, clarify the detail and implications of the parable, discuss the OT parallels and develop the application. The intention of the two writers is different, and that difference is everywhere evident in the format of the presentation. Both men have produced books that permit the parables to be heard again, bringing men and women before the disturbing, penetrating word of Jesus.

William L. Lane

Western Kentucky University, Bowling Green

Savior of the World: The Message of Luke's Gospel. By Michael Wilcock. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1979, 215 pp., \$4.75 paper.

The unique goals of the series "The Bible Speaks Today" (J. A. Motyer and J. R. W. Stott, eds.) are admirably fulfilled in Wilcock's volume on Luke. The expositor of Scripture is often frustrated by exegetical commentaries or unable to utilize them wisely. The beauty of the forest of Biblical theology is too often missed in the preoccupation with exegetical

trees. What should be obvious in the text may be overlooked not only because of inadequate attention but also because of failure to grasp the significance of a word, verse or passage against the characteristics and theology of the whole book. This is perhaps most common in the preaching of the gospels, which lack the linear argumentation characteristic of most epistles. All this scarcely needs to be said but it does need to be addressed. The volume at hand offers not an exegetical commentary (this is presupposed) or a running commentary (which often only states the obvious) but a blend of insights on Luke's characteristics and theology and on the application of these.

There is little grappling with issues. Wilcock states and applies conclusions he has already reached. Matters of literary composition and style, if they appear at all, are imbedded in the exposition and expressed in popular language. (See his treatment of Luke 6:20-49; 8:22-56 as examples.) The introduction does touch on authorship, stressing Luke's concern for the "Gentile mission," his concept of the universal offer of the gospel, and his emphasis on both meanings of *sōzō* ("heal" and "save"). Salvation is central in Luke's writings.

The organization of the material reflects the homiletical purpose of the series. This organization is thoughtful, although somewhat frustrating to the reader who wants to follow Luke's order of the text closely. A typical topical arrangement is "Thoroughness," "Accuracy," "Order" (Luke 1:3). When the annunciation, the Magnificat and the Benedictus (1:26-80) are packaged under the headings "The bringer of salvation," "The scope of salvation" and "The heart of salvation" (pp. 35-38), the very specialized purpose of the book becomes more clear. Luke 2:1-52 is first covered under the heading "Three stories" (pp. 43-45) and then repeated under the heading "Three sayings" (pp. 45-50)—frustrating for the exegete, but superb for the preacher (for whom the series is intended).

A short book on a long and complex gospel should not be faulted for omissions. The problem comes when, in the reviewer's judgment at least, the true significance of a passage—that which is important in Luke's theology and (therefore) for expository preaching—seems to be lost among comments on less important things. Wilcock's paragraph on the healing of the paralytic (Luke 5:17-26) omits reference to the significance of Jesus' authority to forgive (p. 70). Levi's role as a tax collector is not explained, nor is the question addressed as to whether "he left everything" is intended to be normative (5:27-28; p. 71). The raising of the widow of Nain's son (7:11-17) presents Jesus as a prophet whose deed parallels that of Elijah, but this is not mentioned (p. 90). The works of the Messiah and the role of John are not dealt with (7:18-35; pp. 91-92). Luke 8:22-56 is applied to the problem of Christian suffering, but at the cost of ignoring the Christological focus and climax of the calming of the storm ("Who is this? He commands even the winds and the water, and they obey him" [8:25; p. 101]). Luke's introduction to his central section is not connected with Jesus' orientation toward Jerusalem (his city of destiny, so important in Luke) or with his ultimate goal of being "taken up to heaven" (9:51). The parables of Luke 15 are not connected with the introductory dialog between Jesus and the Pharisees, so it is not surprising that Wilcock omits any reference to the elder brother in the third parable. The ascension in chap. 24 is omitted completely.

Perhaps I am too demanding for such a brief work. My concern is because preachers often miss the significant point of a passage due to an absorption with some appealing theme they see in the passage. A book like this needs to be a model throughout for preachers because they are going to use it as a model. Fortunately most of the book can be confidently used in this way. Wilcock's treatment of many of the parables is fresh, sensitive and delightful. His approach to the eschatological passages, seeking the most appropriate application, is admirable. His sensitivity to the passion events is thoughtful and devotional, revealing (as does the book as a whole) the pastoral heart of the author. His evangelical perspective and his evangelistic concern are evident throughout.

This book should be carefully used by preachers. It should be studied by teachers as a possible corrective to any imbalance of exegetical detail and practical application in their

teaching of future preachers. It should be read by lay people for the sheer joy of learning freshly what Luke tells us about the Savior of the world.

Walter L. Liefeld

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation. By James D. G. Dunn. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1980, 443 pp., \$24.50.

Christology in the Making is an encyclopedic study from the author of *Jesus and the Spirit* (1975), *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament* (1977) and other works. In 270 pages of text, supplemented by fifty pages of bibliography and more than one thousand footnotes, Dunn probes the origins of the doctrine of Christ's pre-existence and incarnation in first-century Christianity. The writer critically examines the most important Christological titles—Son of God, Son of Man, Second Adam, Spirit of God, Wisdom, Word—to answer the question, "How and when did the doctrine of the incarnation first come to expression?"

The Son of God title, which occurs more than one hundred times in John, Dunn insists has no bearing on an ontological relation of oneness between Jesus and the Father. Likewise in the synoptic gospels Dunn finds no consciousness on Jesus' part of divinity and sonship rooted in a pre-existent relation with God. So also in Paul (notwithstanding Rom 8:3; Gal 4:4; etc.) no overtones of pre-existence and incarnation are said to be present, but only a description of Jesus' status following the resurrection. Even in Hebrews (cf. Heb 1:2-3; 2:6-9; 7:3) the Son possesses no real pre-existence but merely a pre-existence in the mind of God in the sense of Philonic idealism. In the early period of Christianity, then, "Son of God" is said to bear no relevance to Christ's personal pre-existence or incarnation.

The Son of Man in Dan 7:13 ff., Dunn continues, is not a pre-existent, heavenly being but a symbol for corporate Israel. Pre-existence, therefore, is not implied in any of the eighty occurrences of the Son of Man title in the gospels. Jesus' description of himself as the heavenly Son of Man who descended to earth (John 3:13; 6:62), Dunn argues, was not stimulated by the Danielic imagery. The language, with its clear implications for pre-existence and incarnation, represents a distinctly Johannine redaction of the primitive Christian usage of the title.

According to Dunn the NT description of Christ as the Second Adam focuses not on the Lord's pre-existent state and incarnation but on his resurrection and exaltation. Dunn insists that Phil 2:6-11, by common consent the plainest Pauline passage dealing with Christ's pre-incarnate relation with the Father and assumption of manhood, is a leading example of Adam Christology. On this showing Phil 2:6-7 is said to be a description of Adam's creation in the image of God, temptation, and fall. The hymn as a whole allegedly makes no metaphysical assertions about Christ's eternal pre-existence or deity. Rather it teaches that Christ faced all of Adam's temptations but in each case made his choices unselfishly and consistent with the will of God. By appeal to the same kind of Adam Christology Dunn insists that 2 Cor 8:9 says nothing about Christ's pre-existent relation to the Father or his assumption of human flesh.

