

## BOOK REVIEWS

*Egypt and Bible History from Earliest Times to 1000 B.C.* By Charles F. Aling. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981, 145 pp.

This is a pocket-size thin paperback inside a glossy finished cover adorned with photographed scenes of ancient Egyptian life. The text is supplemented with photo reproductions of monuments, carvings, paintings and sculptures from Egyptian history, but the quality of the photographs could be greatly improved.

The matter of content versus title raises objection in this reviewer's mind. An attempt is made to justify an early date for the exodus with approximately 36% of all the pages devoted to the matter of Israel's sojourn, bondage and deliverance from Egypt, while the rest of Egypt's history is very sketchy. Omitted is any consideration of Gen 10:6, 13-14, treatment of which could have set before the reader earlier elements of Egyptian population. Likewise there is lacking any discussion of early influences from Mesopotamia on the formation of Egypt's civilization.

The author adopts a precise chronology for the exodus, opting for 1446 B.C. based on the 480 years of 1 Kgs 6:1. However, Acts 13:18-22 produces some 610 years from the exodus to Solomon's temple, the comparison indicating that some other dating system was employed to obtain the 480 years. This suggests that the rulers designated by Aling for the indicated chronology are incorrect. Furthermore, data concerning Raamses and Pithom (Exod 1:11) weigh considerably against the early date of the exodus. Not enough remains have been found elsewhere or on the site of Raamses-Qantir to justify the existence of an earlier city or a pharaoh named Raamses. Additionally the Amarna letters (1401-1347 B.C.) work against an early date of the exodus in that the names of the petty kings of Canaan included therein would have appeared in the captives listed in Joshua, and these do not appear in Joshua's history of the conquest.

Finally, the archaeological data do not support an early date for the exodus. Evaluations now current and demonstrable support a 14th- or 13th-century B.C. date on the basis of a clear, pervasive change in population in the area of Israel's occupation. Likewise the pounding that Canaanite cities took under sustained Egyptian invasions after the early date would have had some reflection in later Israelite records, but these are not mentioned.

For these reasons the early date selected for the exodus is suspect. This book, then, amounts to an approval of the early date while disregarding Biblical data fitting the later date. The data of this review and the omissions noted above point up the need to change the title.

Harold G. Stigers

St. Louis, MO

*Baptized into Hope.* By Emmanuel Sullivan. London: SPCK, 1980, xi + 244 pp., £8.50.

Sullivan, a British member of the Franciscan Friars of the Atonement, takes his title from a recent Vatican communique urging various communities into one communion of life, worship and mission: "To this we are bound to look forward and to spare no effort to bring it closer; to be baptized into Christ is to be baptized into hope." The book takes in a wide context of what might be called the ecumenical/charismatic renewal and stems from a renewed understanding that "hope is both a dimension and a dynamic of the Christian life. It links and enfleshes faith and love. It is the Christian commitment to become a fellow worker with God within the mystery of creation and redemption at a given time and place. Hope gives

rise to a new consciousness that the Holy Spirit has been poured out on all flesh and is present and active in the world. Hope creates a sense of responsibility for discerning the action of the Spirit and its direction" (p. ix).

The work that Sullivan envisions and describes lies within five broad categories: the ecumenical movement, the Catholic-evangelical convergence, the liberation movement, the neo-pentecostal movement and the community movement. These categories are those perceived to be where the action of the Spirit can be discerned at the present time. Therefore to try to examine them tentatively, as to where they have currently developed, is both relevant and important—especially so in light of their potential for future growth and interaction.

An introductory chapter deals with the theme of being "baptized into hope," wherein the sacrament of water baptism is apparently thought to be instrumental in conveying various spiritual qualities. Indeed the old theories of baptismal efficacy and effulgence are in need of serious re-examination as to their accuracy in describing spiritual events with scriptural vocabulary. With regard to sacramental theology (in the area of water baptism) being brought into practical coincidence with current experience, it is a pity that the author could not take advantage of P. Jewett's *Infant Baptism and the Covenant of Grace: An appraisal of the argument that as infants were once circumcised, so they should now be baptized* (Grand Rapids, 1978), and that he does not consider the possible metaphorical significance of the NT contexts in which the word for baptism appears, as in D. Robinson, "Towards a Definition of Baptism," *Reformed Theological Review* 34 (1975) 1-15. Following J. Moltmann's theology of hope, which is first a theology of the cross (with rejection, suffering and work) and which holds the Bible to be both a book of promises and of hope (looking toward the reward of work in the future), Sullivan suggests that his five categories represent birth pangs, signs of life in a context of renewal for evangelical Christians. It is well to stress that we need not fear that our Christianity will be tainted by politics or secularized by human goals if we are open to the Holy Spirit and the liberty and freedom he brings, but I feel a closer attention to the difference in detail between spiritual goals and moral goals (e.g. between preaching and starvation) would have been helpful.

While evangelical mission is practically defined as the authentication, articulation and communication of the gospel (p. 29), one must take care to proceed in this work from the spiritual locus of ultimate conversion to Christ which, as implied above, is neither automatically nor necessarily coincident with water baptism (especially infant baptism) since the Spirit is not tied to baptism in NT texts or in current experience. Nevertheless I am reminded of R. Spittler's remark that we should contemplate a theology of Christian initiation that does not overemphasize a constellation of rites to the neglect or underestimation of the final product, which in any case must be produced by the interior work of the Holy Spirit in the human heart. Hence it is true that openness to the Spirit will lend substance to our general hope for the future of man and the future of God in his world as Sullivan contends, but it must always be kept clear that such hope is firmly anchored in his son Jesus Christ and that only in Christ does God intersect with the world. While this intersection is narrow and unique (in conversion) the applications are wide (in a great variety of good works). This crucial Christian distinction is blurred in some of the book's discussion, though perhaps unintentionally. It is clear, however, that there is more than enough hope for the glory of God in each of Sullivan's five categories and that the motivation for the book is fully justified.

The ecumenical movement (defined as the movement among the churches for the recovery of their visible institutional unity) should eschew a false irenicism and carry on in a spirit of self-examination and criticism, with genuine reformation and renewal. Its operation is not only at the level of competitive and comparative theologies, but also with the actual experience of Christians (and hence the strength of the author's last two categories). Teacup ecumenism is not to be despised, since every occasion of friendly conversation enables us to share perceptions of truth. To this end ecumenicity is a charism to build up the Church until it becomes what Christ wants it to be in the service of his kingdom. But Sullivan joyfully links all the world religions and their concern with the movement of man toward God with

this charism. It is hard to see how this link can be profitably forged. Indeed B. Burnett, "The Spirit and Social Action," *Bishop's Move* (ed. M. Harper; London, 1978) 31, puts this point most succinctly: "The fact is that to attempt to superimpose a particular spirituality, a teaching on Christian ethics, or social action as an expression of the love of God, upon lives that do not know his love for them in Jesus Christ, and who do not experience the power of his Holy Spirit, is an exercise in futility. It leads to frustration, boredom, irritation and unbelief."

The Catholic-evangelical convergence offers no clear pattern of issues, but one primary hope is a common hermeneutical method. Sullivan blasts fundamentalism as being bred in immaturity and ignorance and as a scandal to theological sophistication. I am not able to identify these opponents exactly, but Sullivan's own use of Scripture, always in a sensible way, looks pretty fundamental to me. Polemics aside, it is the interpretation of texts that really matters and here the writer is not in touch with contemporary discussion. What he is in touch with is more liberal than it is evangelical. If the Holy Spirit is to be allowed to assist in the hermeneutical debate it is vital to clarify precisely the presuppositions that underlie the approach to an author's meaning and the meaning of the text in its original setting. Philosophical presuppositions are not like evangelical ones for certain definable reasons, and unless this level of analysis is reached the issues will never be resolved and will remain superficial. Sullivan's contribution here is that he focuses the need for a renewed understanding of historically divisive issues—namely justification, scriptural authority and tradition.

