

## BOOK REVIEWS

*The English Bible from KJV to NIV: A History and Evaluation.* By Jack P. Lewis. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981, 408 pp., \$16.95.

Lewis sets about to address himself to the widely asked question, "Which translation of the Bible is best?" He does not in fact give an explicit answer to that question. Rather the author attempts to "guide the reader into an appreciation of what the various translating groups are trying to do while at the same time cautioning about items that seem defects in their work."

The book begins with brief chapters on the Bible in history and early English translations (which antedate the *KJV*). This forms the basis for his working premise: The translation of the Bible into English is an ongoing process that began long before the *KJV*—a process of which the *KJV* is a part, but that is still continuing.

An important chapter in this respect is "Doctrinal Problems in the King James Version." Lewis critically evaluates the misconception that some have—viz., that the *KJV* is the Bible against which all translations are to be measured.

The discussion of the textual question is very brief (less than three pages) and so is insufficient to answer all the charges of the defenders of the *Textus Receptus*. However, it summarizes the evidence well with numerous textual examples. There is a spirited six-page defense of the provocative description of problems with the *KJV* as "doctrinal" based on the assertion that "any failure to present the 'Word of God' accurately, completely and clearly in a translation is a doctrinal problem" (p. 61). The simple conclusion is that "it is now possible to have a more accurate and more readable translation than the King James Version" (p. 68).

Succeeding chapters evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the major translations and revisions. The criteria used include which text is chosen, the fidelity with which the text is rendered and the quality of the English style into which it is translated. In addition, matters such as translational theory, the use of notes and annotations, format, vocabulary innovations, changing editions, and consistency in renderings are dealt with in considerable detail.

The outstanding features of this book are twofold. First, every chapter is massively documented with literally hundreds of examples of words, phrases or verses, showing a remarkable degree of thoroughness and attention to detail.

Second, the evaluations of each version are made using very judicious and charitable comments. It is to Lewis' credit and a mark of his scholarship that he displays so little prejudice and parochialism. This reviewer was unaware until after having read the book that the author contributed to the translation of the *NIV*.

Tony Plews

Bible College of New Zealand, Nelson, New Zealand

*How to Read the Bible for All Its Worth: A Guide to Understanding the Bible.* By Gordon D. Fee and Douglas Stuart. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1982, 237 pp., paper.

On being asked to review this volume, my first reaction was: "Not another 'how to study the Bible' book!" This initial reaction proved to be unfounded. As the preface notes, this is not "just another" Bible study introduction. Fee and Stuart have delineated the hermeneutical principles for the valid interpretation of the variety of literary genres found in Scripture. Thus after introductory chapters devoted to the broad topics of "The Need to Inter-

pret" and the importance of good translations, the authors discuss the peculiar nature and resultant specific interpretive procedures of the epistles, OT narratives, Acts, the gospels, parables, the Law, the prophets, the Psalms, wisdom literature and the Revelation. An appendix gives some criteria for choosing good commentaries, with a brief listing of some of the authors' own choices.

A book with this focus meets an obvious need. In my experience, failure to take into account the specific literary genre of Biblical texts gives rise to more errors of interpretation than anything else. And Fee and Stuart fulfill the objectives they set for themselves admirably. Each chapter contains a list of "rules" pertinent to the respective genre, along with numerous examples. Attention is always given to the context in which particular passages were written, and the reader is encouraged to use appropriate tools in order to illuminate matters that may not be obvious to the readers. Fee and Stuart touch on theological issues (the "prophetic perspective," the kingdom concept in the gospels) where these are indispensable to correct interpretation.

Only two matters of criticism, and these somewhat minor, must be mentioned. First, the danger with this sort of book is that it may induce a case of "exegetical paralysis." So many pitfalls to be avoided are listed that the average layperson may fear to attempt interpreting Scripture on his own. While probably unavoidable, the problem could have been eased by more attention to the positive value of Biblical material. Second, the authors at times state their own hermeneutical or theological approaches without alerting the reader to the fact that many Christian scholars would not agree. This is evident in the one-sided discussion of the issue of women's ministries (pp. 68-69); the assertion that the OT Law applies to believers only where it is specifically reasserted in the NT (p. 147; and the inclusion of the Sabbath commandment in this category is curious—p. 139); and the insistence that OT texts are given totally new meanings in the NT (pp. 165-166; because NT exegetical procedure may not be exactly the same as ours, does this mean they did not use one?). Some decisions on such debated matters are necessary if the book is to fulfill its purpose, but indication of alternative views would have contributed to the fairness and objectivity of the book.