Texts such as 1 Cor 8:5-6; Col 1:15-17; Heb 1:1-3 Dunn claims embody a Jewish wisdom Christology. Paul and other early Christian writers circumstantially attributed to Christ what pre-Christian Judaism had attributed to wisdom—i.e., existence with God in the beginning and a role in creation. The preceding texts, according to Dunn, are all examples of poetic hyperbole and are not to be taken literally. Hence in these Scripture passages Christ is viewed not as a person with God from the beginning through whom God created the universe. Rather the wisdom texts depict Christ as a man who embodies and expresses the creative power of God. Again no ontological assertions legitimately can be made about Christ's pre-existent person. All that can be said is that Christ discloses the character of the creative power behind the world.

The reader who has carefully followed Dunn's argument thus far—i.e., through the first 80 per cent of his book—is presented with a Christ who is a man, an eschatological prophet, through whom God displayed his power and love. From his study of the relevant titles and Scriptural texts Dunn insists that to speak of the incarnation is to say that Christ embodied the creative and saving power of God. Likewise to speak of Christ's divinity is to affirm that Christ manifested to men the reality of God. Throughout the major part of the book the reader has been served up a strictly functional view of Christ. No basis has yet been found in the NT for the doctrines of Christ's pre-existence, Godhead or incarnation as historically understood by the Church. Dunn indeed insists that Jesus never thought of himself as a person who pre-existed with God prior to his birth. Moreover Paul never regarded Christ as more than a being created in time and chosen by God to serve as the instrument of his saving activity. Through the major part of his book Dunn can justify only an adoptionist Christology. Could it be, the reader asks, that Dunn has capitulated to the theological left in the crucial area of Christology?

The final word, however, remains to be spoken. Turning to the *logos* motif in the prologue of the fourth gospel, Dunn argues that at v 14 we meet for the first time the pre-existent Logos-Son who became incarnate. In vv 1-13 of the prologue Dunn finds the Word set forth not as a personal, pre-existent being but as the utterance of God personified. Only at v 14 ("the Word became flesh"), seen as the culmination of the wisdom and *logos* speculation of Alexandrian Judaism, is the bold step taken of identifying Jesus with the eternal Son sent from heaven. Thus Dunn concludes his book with the claim: "Only in the post-Pauline period did a clear understanding of Christ as having pre-existed with God before his ministry on earth emerge, and *only in the Fourth Gospel can we speak of a doctrine of the incarnation*" (p. 259).

In his learned study Dunn purposes, among other things, to show that the Christian (really Johannine) doctrine of the incarnation has no basis in the Gnostic Redeemer myth. Dunn seeks to undercut the Bultmannian thesis by arguing that none of the apostolic writers before John (who was late-first-century) had any conception of a pre-existent Logos-Son who descended to earth and later ascended to heaven. Dunn's attempt to undermine the Gnostic Redeemer myth, whereby Christ's pre-existence and incarnation emerge as but a late postscript to the apostolic consciousness, we judge has been exacted at too high a price. In their reflections on the person and achievements of Jesus of Nazareth, Paul, the evangelists and the author of Hebrews were, we would insist, conscious of the Lord's eternal pre-existent relation with the Father. In the judgment of this reviewer Dunn has failed to give his readers an evenhanded treatment of the relevant NT material. Dunn chides evangelicals for allegedly allowing dogmatic aprioris—e.g., the creeds and confessions of the Church—to shape their view of Christ. But given his substantial indebtedness to the likes of Fuller, Käsemann and Robinson we suspect that Dunn's own critical outlook has been shaped from more dubious sources. Or, put otherwise, in Dunn's Christological opus, exegetical and theological fidelity have been sacrificed on the altar of scholarly novelty.

Bruce Demarest

Denver Conservative Baptist Seminary

The Book of Acts. By Stanley M. Horton. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing, 1981, 310 pp.

Horton has written a popular exposition of the book of Acts. The introduction is brief (6 pages) and concerns the content of Acts. No place is given to questions of text, structure or sources, nor is there any interaction with literature on Acts, ancient or modern.

The format follows that of Acts itself: twenty-eight chapters, reprinting the Scripture text (KJV) followed by a running commentary (in paragraph rather than verse-by-verse form). Footnotes are included but there is no bibliography or author index.

According to Horton the opening statement of Acts shows that the Church "had its be-

ginning in the Gospel (Luke)." He appeals also to Luke 24:45 (their new understanding) and 24:46-53 (their new character as "a commissioned body") as evidence that the disciples "were already a New Covenant Body."

The relation of the Holy Spirit to the disciples, then, is (apparently) distinct from their being constituted members of the Church. Horton refers to the act of Jesus in breathing upon them (John 20:22) as related to receiving him at "the new birth," whereas the event of Pentecost was a "mighty outpouring and empowering." No reference is made to Paul's interpretation of the baptism as found in 1 Cor 12:13. Given the date of that epistle, following as it did upon the events recorded in Acts 2-19, some comment at this point would have been helpful. (He does comment on 1 Cor 12:13 at p. 47, but only as a passing reference in another connection.)

When discussing the events of Pentecost (Acts 2:2-3) Horton describes the symbols of the Spirit—wind and fire—as "empowering" and "acceptance" respectively. The former appears obvious, but what of the latter? How does "fire" come to mean "God's acceptance of the Church Body as the temple of the Holy Spirit"? The author says only that it cannot mean "cleansing" for the hearts and minds of the 120 were "already cleansed."

Horton's remarks on the "baptism" and the "filling" of the Spirit (p. 32) fail to answer the question of similarity or difference. He refers to the "variety of terms" used in the Bible for the relation of the Spirit to people, yet makes no use here of the references to believers being "filled" on other occasions in Acts (e.g. 4:31: "and they were all filled with the Holy Spirit"). In a later comment on 4:31 he writes that "fresh fillings" are given by God to meet continued need and are part of God's provision for all believers. Thus, it appears, the "promise of the Father" (1:5)—viz., the "baptism"—is no single occurrence for any one group but something repeatedly given. Such an interpretation renders the dramatic announcement of John the Baptist and Jesus somewhat less than climactic.

Not infrequently Horton declares that Luke "does not have the space" to include details in his record. Then he goes on to assume that certain things did happen—whether they did or not. This constitutes a kind of special pleading for the writer's theological position, such as "speaking in other tongues" (see e.g. pp. 32, 47, 119-120), or an argument against infant baptism, saying that in the baptism of the Philippian jailor's household "clearly no infants were included" (p. 198). Why "clearly"? Luke has no such comment on the matter.

The main strength of this commentary, in the opinion of the reviewer, is to hold before the reader the fact of and the need for the empowering ministry of the Holy Spirit in the Church. That emphasis is crucial. No other solution will do as they—or we—carry on as the Lord's witnesses.

Walter M. Dunnett

Northwestern College, Roseville, MN 55113

Invitation to the Book of Revelation: A Commentary on the Apocalypse with Complete Text from the Jerusalem Bible. By Elisabeth Schussler Fiorenza. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1981, 223 pp., \$3.95 paper.

This is the third popular commentary on Revelation produced by Fiorenza, who is professor of Biblical theology at the University of Notre Dame and one of three Catholic women who have distinguished themselves by writing commentaries on this book. The other two are Josephine M. Ford (Anchor Bible, 1975), who also teaches at Notre Dame, and Adela Yarbro Collins (1979). It is noteworthy that the work being done on Revelation in America at the present time by Catholics is dominated by the researches and contributions of this "triumfeminate."