The liberation movement is a many-faceted force that works against whatever diminishes, enslaves or negates man and is a broad opportunity for Christians to take a stand for human justice, to get involved. If the Christian community has an inner law of love, then struggles for liberation should be motivated by love, not by political design.

The evaluation of the neo-pentecostal movement is positive and fair. It should be seen from the perspective of British Catholicism. At a time when denominational barriers are being broken down by this renewal many opportunities are created for dialogue. Classical pentecostalism in Britain has historically adopted a remarkably insular and isolated position concerning the renewal movements in the Anglican, Roman Catholic and Baptist traditions (they also are perhaps just as impassive and unreceptive to classical pentecostals from outside the British Isles—I am speaking here of the organizational and leadership level). The result of this has been a suspicious atmosphere toward the Christians in the renewal and has eliminated any serious possibility of influencing doctrines or helping to clarify experiences. Therefore Sullivan is right when he mentions that the classicals have the great weakness of a lack of awareness of their own potential for pluralistic approaches. They have a negative image. Sullivan is very optimistic about the future of the neo-pentecostal renewal and believes that the Spirit may be building a new age of faith, an age of new unity. He speaks of a creative force (this is certainly true in Britain), of a new Pentecost being full of the dynamic promise of Jesus, the promise of great service, the spiritual ethos of renewal.

The community movement is an outgrowth of the neo-pentecostal category in that efforts to penetrate back to the life-style of early Christians followed somewhat naturally the baptism in the Holy Spirit (to use the standard term that Sullivan employs). About a decade ago it was decided that these new experiments in Christian community had become so diverse that a kind of "switchboard" needed to be set up to provide information about the basic communities and their spirit and outreach (cf. D. Clark, *Basic Communities* [London, 1977]). Sullivan now follows Clark in taking an informative look at this ongoing movement that sprang from the charismatic renewal. In Britain as elsewhere these efforts to delve deeply into shared life and deeper freedom for love in action have produced their own literature, and Sullivan dips eloquently into this reserve. This is the most successful and pastorally helpful section of the book. Useful notes on charismatic spirituality will be found here, notes that the more institutional Church can profit from. The community movement is seen as a trailblazing landmark in that it shows how practical love can be.

*Baptized into Hope* is by nature forward-looking and impacts on many frontiers. Readers will be impressed with the author's zeal in engaging so many issues, and they may wonder whether he adequately discerns the direction of the Spirit or involves them in actions with which God is not displeased. No one can say that he has not become a fellow worker with God. He obviously believes that with Jesus all things are possible. May the numbers of his tribe increase.

Paul Elbert

Luton Sixth Form College, Bedfordshire, England

*Black Theology: A Documentary History, 1966-1979.* Edited by Gayraud S. Wilmore and James H. Cone. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1979, 657 pp., \$19.95 cloth/\$12.95 paper.

How does a white professor associated with a white theological institution approach a collection of over fifty essays and documents intended for seminary students and aimed at chronicling a fourteen-year history of theological reflection on the black experience?

The external shape and academic purpose of the title allows one the safe and expected route of "objective analysis." We note the intended three purposes of the book and ask if they were achieved. Have the editors compiled "the most significant documents of the Black churches and church-related movements which would present the origin and development of Black Theology"? Have they filled "out the picture with articles and essays that presented the program of Black Theology, or played a significant role in setting Black preachers and scholars in motion" (p. 2)? Have they written "the kind of critical commentaries that would reflect" their "own personal experience as participants in what transpired" (p. 3)?

In very large measure they have. And the result is what will undoubtedly become a standard reference source in the area for years to come. The calls for drops of water from the tongues of a cultural world of black Lazaruses are loud and clear to this white rich man across the gulf. Sometimes the numbers and repetitiveness of the shrieks dull the ear and raise the tolerance level to another's pain. But that is only to universalize the depth of the pain. The diversity of the sources limits the usefulness of the text as an educational instrument for seminarians. Professors will have to search for the right place in a curriculum for its setting. But that is no judgment on the value of the book, only on the value of our traditional white structuring and concepts of theological education. Why must we struggle to find the right place for this sort of book? Have our evangelical classrooms been swept clean enough of the demons of ethnopedagogical racism to smell the street theology of the ghettos?

Does the collection represent the most significant documents from this period? In great measure, it does to this reviewer. The collection is not restricted simply to essays. Twenty-five of its chapters are devoted to statements by groups and churches, sources seldom touched in academia. At the same time there are significant holes. By deliberate choice the authors have avoided material from influential books (for the most part) and concentrated on shorter pieces and journal articles. Was this choice a wise one? It excludes the voice of Cecil Cone, *The Identity Crisis in Black Theology* (1975), of Deotis Roberts, *Liberation and Reconciliation* (1971), of Joseph Washington and many others. And in doing that it minimizes the achievement of the second purpose as well. Further the journal articles of these men are missing also. Should there not have been a place for Deotis Roberts' 1973 essay on "Black Theology in the Making" and especially his 1975 bibliographic orientation, "Black Theological Ethics"? As an interaction piece covering the debate between black theologians I have found that to be very helpful.

The rationale for these exclusions was that "they belong to the more academic side of the movement" (p. 11). And in this area the professionals argue with one another over the Biblical and theological basis of the confrontation with white theology. The book is said to be primarily about the movement aspect of black theology. But this does not quite ring true. One can hardly classify the essays in Part III and the eight essays by Cone as not belonging to

the more academic side of the movement. And the final "Epilogue" chapter by Cone specifically focuses on the intracrine debates of the black theologians, in this case without the benefit of any of them being heard in the collection on their own terms.

In this same connection, surely a work designed to appraise the various sources for black theology embedded in the history and culture of the black Church must have found more place for its rich oral traditions, and specifically some reflection of the glory of the black pulpit. But only one sermon (by Albert Cleage, chap. 32) is included. Where do we hear the motivating power of Martin Luther King, Jr., or his father (not a single essay by either)? What of Tom Skinner's *Words of Revolution* (not even listed in the extensive bibliography)? The black theology movement is par excellence a movement initiated and fed by the black pulpit. Why, in a work purporting to exclude materials as "more academic," is this source not heard? And what of Cone's rich use of black music in his later work? The sounds of protest and anguish in Selma and Birmingham were communicated in song. B. B. King and Aretha Franklin are "soul" theologians.

Does the work adequately treat the origins of black theology? Limited to the chronological period of 1966-1979, it does a beautiful job. This certainly is a "new . . . stage of theological development" (p. 7). But can one also call it a "threshold" of development? Does not the question of origins demand at least a preliminary Part 1, where we can hear the discussions over the relation of black theology to African roots, to the American slave period, to pre-1966 years of malignant neglect? 1966 was the threshold of academic theologizing. But we need to hear also more clearly the roots in the "hush-arbor" meetings and the "Negro sounds" of Richard Allen, Henry McNeal Turner and Marcus Garvey. To understand how we got to the threshold we need to look at the slave quarters also.

Do the essays adequately reflect the program of black theology? The editors, in the introductions that preface the six parts of the volume, provide enriching critical commentaries that help a white novice like myself in seeing that. They provide not only rich historical background on the impact of the articles and statements as they appeared, but even some taste of self-analysis (e.g. pp. 137 ff.) and interaction with one another (pp. 77 ff.). Read through in sequence before even approaching the individual chapters, the introductions are even more valuable.