Douglas J. Moo

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

*Preliminary and Interim Report on the Hebrew Old Testament Text Project.* 5 Vols. Ed. Dominique Barthélemy, A. R. Hulst, Norbert Lohfink, W. P. Rieger and James A. Sanders. New York: UBS, 1973-1980, 2291 pp., \$17.75.

This work represents an eminently useful analysis of most of the significant text-critical difficulties in the Hebrew Bible. More than 4000 variants are analyzed in a way that resembles the critical apparatus of *UBSGNT*. Each variant is listed in Hebrew with a literal translation into English and French provided by the editors, along with renderings of representative translations in English (*RSV* and *NEB*), French (the *JB* and *Traduction Oecuménique*), and German (*Revised Luther*). The reading adopted is marked by a letter (A, B, C or D) that indicates the degree of certainty in the minds of the editors, and a reference is made to the factors (explained fully in the preface of each volume) that led to their decision. Where required a further note of explanation is added. Finally, a recommended translation is made into English and French.

Selection of variants was based on two factors. First, the variant must involve significant differences in meaning—that is, it must be exegetically significant. Second, one of the five translations adopted for comparison must employ or cite the variant. Other important variants omitted because all five versions employed the Masoretic Text will be included in a forthcoming full scientific report that is intended to provide a wider range of problems and greater balance of viewpoint.

*PIRHOTP* is remarkably conservative in its analysis, usually favoring the MT in its

decisions. This is in part due to its limited mandate. It does not pretend to recover the *Ur-text* as literary analysis would define it but rather the "earliest attested text" (attested either directly or indirectly). Along with this, no purely conjectural readings—that is, those supported neither by Hebrew MSS nor by any ancient version—are ever adopted by the editors, although many of these are listed among the variant renderings. For example, in Ps 2:11-12 the reading of the MT "kiss the son" is accepted with a B rating (some doubt) while the usual emendations are listed but rejected as being outside the terms of reference adopted by the committee. This conservative tendency is also seen in the decision to adopt the MT against the LXX in the troubled textual waters of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Yet the editors expressly profess to have examined each variant on its own merit according to the general principles of textual criticism presented in the preface, without bias toward the MT. These very principles, however, have been criticized by Emmanuel Tov as being too mechanical (cf. "Criteria for Evaluating Textual Readings: The Limitations of Textual Rules," *HTR* 75 [1982] 429-498).

Due consideration must be given to the "preliminary" nature of these reports. Considerable revision is to be expected, and further variants should be added such as Jer 31:32 *gā'altī* for *bā'altī* (to name one). But my general impression of this work is very favorable. A comparison of *PIRHOTTP* and my own analysis of Habakkuk indicated strikingly similar conclusions. The report can be warmly commended both to scholars and to the busy pastor who lacks the leisure to wade through all the critical apparatus of *Biblia hebraica* but who would wish to analyze the two or three variants in a passage cited by *PIRHOTTP* as exegetically significant. It is the reviewer's hope that *PIRHOTTP* will not only gain wide circulation but also will, after due revision, result in an eclectic text of the Hebrew Bible based on its readings.

J. M. Sprinkle

Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, OH 45220

*Handbook on the Pentateuch.* By Victor P. Hamilton. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1982, 496 pp., \$15.95.

In a letter dated January 28, 1754, Horace Walpole coined the term "serendipity," inspired by tales called *The Three Princes of Serendip*, in which the heroes were constantly making "accidental and sagacious discoveries" of things not sought for. While I have never claimed any special propensity for making discoveries such as these, the reading of Victor Hamilton's first book has made me wonder, since it has yielded many unexpected (and valuable) things. The book provides welcome relief from such things as popular overviews of the content of the Pentateuch or critical reviews of sources, and I must admit that an appreciation for the book's contribution soon replaced my initial skepticism about the value of one more survey of any stripe.