For those of us who await with expectation her forthcoming commentary in the distinguished *Hermeneia* series, the present work will be read with an eye for hints and glimpses of the slant that that undoubtedly definitive book will take. Fiorenza's work on Revelation in the past has been distinguished by her rejection of the source-critical theories concerning the composition of the book that have dominated historical-critical exegesis since the end of

the nineteenth century especially in Germany and by her adoption of the *endgeschichtlich* (futurist) method of interpretation in opposition to the regnant *zeitgeschichtlich* (contemporary-historical) method. This commentary by her is no exception to that stance. Although the text for this commentary is the *JB* translation of M. E. Boismard, Fiorenza opposes throughout this work the source-critical theory and *zeitgeschichtlich* glosses of that French scholar incorporated in the *JB*.

Fiorenza does not depart from critical orthodoxy, however, in her view of the authorship of Revelation: The author was not the apostle John. On the question of date she takes a stance that only a few exegetes have taken. While most scholars accept the testimony of Irenaeus that Revelation was composed near the end of the reign of Domitian (ca. A.D. 95), Fiorenza believes that it was composed shortly before Nerva's death in 97/98 shortly after the death of Domitian. She comes to this conclusion on the basis of her interpretation of the riddle of the beast in Revelation 17. She believes that "the five who have fallen" are emperors in the first century who suffered violent deaths—"namely Caesar, Caligula, Nero and Domitian" (p. 166). Since these are only four emperors and not five, however, Fiorenza's interpretation is immediately jeopardized. Did she forget to mention the fifth?

Fiorenza's commentary shows throughout the impact of liberation theology. She says on p. 30 that "Martin Luther King's 'Letter from a Birmingham Jail' reflects experiences and hopes similar to those that determine the theology of Revelation." And the commentary itself is dedicated to four individuals who have recently been killed in their quest and struggle for justice: Oscar Romero, archbishop of El Salvador; Elisabeth Käsemann, the German student killed in Argentina; Karen Silkwood, the American union worker; and the South African student leader Steve Biko.

Feminist theology has also influenced her. She says in the preface: "Feminist theology has pointed out how much androcentric language perpetuates the deep alienation and subtle oppression of women in religion. I have, therefore, sought to avoid such androcentric language wherever possible. Since I was, however, not able to change the androcentric translation of the biblical text itself, I apologize to all those who are offended by such androcentric language."

Emphasizing the unity and integrity of Revelation, she believes that the book was written with a concentric ABCDC'B'A' structure in mind such as is also found in Jewish and Greco-Roman literature. The book is accordingly divided by her into the following parts: 1:1-1:8; 1:9-3:22; 4:1-9:21; 10:1-15:4; 15:5-19:10; 19:11-22:9; 22:10-22:21.

The major symbols of the book are interpreted in the following way: The first seal describes the expansionistic military success of the Roman empire ("Babylon"); the 144,000 out of the twelve tribes of Israel in chap. 7 signify the Church, the New Israel; the two witnesses of chap. 11 are not two individuals but rather a symbol of all the Christian prophets and witnesses who will suffer martyrdom in the endtime; the sun-clothed woman in chap. 12 symbolizes not only the eschatologically saved people of God but also the renewed world; the beast who comes out of the sea in chap. 13 is not only Rome but also all political powers of the first century; the meaning of the number of the beast, 666, is no longer available to us and has been lost; Harmagedon in chap. 16 is a name whose meaning eludes all scholarly attempts at definition and is not intended to give geographic-eschatological information in any case but rather prophetic interpretation; and, finally, the millennium in chap. 20 does not connote a "spiritual" resurrection (the dominant interpretation in the Catholic Church, Greek Orthodoxy, and Protestantism due to Augustine's *City of God*) but rather the traditional Jewish expectation of an earthly messianic kingdom.

The most questionable part of the commentary is the thesis of Fiorenza that the author of Revelation "has not much more information about the endtime than do the authors of the Synoptic apocalypse Mark 13 parallels or 1 Thessalonians 4:13ff, 1 Corinthians 15:20ff, or 2 Thessalonians 2:1ff" (p. 17) and that the intention of the book is not future prediction but prophetic interpretation and exhortation (p. 214). This is an oddly modified futurist stance.

Apart from this and the fact that it appears impossible to come up with an interpreta-

tion of the symbols of Revelation that will satisfy all Christians, this commentary by the dame from Notre Dame is important for its stance on the unity of Revelation and for its insistence on a glorious future for the people of God in the millennium and the new earth. It will be of particular interest to blacks and women and also to Christians in the Third World who are struggling under oppressive and beast-like regimes.

Cliff DuRousseau

Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary, Evanston, IL 60201

The Translation Debate: What Makes a Bible Translation Good? By Eugene H. Glassman. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1981, 121 pp., \$4.25 paper.

As his subtitle indicates, Glassman addresses the touchy question of translation principles while drawing illustrations from the relative merits of some major Bible translations. He leans heavily on modern linguistic theory and, for theological support, turns not only to the NT's use of the OT but to the LXX's as well. His use and apparent understanding of the latter may raise the eyebrows if not the hackles of some (cf. pp. 35-37). The author's thoughts on the question of paraphrasing and his comments on the contribution of the modern missionary movement to contemporary Bible translation provide some of the brightest moments of the book. On the other hand Glassman's repetitive praise of the *TEV* and his obvious disdain for those who advocate a more a formal approach to translation will prove to be a bone of contention for many. He undercuts such criticism to some extent by limiting his remarks mainly to the techniques of translation. His approach in this regard is stimulating and constructive, forcing the reader (as it does) to deal with philosophy rather than with what is often the very subjective question of the appeal of one translation over another.

The debate, as Glassman sees it, is a relatively simple one. In translation we must choose between an old "formal correspondence" method and a newer method of "dynamic equivalence" (pp. 47-67). With formal correspondence, the "receptor" language—that is, the language into which a work is to be translated—is shaped as much as possible to conform to the original language of the work. By contrast, in "dynamic equivalence" the source language—that is, the original language of the work to be translated—is "restructured" into the familiar patterns of the receptor language. Unfortunately Glassman says nothing of the complex problems arising when a receptor language has been shaped by prolonged exposure to the source language in the original texts as well as in the traditional translations of a large and influential body of literature.

By his choice of writing style and publisher Glassman will share his views with a broad audience, evidently wishing to engage the critically-minded layman, undergraduate and young professional. Such choices make the work most vexing, for at times his arguments seem too simplistic and his approach too onesided for the general reader—particularly if this is, and it most certainly will be, for many an introduction to the subject. The overall impression conveyed is that no reasonable man would take exception to Glassman's views. Any who would do so appear unduly conservative, no little bit reactionary, and certainly ill-informed. Unfortunately not all contemporary objections to translational liberties stem from "pedantry" or "confusion" as Glassman implies (pp. 16-22).

When does a creative use of the "dynamic equivalence" method become a thinly disguised attempt at commentary? And when does that commentary become a vehicle for one's own theological baggage? This question goes unanswered here. To bring a translator or his translation into question on theological grounds is not necessarily the response of a reactionary. Admittedly such doubts may prove to be groundless, but they should not be dismissed as the fruits of mere mindless conservatism. Bratcher's inflammatory remarks in Dallas in the spring of 1981 illustrate why some may have serious doubts as to the trustworthiness of the translation he so greatly assisted. These doubts may be ill-founded but the American Bible Society's swift and unmistakably grateful acceptance of Bratcher's resignation over the matter further substantiates such questions as legitimate concerns.