At the same time I wished the book were eight hundred pages instead of "merely" (!) 657. Parts V and VI depart from the chronological pattern of Parts I-IV and focus on topical agenda questions, in this case those of feminism and Third World theologies. I wished that the three questions raised in Cone's Epilogue (pp. 612-623) had each become a Part as well.

A more substantive problem for me in reflecting on the comprehensiveness of the agenda covered has been hinted at earlier in this review. Does the work do adequate justice to what the white calls "evangelical" (and many blacks, "Bible-believing") responses to the agenda made prominent by men like Cone? Part IV especially touches on this area in its discussion of black theology and the black Church. But I felt that the size and significance of the response needed more treatment. Admittedly it is not as academically vocal. And it may reflect, as Wilmore charges, a crisis of identity for a Church still more "Negro" than "black" (p. 247). But it is serious, and it represents a very large segment of the Church. The minimization of black debate partly explains this lack of attention. But if we are to understand the program and the future agenda it must be given more attention. To my way of thinking, Tom Skinner and John Perkins better represent this majority than Cone. And so, for that matter, do Deotis Roberts and Major Jones. Yet apart from William H. Bentley (chap. 28) their sound is not always heard distinctly. The effect minimizes the reality that it is not simply black theology (singular) but black theologies (plural) that we are dealing with in this collection. Its absence will not counteract the frequent feeling of the reader that Cone especially, in his introductions and more particularly in the epilogue, is guilty of paternalism (a charge levelled by the reviewer in *JETS* 17/4 [Fall 1980] 698).

It does not seem to me, however, that the book's greatest value lies in its academic usefulness or is unveiled in the kind of analytical perspectives we have offered thus far. In the

predominantly white constituency of the Evangelical Theological Society it can serve a richer purpose. Wilmore, in his general introduction, speaks of the "personal factor" as crucial in the black Church (p. 3). Our desire is to react in that spirit also. We leave aside here our observation that the character of many of the essays does not always reinforce Wilmore's contention that black theology "did not come to us . . . in theological libraries. . . ." What kinds of personal questions does the book force on me as a white? Here are some of mine.

Do we not need to re-examine our theologies—Calvinist, Arminian, dispensational, covenant—our confessional traditions, and ask ourselves, "How are they white?" How can they be white and nonracist? Why cannot we recognize our color-alertness to Asian theology, to Latin American theology, and our color-blindness to our own? Is it simply that we have not put racism on our agenda? Or is it that theology, as a traditional science-discipline among us, conceives of itself too much as a divine universal created by the white, northern hemisphere for the rest of the world to follow, rather than one human response to our ethnic cultural context? Why is it that the explicit needs and demands of the black American have remained so submerged in our white, evangelical agenda that they have never come to the surface?

And how should these questions affect the structures of our institutions, the absence of blacks on our faculties, our boards of trustees? What of the absence of black concerns in our treatments of ethics and Church history, our insensitivity to white sociological and cultural presuppositions in the process of hermeneutics? Does our attitude to inerrancy explain all the differences between Cone and ourselves? How does racism deny theologically and pedagogically the inerrancy of the Bible?

How should theology be done? How can black theology help us as a catalyst in re-examining the process of theologizing, theology as praxis? And how can we do this without "using" black theology as merely an instrument again for our Anglicizing? Is black theology saying to us, "Contextualization is hermeneutics"? Do we have the courage and the creative thinkers to struggle with these questions? Is this where mutual dialogue must begin between the Wilmores and the Cones and the Carl Henrys and the Pinnocks?

*Black Theology: A Documentary History* can serve its greatest role in this area.

Harvie M. Conn

Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, PA 19118

*Essays on the Patriarchal Narratives*. Edited by A. R. Millard and D. J. Wiseman. Leicester, England: InterVarsity, 1980, 223 pages.

These essays assess and debate the position of John van Seters and Thomas Thompson, whose recent works have cast serious doubt on the historical reliability of the patriarchal narratives. The seven essays—by British scholars primarily—range over theology, archaeology, ancient customs, literary structure, and methodology.

In the lead essay John Goldingay establishes the theological unity of the patriarchal narratives around the theme of blessing. He sets this perspective in the context of the primeval history, the exodus-conquest and the exile, since the patriarchal narratives are found in the Genesis-Kings context. Goldingay responds to Thompson (who holds that salvation history is a literary form, an imaginative creation of faith) by noting that if the earlier narratives are fiction, then the grounds of faith for the exodus-conquest are removed. "If they are not fundamentally factual, the patriarchal narratives have sense but not reference."

A. R. Millard, invoking a wide range of examples, exposes the methodology of van Seters and Thompson as faulty because of a selective use of ancient documents, an over-rating of parallels and especially as drawing too facile conclusions about anachronisms. "If there is to be a search for anachronisms, let it be balanced by a search for reliable information."

J. J. Bimson reviews the import of archaeology. By accepting the Bible's internal chronology and by giving attention to occupied and nonoccupied sites, he suggests that Abra-

ham's time may fall before 2000 B.C. Patriarchal narratives, he proposes, spanned the transition between MB I and MB II.

Both Thompson and van Seters conclude that Nuzi texts have no special relevance to the patriarchs. Instead, van Seters cites parallels to the patriarchal story from the first millennium. M. J. Selman analyzes his proposals and shows why the first-millennium parallels cannot be supported. Selman, who regards some of the objections to Nuzi as justified, concludes with a list of 13 examples of valid evidence from social custom.

D. J. Wiseman argues that Abraham was not a semi-nomad but a person of rank and dignity, worthy to be a founding father. In the process he deflates several of van Seters' and Thompson's linguistic arguments. D. W. Baker describes the literary structures of Genesis in its diversity and unity. This essay, while most helpful, is not directly aimed at unsettling the conclusions of van Seters and Thompson.

Gordon Wenham in a closely reasoned article on the religion of the patriarchs argues that the name Yahweh was indeed new to Israel, as Exod 6:3 suggests. He solves the problem of earlier references to Yahweh by positing that an editor introduced the name Yahweh in the Genesis material to emphasize that God and Yahweh were identical. His supporting material is illuminating.

These essays, the first offerings of the Council of Tyndale House, are characterized by an irenic tone. Frequently the positive contributions of Thompson and van Seters are noted. The writers are good scholars, very knowledgeable of German and American viewpoints. Footnotes abound. There is an index of Biblical references, authors and subjects. These essays, say the editors, "aim to make positive contribution, not merely to criticize the works of other writers." This they do. The "positive contribution" (Wenham's, for example) moves beyond older formulations, while adhering to the belief that the patriarchal history is reliable as history. The critique of van Seters and Thompson is pervasive. It is necessary, and the arguments are generally well taken. Teachers and writers of commentaries and histories will find this book most helpful.

Elmer A. Martens

Mennonite Brethren Biblical Seminary, Fresno, CA

*The Qumran Baptism and John the Baptist's Baptism.* By Leonard F. Badia. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1980, ix + 87 pp., \$6.75 paper.

The University Press of America is one of a growing number of publishers that provide a medium for scholars to make available to the public works that for a variety of reasons would otherwise remain unpublished. In the case of UPA, at least, this has been a successful and happy approach for the most part. Unfortunately the book under review is a drastic exception. A publisher that carries "University" as part of its title might be especially diligent to create and maintain a reputation for careful, scholarly work. How and why UPA let this one through is mystifying at best.

First, of 87 pages, 10 are bibliography, 16 are endnotes and 10 are nothing but *in extenso* direct quotations from 1QS and the synoptic gospels. This leaves only 51 pages of actual argument, a brevity that obviously precludes any extensive probing of this important and complex subject.

Second, Badia limits himself to secondary literature even when he deals with Qumranian passages the proper translation and exegesis of which are basic to his whole thesis. For example (p. 13) he cites the translations of Brownlee and Vermes of 1QS 3:4-5, renderings that lead to the opposite views that baptism was self-administered (Brownlee) or administered by another party (Vermes). The difference is profound, especially if comparison is being made to the baptism of John. At the least Badia should have consulted the authoritative translation and commentary on the *Manual of Discipline* by P. Wernberg-Moeller where it is pointed out (pp. 59-60) that the verbs in question (*zkh*, *thr* and *qds*) are all in the Hith-

paël, thus favoring Brownlee. This would immediately suggest a difference in mode at least between the baptism of John and that of Qumran.

Third, the work is incredibly repetitious. The author continually stresses points he has made over and over, even to the extent of repeating a lengthy direct quotation (p. 26; cf. p. 3). Chapter four (pp. 40-51) is almost entirely a restatement of the leading ideas of the first three chapters. Though summation and conclusion are extremely helpful in any discussion it is clearly overdone here.

Finally, but not least important, hardly a page is without numerous typos, spelling errors, contradictions and the like. Examples are "Anchor" for "Achor" (p. 2), "meterological" for "meteorological" (p. 2), "Tiberias" for "Tiberius" (p. 4), "Cullman" for "Cullmann" (pp. 7, 20, 79), "Telilah" for *ṭēbilāh* (p. 9), "receipients" for "recipients" (p. 32), "Ain Feskha" for "Ain Feshḥa" (p. 42), "Snyoptic" for "Synoptic" (p. 46), "Gerland" for "Gerhard" (p. 69), "Ernest G. Wright" for "G. Ernest Wright" (p. 70), etc., etc.

It is rare that this reviewer does not find some redeeming quality in a book, but this is one such exception. One can only hope that University Press of America will not be so generous in its acceptance of manuscripts and so careless in its proofreading as to repeat this kind of mistake.

Eugene H. Merrill

Dallas Theological Seminary

*Jesus and the Synoptic Gospels: A Bibliographic Study Guide.* By David E. Aune. TSF-IBR Bibliographic Study Guides. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1980, 93 pages.

This little book is an excellent tool for introducing the student to the issues, terminology and bibliography of critical study of the synoptic gospels and the life of Jesus. It is designed for use as a supplementary text in the classroom but would also be a good beginner's reference. For each topic (e.g. "Criteria for Determining Authenticity of the Sayings of Jesus" or "Limitations of Form Criticism") there is a summary of the main assumptions, debates and results of current research followed by a select bibliography. Only works in English are cited, which is probably less confusing for most novices. A system of signs marks the best basic books and those more suitable for intermediate or advanced students. Most bibliographic entries are annotated, sometimes with helpful background on the authors.

At times, however, the book's critical evaluation of the works it cites is patchy. There are places where Aune criticizes the approaches of certain scholars, dismissing them without taking time to argue his case (e.g. on p. 22 he calls the notion that the gospels are a unique genre an "untenable assumption" and on p. 76 assumes without question that the only unity the sermon on the mount has is the literary unity given to it by Matthew). On the other hand, he lists older works such as Edersheim's *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah* along with standard works.

In a book so brief, informed readers are sure to find that works they feel are important are omitted. The editors are planning to publish updated materials from time to time. Hopefully future editions will correct the numerous typographical errors that tend to erode confidence in the accuracy of bibliographical references.

The book's usefulness, however, far outweighs its deficiencies. I wish I had been introduced to it earlier in my studies, and I would recommend it to any student beginning an acquaintance with the critical study of the NT.

Lois K. Fuller

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL



*Word Meanings in the New Testament. Volume 1: Matthew, Mark, Luke.* By Ralph Earle. Grand Rapids: Baker, 285 pp.

Volumes 3, 4 and 5 in the series *Word Meanings in the New Testament* appeared a few years ago covering all the epistles of Paul. Volume 1 is a selection of words taken sequentially from chapters and verses in the gospels of Matthew, Mark and Luke. The volumes are written for "busy preachers and other serious students of the Word" (preface)—not for scholars. Greek words have been transliterated to accommodate the reader as well as the printer.

The risks of inaccuracies and inconsistencies in the process of transliteration are always present—for example, an inadvertent omission of a line above the *e* and *o* used to indicate the Greek letters *ēta* and *ōmēga* respectively. The transliteration of the Greek letter *upsilon* varies from a *y* in *apolyō* (p. 12) to a *w* in *whios* ("son") (p. 243). The Greek *kappa* is transliterated either as a *k* in *ginōskō* (p. 12) or as a *c* in *crima* (p. 262).

The reader appreciates the untrammelled approach to the meaning of a Greek word. Nevertheless he is puzzled by the author's methodology of choosing some Greek words and bypassing others. Some chapters and verses of the synoptic gospels are given scant attention with the consequence that the busy pastor who has selected a certain passage from the synoptics may find that he does not receive all the help from *Word Meanings in the New Testament* that he expected.

A worthwhile feature of the book is the author's numerous references to current Bible translations, commentaries, lexicons and dictionaries. A student of the NT Scriptures using these tools will be able to broaden his understanding of a specific word in the Biblical text.

Simon J. Kistemaker

Reformed Theological Seminary, Jackson, MS

*Interpreting the Gospels for Preaching.* By D. Moody Smith. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980, 118 pp., \$4.50 paper.

This work is a three-part attempt to apply the tools of critical-historical methodology to preaching. The first part consists of a brief overview of the importance of the historical nature of the gospels, form criticism and redaction criticism. The second part deals with the use of this methodology to the preaching of the synoptic gospels. In the case of Mark there is a discussion of the critical issues involved in dealing with a text, specifically Mark 8:27-9:1. With regard to Matthew and Luke two sermons preached by Smith (Matthew 13:1-23 and Luke 1:26-38) are reproduced and a discussion follows in which he describes how he used the various critical tools in their formulation. The third section deals with the gospel of John. Here he discusses the character of this gospel, which, he believes, can scarcely be regarded as historical; analyzes Jesus' farewell discourse; and summarizes some of the problems encountered in preaching from John and the synoptics. A two-page conclusion ends the work.

When asked to review this work, this reviewer accepted the responsibility with enthusiasm, for he wanted to see how the author would use the various tools of form-redaction-literary criticism in preaching, and there are present here some helpful suggestions for preaching. Smith continually argues that a sermon from the gospels should be based primarily on a single passage or pericope. This makes good sense, for if during the oral period these pericopes circulated as independent units and if at times they are located at different places in the various gospels, one should be exceedingly careful about building arguments on the historical-chronological context in which they are found. Smith argues strongly that revelation is to be found not only in the historical events lying behind the gospel accounts but in the record and interpretation of those events as well. He also points out that "whatever else preachers may do, if they are really to preach from a Gospel, any New Testament Gospel, they must inform themselves about the text" (p. 49). This reviewer finds himself in close agreement with Smith on all these points.