Theological problems are not the only pitfalls ignored by Glassman. For example, he endorses the regular use of what is called the principle of "redundancy." In essence the translator is advised to anticipate the potential blind spots of his reader and fill in the gaps with expanded paraphrases adding information (pp. 78-82). The results range from the innocuous (adding "river" to the word "Jordan") through the insulting (identifying the "Holy City" as Jerusalem) all the way to the uncomfortably verbose (the "Sabbath" becomes "[Jews'] day of rest and worship"). One wonders if a simple footnote might suffice. If a translator felt compelled to anticipate every possible blind spot in his readers' understanding of the Biblical world and then oblige them with an amplified paraphrase intended to overcome their ignorance, the resulting translation would prove so unwieldy as to be rejected quickly and decisively by most casual readers. Such a translation would make the *Amplified NT* appear to be a master of brevity and understatement by comparison.

When Glassman says that the translator must "communicate what the Greek actually means" (p. 34) he is of course echoing a great reformation truth: "Sola Scriptura." Some of his examples, however, tend to leave one feeling that the translator is encouraged to take the place of both critical commentator and Bible teacher. This renders "Scriptura" less and less "Sola." Consider the subjective or objective genitive. Glassman ignores the various options (p. 29) including that of remaining as vague as the original. He contends, "What we have to ask is, how would the author have said it if he had been speaking our language?" (p. 52), but he does not discuss when the translator should leave that decision up to his reader. We seem on the verge here of a new age of "patronizing translations."

Another example of patronizing is Glassman's evident desire to expunge many graphic metaphors and idioms from translation even though these figures of speech are based in the original text or an established pattern of traditional usage (pp. 104-112). Consequently we are told to do away with the "coals of fire" of Rom 12:20 and the "cleanness of teeth" in Amos 4:6. To Luke's descriptive phrase "whose blood Pilate mingled with their sacrifices" (Luke 13:1) Glassman prefers "whom Pilate killed while they were offering sacrifices to God." The dynamic and memorable "they cast the same in his teeth" (Matt 27:44) would be rendered blandly "they insulted him." While it is certain that such simplifications are less challenging to the intellect and capable of quicker recognition, in the long run what will be the cost of such concessions? Are we then to turn a masterpiece of literature into a prosaic chronicle as memorable as last week's newspaper? There are many ways to become nonsensical. One way is to reduce the Scriptures to the level of a Dick-and-Jane reader. In an age of commercial jingles and other literary trends that Bertrand Russell described as "language moving toward sign" there is a growing segment of our population who resent being "talked down to." While this does not mean that we should preserve an archaic KJV at all cost, it does mean that a Bible translation somewhat above the prose level of *People* magazine is to be desired.

Evidently Glassman's translational philosophy was hammered out in the long years he spent on the mission field communicating the gospel in a culture far removed from a comfortable Christian heritage. And though the literary traditions of Pakistan may be rich and ancient they are certainly not influenced to any great extent by a strong Christian tradition. This may make him somewhat insensitive to the value of such a heritage. Glassman is to be commended for acknowledging the modern missions movement (in particular Wycliffe Bible Translators) as a major force in developing a viable science of Bible translation. But Glassman may be to some extent guilty of "stacking the deck" or at least of skirting a number of crucial issues when he argues for the use of "dynamic equivalence" in an English translation by noting its effectiveness in primitive cultures. It is, after all, one thing to communicate the Biblical message in culturally deprived and linguistically impoverished areas and quite another to demand that the translation techniques used in more complex and sophisticated cultures and language traditions follow the same reductive principles. We may inadvertently be aiding and abetting the impoverishment of our own language and the virtual isolation of that language from its rich heritage of theological discussion.

One gets the uncomfortable impression that, in following Glassman's ideas, we run the risk of alienating a new generation from its religious roots through the use of radically oversimplified and unnecessarily "purified" renderings of commonly understood and commonly accepted passages. Will we not, following these principles, actually divorce our generation from a textual tradition that is rich, vital and constructively familiar to us all? Our heritage to be sure should not be preserved by the reactionary clinging to linguistic archaisms or by preserving, for familiarity's sake, what is obviously faulty translation. Nonetheless the issue is far more complex than that. This complexity, whether or not Glassman is aware of it, is largely unaddressed in his work. Such a failure is a serious if not fatal flaw.

Michael Braun

Community Evangelical Free Church, Gainesville, FL

Student Map Manual: Historical Geography of the Bible Lands. Edited by J. Monson. Jerusalem: Pictorial Archive (Near Eastern History) Est., 1979, 168 pp., \$34.95 (distributed through Zondervan in North America).

The Pictorial Archive Project of Richard Cleave has progressed another step closer to the completion of its multifaceted study of the geography of the Bible lands with the publication of this volume of maps and indexes in 15 separate topical sections. Since the manual contains no explanatory text the instructor has a great deal of freedom in developing his own approach. The absence of detailed maps that chart the movements of peoples and armies has the advantage of requiring a high degree of student involvement with mapping. An index is provided before each section to outline the period of history that each map covers, to indicate the Biblical and non-Biblical texts of relevance to each map and to cross-reference each map with similar maps in the *Macmillan Bible Atlas*. The maps themselves show the terrain of the land, waterways, lines of communication (local and international are distinguished by color) and names of important sites. When a site has more than one name both are frequently given, and when the location is in doubt a question mark will appear after the name. The maps are attractively produced with great care being given to the visualization of the geography and history of the Bible lands. The unique east orientation of the maps is certainly a step forward for the study of the geography and history of the Holy Land and is closer to the Biblical orientation to the land.

The first section contains 16 full-color regional maps in a large scale (1:215,000 or about a quarter-inch to the mile). The second section has a map (1:1,500,000 scale) for each of the ten main archaeological periods (Chalcolithic through Byzantine). The major archaeological sites occupied during each period are identified by their modern or historical name(s), and room is provided below each map for student notes. Sections 3-13 provide the framework for an adequate comprehension of the geography of the history of the Bible. Sites mentioned in written texts are printed in red, while other archaeological sites occupied in each historical period are noted in black. The summaries of the contents and sources that precede each section of maps are brief and complete although the inclusion of dates for Israelite and foreign kings might have been helpful.

The fourteenth section contains three maps of the city of Jerusalem (first temple, second temple and Byzantine period), a bibliography of books on Jerusalem, and a ledger and map of all the significant archaeological sites visible in Jerusalem today. A clear distinction is made on these maps between items that are definite and places that are conjecturally located.

The final section is an index to all the 865 names of sites given on the maps in the manual. These names are identified by grid reference, their modern name and an archaeological and historical chart that shows when each site was occupied according to archaeological or written sources. The list of place-names is indexed to the *Encyclopedia of Archeological Excavations in the Holy Land* as well as Cleave's mini-archive of 2500 slides. This tool has the potential of revolutionizing the armchair study of the historical geography of the Bible

lands if its resources are used to their full extent.

Naturally there are individual points of detail that one may call into question, but they appear infrequently and are often a matter of interpretation. For example, in light of the work by D. Livingstone we might have hoped that the location of Bethel and Ai would have a question mark after them, but they are absent from all maps. Some confusion is created in the archaeological maps because the selective basis of including only "significant remains" means that some sites are omitted (cf. *Atlas of Israel* [1970] ix. 2). Gaza is not located on the Early Bronze archaeological map 2-2 but is given on the Early Bronze historical map 3-1 and is indicated as occupied in the Early Bronze period in the chart in index 15-2. In spite of these and a few other dubious items of information, it is clear that a considerable amount of expertise has gone into the preparation and visualization of this study of historical geography. The Wide Screen Project has made another solid contribution to the study of the Bible with the publication of this atlas.