On the other hand it must be pointed out that in general the book fails to provide a true synthesis between historical-critical research and preaching. It is one thing to acknowledge that the evangelists are inspired and authoritative interpreters of the life and teachings of Jesus. It is another to maintain this and at the same time deny the historicity of the events recorded in the gospels by the evangelists. To say that the gospels are kerygmatic and not biographical may be true, but this does not mean that the *bios* recorded in them is fictional. For this reviewer there must exist continuity between both the event and the interpretation of that event in our gospels. It may be a "historicist" mentality to ask whether the gospels recount what Jesus actually said and did (p. 22), but one cannot simply be satisfied with asking how the gospel stories functioned in the tradition. Fairy tales also "function" in their traditions. Smith may be able to preach the annunciation story and at the same time deny the virgin birth on the grounds that this would devalue Christ's humanity (p. 69), but few evangelicals will accept this method of interpreting the gospels for preaching. Any authoritative message of the evangelist contained in the virgin birth-annunciation account cannot stand apart from the historicity of the event, for the evangelist bases his message and interpretation on the reality of the events he reports. For this reviewer it is impossible to assert that one is proclaiming the mind of Luke, or any other evangelist, and at the same time deny the historical ground on which they build their arguments.

Robert H. Stein

Bethel Theological Seminary, St. Paul, MN

*Acts and the History of Earliest Christianity.* By Martin Hengel. Translated by John Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress, ix + 149 pp., \$8.95.

This is a lucidly-written and well-translated book from a professor of NT and early Judaism at the University of Tübingen. He explicitly states in his preface his twofold concern of questioning "the radical historical scepticism" so prevalent within German scholarship, which is frequently highly speculative, and of going to the opposite extreme of "primitive ostracism of historical . . . methods, without which neither historical nor theological understanding of the New Testament is possible." The book is divided into three parts.

Part one discusses a historiography of both the ancient and Christian writers. Hengel shows that ancient historians as well as NT writers pieced together fragments of sources that often left gaps that at times raise unanswered questions. Because of the expense of writing materials they had limited space for writing their work. Hence there was a tendency to reduce rather than expand the narrative material, and this tendency goes against form-critical views.

Hengel thinks that the gospels and Acts had biographical interests very similar to contemporary Jewish or Hellenistic and Roman biography and history that were not isolated from the immediate environment, as K. L. Schmidt wrongly attempted to do by making them similar to medieval legends. The form critics' idea of the freely circulated detached isolated units is unrealistic because of the short time between the events and the written documents. The *Sitze im Leben* are modern inventions rather than historical realities. One sees that the biographical interest of the gospel writers is very similar to that found in the OT and Judaism rather than the legendary romances that were written long after the fact. The NT writers did have a theological interest but one cannot automatically conclude from this that they were not historically accurate in their writings. Hengel exhorts the reader of the NT not to come with undue skepticism of the historical-critical method so as to remove the essential ingredients of the text. It must be realized that Jesus and the early Christians shook mankind then and can do so now. The text must speak for itself. Hengel believes that the author of the third gospel and of Acts (written around A.D. 80-90) was Luke, the physician who joined Paul in his missionary journeys as seen in the "we" passages in Acts—which would eliminate the free inventions of a noneyewitness author proposed by radical re-

daction critics. The author writes a history that serves as a foundation for the faith and its extension into the ancient world.

Part two of the book makes a study of the first decades of the Christian Church starting with the Hellenists and ending with the apostolic council. He gives some good insights on the role of the Hellenists in Jerusalem and the expansion of the Church into Gentile territories. It was not until Paul's ministry among the Gentiles that the early Church was freed from the clutches of the Mosaic Law. Against Baur, Hengel thinks that Peter was not the leader of the Jewish faction that opposed the Gentile Church under Paul's leadership but rather that Peter held a mediating position, for he went to the tanner's house in Joppa and did have fellowship with Paul. Peter's leadership was diminished by Agrippa I's persecution, and James became the leader of the Jewish faction. However, Hengel thinks that Paul's opponents mentioned in 2 Corinthians were largely from Peter's group. Although Peter and Paul basically agreed with regard to the Law, still Peter's resentment against Paul was due to Paul's humiliation of him at Antioch (Galatians 2). The Hellenists were pushed out of Jerusalem and went to Antioch where the Gentile mission flourished apart from the legalism of the Jewish Christians. The Jerusalem council recognized Paul's mission as legitimate. When James took over in the leadership of the Jerusalem Church Peter was forced to work outside of Palestine among the Diaspora and thus compete with Paul, as seen in Paul's letters to the Corinthians. In the end, however, perhaps due to the Neronian persecution, they were reconciled to each other.

Part three is eight pages of theses that serve as a critique of the historical-critical method.

There are many points that one could debate with Hengel. For example, he identifies the Jerusalem visit of Galatians 2 with Acts 15, some of his reconstructions of the early history of Acts are not as clear as he at times purposes, and at times his solving of the differences between the Gentile and Jewish Christians seems to have a touch of the old Tübingen school. But the more problematic, at least for the evangelical, is his defense of Lucan accuracy on the one hand while on the other hand thinking that Luke is inaccurate in many cases. He feels that Luke at times exaggerated (pp. 74, 77), minimized differences (pp. 56, 133), was too biased (p. 101), was often inaccurate (pp. 112, 117), and harmonized unresolved difficulties (p. 120). The reader is left to wonder what Hengel's criteria are for deciding what is accurate or inaccurate. He never tells us. His dating of Luke-Acts as late as A.D. 80-90 seems to be presupposed rather than well reasoned.

However, this work is a far cry from what was proposed by the old Tübingen school and is proposed by many scholars today. It is a breath of fresh air not only to have Luke regarded as a serious theologian but also to take his writing of history seriously. It is a book worth reading and pondering.

Harold W. Hoehner

Dallas Theological Seminary

*The Thought Structure of Romans with Special Reference to Chapter 6.* By Bruce N. Kaye. Austin, TX: Schola Press, 1979, 202 pp., n. p. paper.

Few passages are as crucial in understanding Paul's theology and his manner of argumentation as Romans 6. The meaning of Paul's vivid *syn Christō* language and its relationship to the doctrine of justification expounded in Romans 1-4 are issues of far-reaching significance and perennial concern. Bruce Kaye's book, which is a publication of his Basel doctoral dissertation, is a bold attempt to solve some of the basic theological problems presented by this intriguing chapter and to relate its message to Romans as a whole.

At the outset it must be said that the title is a bit misleading. Kaye says very little about the thought structure of Romans as a whole but concentrates exclusively on linguistic and thematic links between chap. 6 and the rest of the book. Structurally he finds chap. 5 to be a "bridge" between the more general and impersonal discussion of justification in chaps. 1-4

and the presentation of personal Christian experience in chap. 6 and following. Chapter 6 is not (*pace* Jeremias and Dahl) a digression but an integral part of Paul's argument, organically related to chap. 5.

Having established the place of chap. 6 in the argument of Romans, Kaye moves to an analysis of five of its key themes: sin, baptism, relationship with Christ, law and grace, and slavery. Against prevailing opinion Kaye argues that Paul does not view sin as a semi-mythical "power" in chap. 6 but employs a form of personalization suited to the literary context. Sin, in chap. 6 as well as elsewhere in Romans, means "sinful act, or the guilt consequent upon such sin." The role of baptism in 6:1-6 is downplayed, its purpose according to Kaye being simply to show that the Christian and Christ are related. The nature of this relationship is explored next. Eschewing corporate and inclusivistic ideas, Kaye wishes to view the *syn* language as an extension of the representative role of Christ dominant in chaps. 1-4. The "personal" focus of chap. 6 naturally leads to this extension, according to which emphasis is placed on "the unity between the represented and the representative" (p. 85). This view is specifically contrasted with the approach of Tannehill, who is accused of "structuralisation," an over-emphasis on the discerning of monolithic theological structures in Paul's thought. An important part of this chapter is Kaye's answer to the perennial "two crater" problem in Romans: Chapter 6 is not a working out of the doctrine of justification but another, more personal way of viewing the relationship between man and God. Ultimately, claims Kaye, the two "craters" have linguistic boundaries only: They represent two "different ways of speaking."