Gary V. Smith

Winnipeg Theological Seminary, Otterburne, Manitoba

Archaeology, the Rabbis and Early Christianity. By Eric M. Meyers and James F. Strange. Nashville: Abingdon, 1981, 175 pp.

The authors—the one trained in the Hebrew Bible, Jewish history and archaeology, the other in NT, Christian origins and archaeology—begin their treatment of their subject by proposing that the serious historian should use in his study a twofold methodological approach of "texts and monuments" (pp. 30-31). With this twofold approach he should consider seriously the new data presented by archaeological research as he wrestles with the complex problems related to ancient Judaism and Christianity. Meyers and Strange contend that "the archaeological evidence is the most honest of all" in dealing with the complex problems of the culture of Palestine in the early centuries of this era, "for the paraphernalia of everyday life is manufactured for one's personal needs, not for one's audience. Therefore, it would be a serious error to exclude archaeological and other non-literary evidence in reconstructing the history and culture of the period" (pp. 27-28). As sample evidence for their contention they cite such archaeological evidence as the buildings constructed by Herod the Great, including the second temple and its foundation platform, and the evidence of early Christianity in the ruins of the so-called "St. Peter's house" at Capernaum.

The authors maintain that archaeology can be helpful in the interpretation of the ancient texts, including bringing clarity or better understanding to secure or difficult passages (p. 28). Further they state that archaeology "can confirm their [the rabbinic and NT texts'] reliability . . . and establish the veracity of historical information preserved within them." They argue, however, that "archaeology can and does often contradict the written text or appears to be in conflict with it" but only give two illustrations in support of their claim (one rabbinic and the other from Luke 24:13 [Emmaus]; p. 29).

Much of the authors' reasoned argument is developed from archaeological work done in upper Galilee (p. 45) such as at Khirbet Shema', Meiron and Gush Halav (the authors are presently working at en-Nabratein and recently discovered a Torah shrine that has been given the name "an ark of the covenant"). Data from this work is compared with archaeological material coming from other places such as Jerusalem, Nazareth and Capernaum.

Regarding the cultural setting of Galilee they declare that "the conservatism in art and language of Upper Galilee is indicative of a deeply set religious perspective which extends into western Gaulanitis" (p. 47).

The authors have a very interesting chapter on "The Languages of Roman Palestine," arguing that by the first century A.D. the knowledge of Greek was on the rise in the Aramaic-speaking countryside while Aramaic was on the decline even among the urban dwellers. Hebrew functioned as a minority language but continued because of Jewish pride and tradition, while Latin was the specialty language of the Roman authorities (pp. 90-91).

In an interesting chapter on "Jewish Burial Practices and Views of Afterlife, and Early Christian Evidences," Meyers and Strange argue that funerary inscriptions in Greek from Beth Shearim demonstrate such close interweaving of Semitic and hellenistic views of the afterlife that the dominance of the Greek does not of itself aid in showing the degree of Jewish accommodation to Hellenism (p. 108). They argue that the subject of Jewish Christianity deserves much more study from the perspective of the mounting archaeological evidence (p. 108).

In the chapter on "Churches in the Holy Land" they put emphasis on house-churches, synagogue-churches and cave-churches as the places in these early times where Christian worship took place. The chapter (7) on synagogues and art gives a helpful description of the variety and chronology of ancient Palestinian synagogues and tackles the question of Greek symbols in Jewish synagogues that, the authors suggest, may have been merely ornamental (p. 153). In their development of the theme "Jewish and Christian Attachment to Palestine" (chap. 8) Meyers and Strange show, through the literature and the archaeological evidence, that the physical land of Palestine continued to be important to both Christians and Jews in the early centuries of our era.

They rightly conclude in the final chapter that in the study of Christian origins and Jewish history in the rabbinic period both the literary and the archaeological evidences are "necessary for a better understanding of the broad social and religious setting that influenced Roman Palestine" (p. 166).

The book is very provocative and stimulating, opening up and/or emphasizing a number of archaeological and literary questions that need addressing for a better understanding of Palestine in the Roman period. There are good chronological charts of persons and events for the intertestamental and Roman periods (pp. 13-18), some fine archaeological drawings and two maps (pp. 110-124).

W. Harold Mare

Covenant Theological Seminary, St. Louis, MO

Toward an Exegetical Theology: Biblical Exegesis for Preaching and Teaching. By Walter C. Kaiser, Jr. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981, 268 pp., \$9.95.

As Bengel observed, if Scripture is the foundation of the Church and the Church the guardian of Scripture, then the well-being of the Church and her success as a guardian are correlative. When the Church is healthy she zealously guards Scripture. And when she guards Scripture she is healthy. But alas! The inverse is also true. When the Church is weak she fails to guard Scripture. And when she fails to guard Scripture she is weak.

Walter Kaiser's *Toward an Exegetical Theology* is a call to pastors and Bible teachers to guard Scripture and build the Church on its sure revelation of Christ by carefully, faithfully and intelligently relating exegesis to homiletics and teaching and preaching to sound interpretative procedure. It is a call for teachers to feed the Church the "natural" spiritual food of the Word to replace the "junk food" of modern culture, which she has so long been given.

This is a book designed to bridge the gap between the academic study of the Biblical text in the original languages and the actual delivery of messages based on that text. "Very few centers of Biblical and homiletical training have even taken the time or effort to show the student how one moves from analyzing the text over to constructing a sermon that accurately reflects that same analysis and is directly dependent on it" (p. 8). So, its title notwithstanding, it is neither a theology based on exegesis nor a theology of exegesis. More appropriately it could well have been called *Toward an Exegetical Homiletics*.

Like a good sermon, the book is divided into three main parts with a conclusion. In Part I Kaiser introduces "The Current Crisis in Exegetical Theology" as well as "The Definition and History of Exegesis." In Part II, the heart of the book, he devotes six chapters to the exegetical procedures of contextual, syntactical, verbal, theological, and homiletical analysis and gives eight illustrations of syntactical and homiletical analysis (Isa 44:24-28; Jer 17:5-10; Pss 1:1-6; 2:1-12; 1 Thess 4:1-8; 1 Pet 1:3-9; Eph 5:15-21; 2 Cor 5:1-10). The third

part focuses on special issues associated with prophecy, narrative and poetry in expository preaching.

"The Current Crisis in Exegetical Theology" (chap. 1) surveys the different historical answers given to the questions "How do I know what a text meant in its original historical context?", "How do I know what a text means today, to me?", "How do I relate the answer(s) to the former question to the answer(s) to the latter?" In brief Kaiser treats us to a mini-history of the debate on theory of meaning, introducing us to the views of William Ames, J. A. Ernesti, J. S. Semler, F. E. D. Schleiermacher, Hans Georg Gadamer, Emilio Betti and E. D. Hirsch, Jr. The latter is the author's (and this reviewer's) champion for he (Hirsch) believes: A text has only one meaning; that meaning is a function of the author's intention; this intention and meaning is identifiable with, expressed in terms of, and discernible by means of the publicly accessible, objective words of the text. Hence Hirsch and Kaiser believe that objectivity and validity in interpretation are possible, that it is possible to have real, objective knowledge about the past. For Hirsch what a text means for me today is its "significance," the relation I see between the meaning of the text and my situation. Therefore, Kaiser concludes, the interpretative act must first accurately assess the author's single meaning in a text and then, secondarily, in the light of and on the basis of that meaning, determine the text's significance for me and my situation today (p. 36).

"The Definition and History of Exegesis" (chap. 2) is divided into three sections. First, Kaiser defines hermeneutics as "the theory that guides exegesis" and exegesis as "the practice of and the set of procedures for discovering the author's intended meaning" (p. 47). Both focus on the text itself in order to determine and represent what the text itself means. Second, in speaking of the practice of exegesis he argues that if the text of Scripture is the central concern of exegesis, then mastery of the Biblical languages, especially the syntax and grammar of their phrases, clauses and sentences, is *sine qua non* to the interpretative task. Third, he offers a brief sketch of the history of exegesis to help us benefit from past successes and avoid past failures.

In chaps. 3-7 (Part Two) Kaiser explains his exegetical procedure in terms of contextual, syntactical, verbal, theological and homiletical analysis. He begins with contextual analysis because "unless the exegete knows where the thought of the text begins and how that pattern develops, all the intricate details may be of little or no worth" (p. 69). Meaning cannot be atomistically attributed to isolated words, phrases, sentences, or even paragraphs apart from their overall context (p. 70). And there are four levels of context: sectional, book, canonical and immediate. Syntactical-theological exegesis is the label Kaiser prefers to replace "grammatical-historical exegesis." This new label, while incorporating the essence of grammatical-historical exegesis, emphasizes syntax and Biblical theology as the most important ways of discovering the text's meaning. The paragraph, which consists of clauses, phrases and independent propositions, is the center of concern in syntactical analysis. But since "words and idioms are the most basic of all the linguistic building-blocks of meaning" (p. 105), a chapter on verbal analysis follows that on syntactical.

Since according to Kaiser "the missing ingredient in most sermon preparation is theological exegesis" (p. 131) a chapter on this topic follows. Biblical theology can show what theological topics and motifs have informed the text being exegeted and so enable the exegete more fully to ascertain its meaning. Finally, the "how-to" portion of Part Two concludes with a chapter on homiletical analysis in which Kaiser gives suggestions for "transferring the results of the syntactical-theological analysis of the text into a viable didactic or sermonic format" (p. 149) by paying careful attention to the subject, emphasis and theology of the text.

Having given eight "Illustrations of Syntactical and Homiletical Exegesis" in chap. 8, Kaiser turns his attention to three special issues. In chaps. 9-11 he discusses the use of prophecy, narrative and poetry in expository preaching. Correct principles and procedures are contrasted with common pitfalls and problems. The book concludes with a challenge to the exegete/pastor to depend on the power of God's Spirit—the Spirit of wisdom, knowledge, understanding and utterance—in the preparation and delivery of his message.

Without a doubt this is both a timely and a much-needed book, for there is a great dearth of sound expositional preaching in the land. Furthermore it is clearly, forcefully and engagingly written. It is provocative, challenging and informative—all at the same time. It is not designed to be a final or full-blown answer to the problems and issues it addresses but a beginning or, as Kaiser describes it, “an exploratory and provisional type of firstfruits” (p. 9).

Perhaps its provisional nature accounts for several of the following criticisms. First, the phrase “exegetical theology” is never defined. This phrase suggests either a theology based on exegesis or a study of what God says about exegesis. Since the book is not primarily concerned with the former, we must ask: “Does the Bible really teach us about exegetical principles, theories of meaning, word studies, and the like?” A Biblical view of God, man, revelation and language would preclude certain theories of meaning and certain exegetical principles and procedures and favor others. But is it really helpful to speak of “exegetical theology” when the concern is to ground sermon preparation, construction and delivery squarely on sound exegetical techniques?

Second, it is understandable (since Kaiser teaches OT) but somewhat lamentable that more of the illustrations scattered throughout the book were not drawn from the NT, since the majority of his readers are (for better or for worse) probably more familiar with it.

Third, he assumes that most of his audience should and do translate and exegete the Scriptures in Hebrew and Greek as they prepare their sermons. Granted that they should, do most actually do so? And if not, what kind of exegetical book(s) should be written for them? Furthermore, is a reading knowledge of Hebrew and Greek as important as Kaiser contends for understanding the meaning and structure of a text? Do I have to read Plato in Greek or *The Arabian Nights* in Arabic to understand either their meaning or structure and to be able faithfully and accurately to teach what they say? The more perfect the translation from which one works, the greater the possibility for accurately ascertaining meaning and structure without recourse to the original. Discerning meaning and structure seem more a function of literary ability, skill and sensitivity than of sheer linguistic and grammatical knowledge.

Fourth, some readers will be uncomfortable with Kaiser's categorical denial that any NT author interpreted the OT midrashically or in terms of pesher exegesis (pp. 56-57). “We would contend that in all passages where the New Testament writers quote the Old to establish a fact or doctrine and use the Old Testament argumentatively, they have understood the passage in its natural and straightforward sense” (p. 57). Perhaps Hirsch's distinction between the meaning of a text and its significance for a situation would be helpful here. Perhaps quite often in using the OT the NT authors are not attempting to exegete the meaning of the OT text but to assert its significance for the Church in the light of the coming of Christ and God's kingdom (cf. Matt 13:51-52).

Fifth, granting we can discover the meaning and structure of a text, more thought needs to be given to these questions: “How do I ascertain the significance the text was intended to have in its own day?”, “How do I determine the significance this text has for today?”, “Is there or should there be a relation between the answer to the first question and the second?”, “Is it possible that a text has a discoverable, objective, normative significance”—i.e., that its author used his text to address the needs of a particular situation and that the proper use of his text in our hands is to address the same type of situation with it as he did? In other words does each pericope have not only a fixed, God-ordained meaning but also an equally determinate practical use ordained by God? If so, then one important dimension of the preacher's and teacher's task is to discover the God-ordained, practical value of the pericope at hand and make that the application of the text about which he is preaching or teaching.

Sixth, and finally, if there is any truth in my suggestions in the two preceding paragraphs, then we must ask: “Does the NT as a whole, or do its authors as individuals, provide a canonical way of using and applying the OT?” In other words, “is there a particular NT way or are there particular NT ways of understanding the significance of the OT as a whole

and of its parts individually and, if so, is this NT understanding of the OT's significance normative for us today?" In brief, "must we understand the significance of the OT in terms of the NT even though we must understand the meaning of the OT *qua* OT?"

John J. Hughes

Westmont College, Santa Barbara, CA

The Philokalia: Volume I, The Complete Text Compiled by St. Nikodimos of the Holy Mountain and St. Makarios of Corinth. Translated by G. E. H. Palmer, Philip Sherrard and Kallistos Ware. London: Faber and Faber, 1979, 378 pp., \$34.00.

To attempt to review a spiritual classic is a humbling task. Which of us can stand in judgment of genuine communion with God? Therefore I do not attempt to judge this collection but to merely report on it.

The Philokalia, or the love of the highest good, is a collection of texts dating from the 4th to 15th centuries. It was originally compiled in the 18th century by the two monks whose names appear in the subtitle. The work went through several editions, eventually appearing in this century in five Greek volumes. The current English translation project will be issued in five volumes following the best Greek text.

The work has had a profound effect in shaping Orthodox spirituality throughout the ages. In particular it has had an impact on Russian Orthodox spirituality. Dostoyevsky was an avid reader of *The Philokalia* as his writings demonstrate. Indeed one could recommend this collection of texts simply for its historic value. The writers are not all unknown apart from this collection. The first volume contains the work of St. John Cassian, whose writings are included in *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Series II*.