After a brief survey of Paul's argument about the Law in Romans, Kaye concludes that the apparently intrusive contrast between Law and grace in 6:14-15 is in reality a contrast between "works of the Law" and grace. This conclusion is based on the contention that Paul does contrast grace and "works of the Law" in Romans, but nowhere does he set in antithesis grace and Law. Finally, with respect to the fifth theme, Kaye contends that slavery, not freedom, is the key issue in 6:15-23: Paul here gives "an analysis of the existence of the Christian in terms of slavery" (p. 120). The background for this imagery is to be sought not in any specific philosophical school (such as Stoicism) but in the general contemporary situation as appropriated by the early Christians. In conclusion, Kaye reasserts his view that chaps. 5-8 present a new way of expressing basic convictions about the relationship of man and God and are not simply an expansion of justification. Romans 6 is devoted to the basis of and need for moral effort within this relationship.

Kaye's surveys of key themes in Romans are very useful and often insightful, and his comments on structure and theology are stimulating. His overall view of Romans 5-8 as a formulation of Christian existence parallel to, rather than a development of, Romans 1-4 has much to be said for it. The analysis of 6:15-23 in terms of slavery is surely correct. And while I am not yet convinced by it, Kaye's argument that literary rather than theological reasons explain the personalization of sin is worth considering. Inevitably, however, especially in a work that deals with so many issues, some questions must be raised.

First, granted that baptism in Rom. 6:1-6 is often made too prominent, can it be relegated to quite as subordinate a position as Kaye wants to give it? The fact that our being buried with Christ takes place through baptism (v 4) suggests that more than signification is involved.

Related to this, second, is the question whether representation can do justice to the strongly participationist language of 6:1-11. Unity with a representative (which Kaye grants) does involve more than representation as such and must be characterized by some kind of inclusivistic language—whether this be primarily realistic or (better) forensic. It is not Christ as "representative sinner" who is presented in Romans 6, but Christ as victorious redeemer, in whose work (not just person) Christians participate.

Third, Kaye's view that "Law" in 6:14-15 is an abbreviation for "works of the Law" must be contested. No parallel to this abbreviation is cited (only the opposite process, whereby "works" sometimes represents the whole phrase), and nothing in the context justi-

fies it. In fact the use of *nomos* in 7:1-6, which Kaye links with 6:15-23, offers strong contextual reasons for thinking that *nomos* must be the Mosaic Law as such or perhaps the era that it characterizes. Sufficient attention to the preposition preceding it (*hypo*) in a context of lordship and slavery explains the seeming harshness of the contrast with grace.

The basic weakness of the book is its breadth. The attempt to deal with so many complex issues means that valuable insights are left "dangling" because of insufficient argumentation or inattention to crucial evidence. (A further distressing feature is the inexcusable number of typographical, grammatical and spelling errors.) A certain lack of cohesiveness is also evident. The relationship between the various thematic studies, and between them and the overall purpose of the book, is not always clear. Still, the monograph is a valuable collection of studies on and related to Romans 6 and offers material well worth developing further.

Douglas J. Moo

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

*The Unsearchable Riches of Christ: An Exposition of Ephesians 3:1-21.* By Martyn Lloyd-Jones. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1980, 315 pp., \$9.95.

In the opening words of the preface the author writes: "Each chapter of this book records a sermon preached by me on a Sunday morning during my regular ministry in Westminster Chapel, London, during the year 1956" (p. 5). There are 24 chapters that expound the 21 verses. The book is actually an exposition of topics based on phrases found in those verses. For example, five chapters are devoted to v 17 on such topics as (1) "Christ in the Heart," (2) "Truth Begins to Shine," (3) "The Heart Prepared," (4) "Rooted in Love," and (5) "Grounded in Love." The book is volume six of a projected eight-volume series on Ephesians.

This volume will satisfy neither those who critically approach the Scriptures nor those who desire a word-by-word exegetical commentary. It will, however, warm the heart of those who want to "be filled with all the fulness of God." Lloyd-Jones exalts the person and redemptive work of Christ in his book. He admits his inadequacy and inability to expound the chapter because he is so overwhelmed by its truth (p. 155). This sense of awe and reverent worship pervades the book. Hymns, quoted throughout, enhance its devotional tone.

Throughout the book he offers criticisms of contemporary evangelicalism. He criticized dispensationalism for not applying OT promises to Israel to the Church (p. 45), the evangelistic invitation to "receive Christ into your hearts" (p. 143), the teaching of "taking it by faith" (p. 171), the concept that activity is "an end in itself" (p. 252), and a spirituality that lives on books instead of on Christ (p. 261).

He equates the fulness of the Spirit with the baptism of the Holy Spirit (p. 31). He identifies canonicity with a book "written by an apostle or else under the influence of an apostle" (p. 35). He holds to the covenant of redemption and the covenant of grace (p. 222).

One conspicuous error was noticed. He claims that *eros* and *agapē* are the two words used in the NT to describe love (p. 232). *Eros*, of course, does not appear at all, but *philē* does. There is an extensive quotation of an author without any footnote documentation (pp. 239-241). In fact there are no footnotes in the book, nor is there a bibliography.

Robert Gromacki

Cedarville College, Cedarville, OH

*Harper's World of the New Testament.* By Edwin M. Yamauchi. Editorial and additional material by Ruth Connell and Derek Williams. New York: Harper, 1981, 128 pp., \$9.95 paper.

*Harper's World of the New Testament* is hardly a half-inch thick but is packed with a great amount of data. Organized in four sections—"The Jewish World," "Myths and

Cults," "The Roman Empire," and Roman Life and Belief"—this study of the background of the NT describes for the novice the context into which not only "the foundations of the modern world were laid" but also the establishment of redemptive Christian belief that "turned the world upside down." The aim of this succinct study is plainly put: to show "how crucial to our understanding of the New Testament is our understanding of its setting" (p. vi).

A reading of the book produces a vivid impression of the amount of material packed within its covers. This, however, tends toward a rather "statistical" style in all too many places, so that reading is somewhat laborious at times, producing on occasion a disjointedness that can actually obscure some of the relations between the NT and the world of its day. Examples of disjointedness are seen in the connecting of successive political movements. For instance, "The Herods" follows "The Roman Conquest" without a connecting transition. An error is found on page 7 regarding Drusilla. She was the wife of Felix, procurator of Judea, and the sister of Agrippa, but she is not recorded as appearing at the hearing given to Paul at which Agrippa (II) was present. Berenice was the sister of Agrippa who was present, and this was in the procuratorship of Festus, who succeeded Felix. Paul's appeal to Caesar is recorded (p. 8) but not against the background of Acts 25:13-26:25, perhaps an oversight.

In the third section of the book the discussion of the succession of Roman emperors progresses more than two centuries beyond the NT period, ending with Constantine. The predilections of most of the emperors for evil habits are set out briefly, but we are not informed how these things affected the future of the modern world nor how they immediately affected the Church. Constantine's life is capsuled in two short paragraphs that do not portray his significant work of freeing Christianity from persecution or the impact for weakening the testimony of the visible Church by his elevating it to a recognized religion.

In the second section, syntheses of the teaching of various myths and cults are offered, from Pythagoras to the Sceptics, Stoics and Epicureans, but the lack of delineating the effect or contribution of their influence on the time of the NT peoples makes this section rather more statistical without furthering appreciably the purpose of understanding the NT.

The same is true of the treatment of the Near Eastern religions. While the purpose is said to be to chart the warriors and priests who made the background of NT times, the very complexity and multiplicity of data intensifies the statistical character of the material, and this reader is left with an unrelieved deadening of perception as far as the relevance of this material to the NT is concerned.

Harold G. Stigers

St. Louis, MO

*New Testament Theology.* By Donald Guthrie. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1981, 1064 pp.

Some books are awaited with great anticipation but, when finally published, fail to meet expectations. Donald Guthrie's *New Testament Theology* is not one of those books. This work, by the professor of NT at London Bible College and author of the comprehensive *New Testament Introduction*, has been eagerly expected for some time and is a masterful and thorough analysis from an evangelical perspective of Christian doctrine as it is found in the NT.

The format of Guthrie's book is at the same time traditional and innovative. It is traditional in that he structures his material according to the classic divisions of systematic theology (though he claims that "any parallels our divisions may have with those of historic dogmatic theology arise only because the major areas of spiritual inquiry are essentially timeless," p. 73). It is innovative in that he does not attempt, as most twentieth-century NT theologians do, to describe the theology of the NT according to its major authors (Kümmel), types of literature (Ladd), or NT theological categories (Richardson). He does,

however, retain the benefit of a format structured along literary lines by analyzing his material in literary groupings within each chosen systematic category. For instance, in chap. 5 ("The Holy Spirit") we find the convenient subsections: "The Background," "The Synoptic Gospels," "The Johannine Literature," "Acts," "Paul," "Hebrews," "The Rest of the New Testament" and "Concluding Comments." In other—longer—chapters there are doctrinal subsections that are then further broken down into literary groupings. A good example is chap. 6, "The Christian Life," which is divided into five subsections: "The Beginnings," "Grace," "New Life in Christ," "Sanctification and Perfection" and "The Law and the Christian Life." Each of these sections is further divided by the categories of literature, e.g. "The Synoptic Gospels," etc. After a brief introduction on the nature of NT theology Guthrie gives us ten successive chapters on the following topics: "God," "Man and His World," "Christology," "The Mission of Christ," "The Holy Spirit," "The Christian Life," "The Church," "The Future," "The New Testament Approach to Ethics" and "Scripture." He follows these with a 37-page bibliography and indices of references, authors and subjects.

This structure is in accord with two premises that Guthrie claims have influenced the layout of his theology. "The first is that the subject matter is approached from the conviction that it is a revelation of God rather than an exploration of man. The other has been the needs of the user of the book" (p. 73). Both of these aims are ably satisfied by this work. The needs of the student of NT theology are well served by a work in which virtually any topic imaginable (e.g., the view of the book of Hebrews on Scripture, or the use of the title "Son of God" in Paul) is readily accessible. For instance, in searching for James' view of the Holy Spirit this reviewer found nothing under the topic "Holy Spirit" but, by using the Scripture index, found that Guthrie does not consider Jas 4:5 to be a reference to the Holy Spirit but rather the spirit in man (cf. p. 183). In short, Guthrie has something to say on even the most obscure topics, and his indices and format make it very easy to find out what that is.

As one might suppose, the book's format lends itself well to use in both systematic theology and NT theology classes, and its readability allows it to be used by laymen as well as theological students. I know of pastors who are using this work with great profit in classes in their churches and in personal discipleship with their more concerned and dedicated laymen.

The second purpose stated by Guthrie for his format is that the NT is "a revelation of God rather than an exploration of man." It is more difficult to understand why this necessarily leads him to a systematic presentation since Ladd, to name but one NT theologian, certainly conceives of the NT as revelation also but does not structure his theology according to systematic categories. To be fair to Guthrie he has entered into dialogue with some of the major figures of twentieth-century NT theology on this question, and he is reacting more to the rigid historicism of Wrede and Schweitzer than to his evangelical contemporaries such as Ladd or Goppelt. Nevertheless it seems a strangely judgmental statement to make.

A further criticism of Guthrie's format is the lack of interplay it allows, because of the fear of unnecessary repetition, between interpenetrating ideas—e.g. Paul's Christology and eschatology. Things are not always so neatly separable as Guthrie's format might imply and as he sometimes admits (cf. the discussion of the concept of kingdom in at least two major places: pp. 409 ff. and 702 ff.).

Guthrie begins his work with an introduction that explains his view of NT theology. After a very brief survey of the history of the discipline (a survey, by the way, that is so brief as to be almost useless) he delves into the nature of NT theology. Relying heavily on R. Morgan, *The Nature of New Testament Theology* (cf. p. 28), he argues against Wrede's distinction between theology and religion. Here Guthrie states clearly his belief in the NT teaching as "an abiding revelation from God, which therefore concentrates on what God has to say to man rather than on man's various religious experiences in his search for God" (pp. 29-30). He argues with Schlatter for the accessibility of doctrine in the NT, although carefully

acknowledging that "to recognize the need for some continuity between New Testament theology and Christian convictions does not mean, however, that the New Testament theologian is entitled to impose on the New Testament a dogmatic structure which is derived from the historic dogmatic formulations. . . . The fact is, the basic problem with which the New Testament deals is how sinful man may approach a Holy God, and this is the same for all ages. It is our contention, therefore, that New Testament theology is authoritative and therefore normative in the essentially spiritual area with which it deals" (pp. 32-33). Guthrie also recognizes "that the New Testament theologian must first himself face the relevance of what he writes. . . . He must in fact approach his task in faith, even if he be charged with bringing to it a bias which renders his work historically unacceptable. For unless the theologian can respond to the basic message of the New Testament he will become a mere antiquarian, observing remote past opinions about Jesus Christ" (p. 33). These two rather lengthy quotations raise the question in the reader's mind of the relation between the theology and the historical reliability of the text, a question with which Guthrie does not deal until pp. 42 ff.

After a survey of the problems raised by either a purely literary or a purely analytical approach to NT theology (his major concern with a literary approach seems to be its "tendency to over-emphasize the differences," p. 35), he discusses the place of "personality" (meaning that of each NT author) and canon in NT theology. The next two sections are perhaps the most important for Guthrie. His discussion of "the relation between history and theology" (pp. 42-49) is primarily negative, arguing against the Bultmannian and post-Bultmannian schools with their historical skepticism. I was surprised at the strange lack of dialogue with Cullmann, Goppelt and others of the *Heilsgeschichte* school since Guthrie's conclusions in the section seem favorable toward their view of history and theology as intertwined (cf. p. 49).

One of Guthrie's main emphases throughout the *Theology* is highlighted in the next section of his introduction, a section entitled "Variety and Unity Within the New Testament." A corollary of Guthrie's acceptance of the NT as a revelation from God is his acceptance of it as a basic unity. This is seen as early as his preface, in which he states: "It is further hoped that [his book] will go some way towards demonstrating the considerable amount of unity within the New Testament and will help to offset the prevailing tendency to stress the diversity" (p. 17). In his introduction he acknowledges that the concept of theological unity in the NT "cannot be taken as assumed, especially in view of the strong modern rejection of the idea. Nevertheless, anyone who sets out to write on New Testament theology must state in the clearest possible terms whether he is going to treat the New Testament literature as a collection of disconnected sections and aim to display their diversity as if that in itself was his main aim; or whether he is going to approach the text as a means of revealing various aspects of the united whole. No one can deny the decision on this matter has a profound effect on the presentation of New Testament teaching" (p. 49). Guthrie skillfully handles the problems that a recognition of variety in the NT causes, and he finds his unifying factors in Jesus Christ as the key figure in NT theology (p. 54), the work and mission of Christ (p. 55), the fulfillment motive and the idea of community (p. 55), and the ideas of the future hope and the "all pervasive activity" of the Holy Spirit (p. 56). He defends the concept of harmonization, "although any unnatural straining to achieve agreement must be rejected" (p. 56). Further sections on the relevance of background studies for NT theology and a summary of several important figures and groups of literature in the background to the NT, questions about authenticity, and a final section on the structure of NT theology round out Guthrie's introduction.