But the Orthodox themselves would claim that there is another reason for reading this work. That is to profit spiritually from the insights it contains. And whether one agrees with the monastic asceticism that permeates the work, one nevertheless is impressed with certain elements of the devotional life as recorded in these texts. There is certainly ample proof even in this first volume that there are incredible resources for meditation and devotion that rival the cultic use of TM in our age. This is, then, a Christian tradition that can produce greater peace and tranquility than the satanic counterparts evident in our society.

Two quotations will illustrate the character of the collection. From St. Diadochos of Photiki we learn that the definition of patience is "with the eyes of the mind always to see the Invisible as visible" (p. 252). Calvinists may appreciate the insight of St. Isaiah the Solitary: "Once you have begun to seek God with true devotion and with all your heart, then you cannot possibly imagine that you already conform to His will" (p. 25). As would be expected, there is an emphasis on the use of the Jesus prayer. Of particular relevance in this regard are the writings of St. Hesychios and St. Neilos.

Before each of the nine authors' works the translators have placed a short biographical introduction. The volume includes a glossary and a full index, making it possible to look up specific subjects. The layout makes the book easy to read and use.

A word of warning is in order. As the editors point out it is dangerous to extract isolated elements of Orthodox spirituality or to attempt to follow the spiritual directions contained in *The Philokalia* apart from an ecclesiological grounding. This is Church spirituality, not isolated individual spirituality. One of the problems that one encounters in discussing Orthodox spirituality is that many people attempt to extract spirituality from the total Orthodox Church experience. Logically this cannot be done. These texts can really only be understood in the context of Orthodox world-view and not as detached spiritual exercises. For this reason, and because of the length of the collection and the prohibitive price, *The Philokalia* will not receive from the non-Orthodox the attention that this collection merits. While it is possible to understand Orthodox churches apart from an examination of their

spirituality, no one should think that he knows the Orthodox Church without having studied these texts.

James J. Stamoolis

154 Frothingham Ave., Jeannette, PA 15644

How the Pope Became Infallible: Pius IX and the Politics of Persuasion. By August Bernhard Hasler. Translated by Peter Heinegg. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1981, 383 pp., \$14.95.

This volume offers an intriguing combination of carefully researched history and stridently partisan polemic. Its author earned doctorates in both Catholic theology and modern history and, before his death in 1980 at the age of 43, had been employed in the Vatican Secretariat for the Unity of Christians. The book is a popularization, with many interesting illustrations, of Hasler's dissertation, published in 1977 as *Pius IX (1846-1878), Päpstliche Unfehlbarkeit* and *1. Vatikanisches Konzil; Dogmatisierung und Durchsetzung einer Ideologie* (2 vols.).

Hasler desires to describe and evaluate the process that led the First Vatican Council to declare on July 18, 1870, that "the Roman pontiff, when he speaks *Ex Cathedra* . . . is endowed by the divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter, with that infallibility with which our divine redeemer willed that the Church should be furnished in defining doctrine of faith or morals." His twofold argument is straightforward. First, this decree is not supported by Scripture, it violates Christian tradition, it turns aside the contributions of recent thought, and it damages the health of the modern Church. Second, Pius IX—an aged (78 in 1870), dangerously "mystical," perhaps senile, perhaps deranged, certainly unstable individual—ramrodded this decree down the throats of an assembly of bishops that included many who wished to have no part in such a pronouncement.

Hasler has used fully the traditional accounts of Vatican I, which come mostly from those (like Cardinal Henry Manning of England) who supported papal infallibility. But he has also tracked down sources from the 150 or so bishops who expressed initial opposition. These materials, Hasler reports, are often difficult to find since the Vatican hounded resisting bishops during their own lifetimes and suppressed their papers after they died. In spite of exaggeration and rhetorical overkill (Pius IX "at bottom . . . understood nothing," p. 123) Hasler's case is convincing. He concludes that Pius IX engineered the decree for three reasons. He wished to support his own political position in Italy, which nonetheless crumbled later in 1870 as a result of the Franco-Prussian War and the reunification of Italy. The pope also desired it for murky personal reasons. But—most importantly—the decree was to serve as the Church's grand statement against the anti-authoritarianism and anti-supernaturalism symbolized by the Enlightenment and the French Revolution.

Evangelical Protestants have much to ponder in this work. They will be pleased with Hasler's devastating recital of the history behind the Vatican I doctrine of papal infallibility. They will be far less pleased with the bases of Hasler's criticism. Hasler was an ally of Hans Küng, who in the introduction praises Hasler for understanding that "the historicity of truth" makes infallibility impossible. (The preface to this English edition notes that Küng's introduction to this book was one of the reasons the Vatican Congregation of the Faith gave for depriving Küng of ecclesiastical teaching privileges in December 1979.) If Protestants follow Hasler in his conviction that Pius IX imposed papal infallibility unjustifiably, they cannot follow him in the relativizing of all truth. Hasler believes that Jesus "was mistaken" concerning the end of the world (p. 32), he believes with Walter Bauer that orthodoxy resulted from political maneuvering (p. 34), and he feels modern learning has rendered much traditional Christian belief *passé* (*passim*). A Protestant who believes in Biblical infallibility might be much more sympathetic to Pius IX, who erred not in defending truth (as Hasler seems to suggest) but in the truth he chose to defend. The book con-

cludes with an appendix containing excerpts from conservative Catholic criticism of Hasler's 1977 dissertation. It provides a brief but fascinating insight into the terrible tension between modernists and traditionalists within contemporary Catholicism.

Mark A. Noll

Wheaton College, Wheaton, IL

Toward Reunion: The Orthodox and Roman Catholic Churches. By Edward Kilmartin. New York: Paulist, 1979, 118 pp., \$4.95 paper.

For those interested in the question of Church reunion, this book is necessary reading. But it deserves a wider audience than the ecumenists. Kilmartin reviews the last twenty years of Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox dialogue and provides an excellent historical survey of the relationship between these two Churches throughout history. While this reviewer thinks that Kilmartin, a Roman Catholic, is too easy on his own communion regarding their responsibility for the events leading to the schism that divided the churches, this blemish does not mar the usefulness of his survey. A more serious charge is that the author ignores the theological change in his own Church while accusing the Orthodox of changing their doctrine. That the Orthodox Church has significantly changed would be hotly contested by any Orthodox theologian.

In spite of these criticisms that center around the author's apparent preference for his own tradition the book is a handy guide to the differences between the Roman Catholic Church and the Eastern Orthodox Church and fills a void in our knowledge of the current dialogue by these bodies. For those who think that the Eastern Orthodox Church is merely a form of the Roman Catholic Church this book dispels that notion. The clear theological differences between Orthodoxy and Catholicism are unmistakably spelled out. Likewise the differentiation within Orthodoxy on certain theological points is alluded to. In fact Kilmartin bemoans the lack of unity with which he hears Orthodoxy speaking. Again this would appear to be his own bias coming through. The Orthodox themselves are not as troubled by diversity. In fact the Orthodox churches rejoice in their distinctives. The charity with which they allow the diversity within the Orthodox communion is seen as one of the strengths of Orthodoxy. Kilmartin, viewing it from the perspective of a central teaching authority, believes the dialogue cannot really progress until there is a more unified, authoritative voice within the Orthodox Church.