One other objection may be brought against this otherwise very fine introduction, and even this objection is one with which Guthrie struggles. Two of his assertions about NT theology work at cross purposes—namely, that NT theology must be viewed as "normative," and that the categories he has developed are conditioned by his personal questions of faith. The problem is that of realizing that our answers are conditioned to some extent by the



questions we ask and hence the questions, as well as the answers, are never "timeless." Guthrie recognizes this problem (p. 34) but does not deal with it adequately enough for this reviewer. Many have felt the best way to find the NT's "timeless" answers is to permit it to speak for itself in the very categories by which we structure our theologies. This method at least mitigates our desire to find in the NT what we wish to be there rather than what actually is there. It is the NT itself that is normative, not our theological understanding of it.

It is impossible in a review of this size to discuss all of the differences that one would have with Guthrie's handling of the NT material, but I am struck with the clarity and thoroughness of his treatment of it. Guthrie is very cautious in his method (cf., e.g., his fair yet rightly indecisive treatment of the *stoicheia* on p. 144), though this caution is sometimes a smoke screen for skirting a particular issue. A good example of this occurs when Guthrie, discussing current Jewish understanding of God, makes the statement that "the Most High was removed so far from his own creation that he needed some intermediary to maintain contact with the world. There is nothing of this remoteness in the New Testament approach" (p. 76). However, a footnote admits that E. P. Sanders in his book, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, has vigorously denied that the rabbis thought of God as inaccessible. Guthrie notes this but does not refute it and offers very little evidence for the remoteness that he claims for the Jews of this time. The issue is further clouded when he recognizes that the concept of God as Father is "not absent from the Old Testament or from Jewish usage" and, though he says "this tended to be a nationalistic idea rather than individual relationship," he does mention that the idea of "corporate fatherhood did not exclude the idea of individual relationship. Indeed it prepared the idea for its full development in the New Testament" (p. 81). This "on the one hand . . . on the other hand" sort of argument often makes it difficult to discern where Guthrie really stands on some issues.

Guthrie consistently argues apologetically for the truth of the faith he holds. For example, we read: "Modern rejection of the synoptic exorcisms is not based on the study of the text but rather on a priori considerations. Medical science classifies in accordance with well defined scientific principles, which make no allowance for spiritual forces as explanation of physical phenomena. Belief in demons and their harmful effect on human life is ipso facto excluded. But this in itself is no conclusive proof that demons do not exist" (p. 129). He also argues for an interpretation of the gospel evidence about exorcisms on the basis of presupposed views of Jesus' deity. Guthrie states the conclusion that Jesus himself accepted demon possession as a fact and "[Jesus] must, therefore, have either been mistaken or adapted himself to the level of understanding of his contemporaries" (p. 129). But here Guthrie quite rightly denies both these views without arguing for a third in their place.

The apologetic tone continues throughout the text in favor of the unity of the NT also. Guthrie states that "Paul's view [of exorcisms] ties in with the extensive emphasis on exorcisms and demon possession in the synoptic gospels" (p. 143), but he has offered little evidence in favor of this view and in fact once again cites a footnote in which he willingly admits that his major comrade in arms proposing this same view (H. Schlier, *Principalities and Power in the New Testament*) has been severely criticized on this point. This emphasis on unity is further demonstrated in his handling of the Son of man sayings in John where he says, "In summing up the Johannine Son of man teaching, we must note that it accords completely with the synoptics' presentation, that it presents both heavenly and earthly aspects, that all the passages undoubtedly refer to Jesus and not to another, and that it is in harmony with other expressions of Christology in the gospel. In itself it is an important link in the view that a basic unity exists between the synoptic and Johannine approach to Christology" (p. 287). Other examples of his defense of the unity of the NT abound (cf. pp. 659, 856, etc.).

Sometimes his interest in authenticity swallows up any comment about the real theology of the passage. In commenting on Jesus' self-consciousness as portrayed in Luke 22:29, Guthrie states: "Before this statement can be taken in evidence, mention must be made of the view that it is not an authentic saying" (p. 311). He then spends the paragraph discuss-

ing the verse's authenticity without ever returning to elucidate what contribution the passage has to the discussion of Jesus' consciousness of Sonship.

Perhaps the best feature of this work is Guthrie's uncanny ability to pick out the salient features of very large theological discussions and emphasize them without making the arguments appear simplistic. His measured style and copious footnotes contribute to this feature of the work. Hence in the space of only 21 pages (pp. 270-291) one finds a fair and balanced discussion of the Son of man passages. Or, to give another example, in 15 pages Guthrie splendidly analyzes the NT teaching on sanctification and perfection (pp. 661-675). Of particular interest to the NT scholar will be Guthrie's discussion of the Christological hymns (pp. 343-365). This reviewer also found exceptional Guthrie's ability to speak simultaneously as both the NT exegete and the systematic theologian on the questions of "The Christian Life" (chap. 6). His chapters entitled "The New Testament Approach to Ethics" (chap. 9) and "Scripture" (chap. 10) are both very helpful, though less than satisfying in some places. The discussion of politics (pp. 947-948), for example, makes no mention of the important pericope Acts 5:17-32 where Peter declares "we must obey God rather than man" (Acts 5:29). Similarly the discussion of Scripture, though admittedly more exegetical than systematic, shows little acquaintance with the current discussions in America concerning inerrancy and infallibility.

Guthrie's use of footnotes calls for some attention. There is a wealth of jewels among the usual scholarly citations. For example, in showing that John's view of true humanity displays man as "dependent on supernatural forces outside himself" (p. 158), he quotes Jean-Paul Sartre as illustrative of the opposite view: "Total responsibility in total solitude—is not this the very definition of liberty?" (p. 159 n. 140). And again, while discussing a few pages later man's mind and will and their relation to performance of God's will, he cites this gem from W. D. Stacey: "*Nous* approves the course of action but *pneuma* supplies the energy to perform it" (p. 169 n. 161). An excellent example of Guthrie's consistent ability to use footnotes in order to lead the reader into further discussion of a problem without getting bogged down in it himself is found in his treatment of the "I am" sayings in John (2 pages—pp. 331-332), but I found surprising the lack of footnoting to the wealth of secondary literature available on Jesus and women (pp. 155-157—though cf. the extensive footnoting in the discussion of the role of women in the Church, pp. 774-778).

The publishers are to be highly commended for the beautiful production of this work, from the fine painting of the holy family reproduced on the dust jacket to the clarity of even the small though readable print of the footnotes (at the bottom of the page, thank goodness). I found only four printing errors in the entire work (p. 41: "with" should be "within"; p. 211: "proposition" should be "preposition"; p. 273 n. 162: "Verständnis" should be "Verständnis"; p. 306 n. 255: J. Dunn's book is entitled *Jesus and the Spirit*, not *Jesus and the Holy Spirit*), and the indices are superbly done. The bibliography, on the other hand, is an undivided alphabetical listing by author chiefly on those books found in the footnotes and is not useful for further research into special topics of interest (cf. the helpful bibliography found in G. Hasel, *New Testament Theology*, Grand Rapids: 1978, pp. 221-243).

The dust jacket of this book claims: "Marked by scholarly rigor and thoroughness, this volume will serve as a standard reference and text, reflecting mature conservative scholarship at its best." It would be hard to disagree with that statement.

Drew Trotter

Elmbrook Church, Waukesha, WI