One of the most important features of the book is that over one-third of its length is devoted to the documentation that came from the theological commission of the two churches. These documents portray the degree of unity but also the disagreement between the two Churches. As might be expected, the statements on marriage and abortion display a strong pro-life, family-centered position. The book is worth reading for anyone who is interested in either the Roman Catholic Church or the Eastern Orthodox churches.

James J. Stamoolis

154 Frothingham Ave., Jeannette, PA 15644

Baptists and the Bible. By L. Russ Bush and Tom J. Nettles. Chicago: Moody, 1980, 456 pp., \$10.95.

Baptists and the Bible is a journeyman's introduction to Baptist views of the nature of Scripture. It is a case study in historical theology that should stimulate effort on this and other theological topics.

Bush and Nettles, professors at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary in Fort Worth, Texas, undertook the massive task of reading essential writings of Baptists from John Smyth (c. 1610) to the furor over the Genesis volume in the *Broadman Bible Commentary* (c. 1965). In some ways it is an apology for inerrancy as the traditional Baptist position. On the other hand it recognizes that the issue of inerrancy as such is a modern question to which earlier Baptists spoke only by inference.

Beginning with the English Puritan Baptists (e.g. Thomas Helwys; the 1644 London Confession of Faith), in the first section the authors summarize the views of men whose writings had widespread influence on Baptist thought in America in earlier generations (e.g. Benjamin Keach, John Gill, Andrew Fuller). Carey and Judson exemplify the confidence in the power of Scripture on which missions and ministry were based and that the scholars of their time sought to explain.

The challenge of the burgeoning physical, biological and social sciences to Biblical studies and theology in the nineteenth century makes that period one of high interest and drama in any historical consideration of the doctrine of Scripture. The second part of the Bush-Nettles study deals with the cross-currents, the figures, the emotions and the relations that make the turn of the century so complex theologically. Space precluded dealing fully with the thought of each theologian. The bibliographies indicate the writers felt the task too great to read everything each figure had written on the subject. The authors' Southern Baptist background makes the presentations of their historic theologians more familiar, though there is no "southern bias." The impact of the "progressive theology" on all who wrote since 1880 is handled more with charity than with the historical rigor such a study demands.

The third part summarizes the doctrinal statements Baptists have made in their numerous "confessions" over the centuries. Then Bush and Nettles propose a rather conservative "Baptist position" distilled from the authors and writings reviewed in the book. It is constructive, intended for discussion, and sensitive to recent moods, both modernizing and errantist.

Since the heyday of the modernist-fundamentalist controversies sixty years ago there has been surprisingly little formal theological writing among Baptists that deals with the issue that so decimated Northern Baptists and has left suspicions throughout the evangelical wing of the Church in America. Dale Moody's just-published *The Word of Truth* (Eerdmans, 1981) is the first systematic theology published by a Baptist since Mullins (1917) and Conner (1936). Notably, all three are Southern Baptists. Oddly, Bush and Nettles fail to mention Carl F. H. Henry's five-volume *God, Revelation and Authority* (Word, 1976-), which deals specifically with the topic of Scripture. Even more curiously, they totally ignore Norman Maring's excellent essay on "Baptists and Changing Views of the Bible" (*Foundations*, 1958) although they quote from an article by Carl Henry in the same issue of the Baptist historical journal. Their style is pedestrian but not tedious. The four indexes are quite complete.

The book is a good introduction to Baptist thought on Scripture, a commendable first effort in historical theology on any topic for Baptists. But it attempts too much and therefore omits significant sources and includes undigested material. Detailed studies on a smaller scale are now needed that will have the advantage of the path these pioneers have broken. Additional studies should give further detail and increase appreciation for the complexities of the issue. Nonetheless it is unlikely that they will contradict either the conclusions or the final proposal of this volume.

David T. Priestley

Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago, 110 E. 55th Street, Chicago, IL 60615

Harper's Introduction to the Bible. By Gerald Hughes and Stephen Travis. Editorial and additional material by Jean Morgan and Derek Williams. New York: Harper and Row, 1981, 195 pp., \$9.95 paper.

Harper's *Introduction to the Bible* is packaged like Harper's *World of the New Testament* and covers a tremendous range of time and events in 128 pages. In format similar to the latter, the contents are divided into four parts: (1) The Birth of a Nation; (2) The Growth of the Kingdom; (3) The End of an Era; and (4) The Birth of Christianity.

The pictorial helps—diagrams, photos of ancient ruins and modern customs—add to

one's understanding quite well and speak well of taste and precision of illustration. But some of the art work is more like illustrations in children's books. Indeed, something similar could often be said of the text.

The purpose of the book is announced in the preface: to chart the background of the cornfields and battlefields of the Near East centuries ago, events that gave rise to the Bible. Yet as one reads the contents one is occasionally presented with a rather rewritten Bible to the detriment of the Bible's actual contents. For instance, the developmental character of the formulation of the OT "Law" is presented (p. 70): Verbal transmission carried it down to Ezra's time when "it was finally written down in great detail" in Babylonia and then brought back to Jerusalem. Again, the writers equivocate respecting the authorship of all of Isaiah; it is a matter of some doubt.

The discussion of the assemblage of the books of the OT is also given an equivocal treatment. While stating the length of time during which the OT grew (p. 80) and the results of the discovery of the Dead Sea scrolls, not one word is given to the position announced years ago by W. H. Green (1898) that the writings of the OT were accepted from the first as authoritative because they came from the prophets called of God (*General Introduction to the Old Testament: The Canon*, p. 35).

The same equivocation is found with respect to the date of Daniel. Rejection of Danielic authorship by some writers is pointed out—rejection on the basis of the inclusion in Daniel of future empires followed by mention of difficulties with the view that Daniel was "accepted as Scripture in the second century." The work of Edwin Yamauchi clarifying certain Greek words in Daniel as contemporary at least with Daniel is not mentioned. Moses "became aware" of the possibility of leadership. But actually God met him at the burning bush and commissioned him to lead Israel out of bondage. The supernatural is reduced. Jeremiah is said to feel that the Jewish people were not going far enough in reformation, that slowly but surely he found himself preaching against the priests of Judah (p. 59). This entirely slides over the commission Yahweh gave to Jeremiah and specific instructions of what to say. Yahweh is shoved out of the picture.

Data here and there are not always accurate. For instance there is the good possibility that Ur of the Chaldeans (Gen 11:31) is to be placed not in southern Mesopotamia (p. 6) but in the area near Haran (so apparently the Ebla tablets). Long since has the source of the manna been denied to be the secretion of a desert insect. There were not enough of them to provide the daily food for the 600,000 soldiers in Israel who came out from Egypt (p. 19). Nor are there the porous kinds of rocks in Sinai to hold the enormous quantities of water to assuage the thirst of these men and their flocks—to say nothing of women, children and older men. The supernatural is denied. The refusal to go up and take the land when at Kadesh Barnea is made a refusal in the face of superior forces. While this is true, the rebellion of unbelief is not noted, nor is the assertion by Caleb that it was indeed possible that Yahweh would fight for them.

And lastly the record of the resurrection is quashed. We are told only that "three days after the death of Jesus the tomb was empty" (p. 109). No word is said about the happenings of the actual event. Again the supernatural is avoided.

This book is a good example of how to say much about what is in the Bible but leave out essentials and give the impression that its connection to God and his truth is not very well defined or is unimportant.

Harold G. Stigers

St. Louis, MO