The author's goal has been to produce a text on the Pentateuch for undergraduate and seminary English Bible classes. Furthermore, he has considered the student both as scholar and proclaimer of God's Word, and thus he attempts to address matters of the classroom and the pulpit at the same time. At certain points he succeeds better than at others, but the result is a work that again and again treats the important theological questions of the Pentateuch.

Because his main concern is to survey the content and to discern its theological import, both then and now, Hamilton has not written a history of Israel from Abraham (or earlier) to Moses, nor has he written a Pentateuchal "Introduction." Thus he bypasses such standard issues as the historicity of the patriarchs or the date of the exodus. His only discussion of authorship comes in the chapter on Deuteronomy, where he sides with those who defend "partial, substantial, or ultimate Mosaic authorship" (p. 378). He does, however, address the literary question of sources and consistently sides with those who see unity in the vari-

ous books and smaller segments. For example, the statements about Genesis as "a unified composition, neatly arranged by the author (or the narrator or editor)" (p. 18), characterized by a "literary artistry" (p. 134), are typical of his approach.

This attention to unity has led Hamilton into frequent use of the methods and results of structural analysis and (especially) rhetorical criticism alongside more traditional approaches. It is one of the unique contributions and particular strengths of the book. These disciplines have only come to the fore in the last decade or so in OT studies, and Hamilton's is one of the first books from an evangelical pen to systematically employ them on a popular level. They emphasize the structure of literary units ("pericopes" of varying lengths, from the level of a few verses to the chapter and even the book level), especially their composition and ordering into unified wholes. The final form of the text is the primary concern. A case in point is the discussion of the flood narrative (pp. 72-76). The author devotes two pages to delineation of the standard critical approach, including two lists, one giving the duplications within the account and one detailing the source analysis into J and P. He then devotes three pages to cautious rebuttal, mentioning Cassuto, Gordon and Kitchen on the documentary hypothesis as a whole, and then reflecting on the unity of the section, using four lines of reasoning. One is a judicious harmonizing approach; a second uses E. Nielsen's work on oral tradition; a third leans on F. I. Andersen's discourse analysis of the passage; and a fourth emphasizes recent works calling for analysis of the text's final form. The result is a good case for the integrity of the section.

The benefits of this approach are salutary, and Hamilton moves beyond atomizing analysis to ask about the implications of any editorial processes. The book is permeated with helpful examples of this. I found his treatments of the placement of Genesis 38 and Numbers 15, or the theological implications of Numbers 13-14, for example, to be especially stimulating.

Another of the author's strengths is his discussion of extra-Biblical parallels at relevant points. He has major (9-12 pages each) excursions on the Mesopotamian creation and flood epics, as well as the Mesopotamian and Hittite law codes, and minor ones elsewhere. In each he notes similarities with Biblical materials, and he is also careful to point out the differences. His differs from many such treatments in that he selects a few examples of the most significant similarities and differences for in-depth analysis, rather than making generalized statements in a few sentences and moving on. In each case he carefully deals with the unique theological contribution of the Biblical accounts.

A final contribution is in treatment of questions that believing Christians often ask, ones that mainstream scholarship often sidesteps. For instance, he wrestles with the question of the validity of Deuteronomic theology in the light of Job, Ecclesiastes, other Scriptural evidence, or even experience. He probes the meaning and implication of God's hardening of Pharaoh's heart. He deals with why there was no apparent sacrifice for deliberate sin. He repeatedly highlights the theme of holiness, pointing out its special significance in Israel's life, and hints that a similar regard for it today is mandatory for Christians. In each case I found that his discussion goes well beyond the majority of treatments of these subjects, both in the care of analysis and in the adequacy of answers.

The book includes author and Scripture (but no subject) indices. The numerous bibliographies, at the end of each of the 23 chapters, focus primarily on the last decade and are very thorough and helpful.

There are only two criticisms worth making here. One concerns the style of the book, which at times is more appropriate to a classroom or pulpit setting than to an academic textbook. For example, Abraham is seen as not possessing "all the promises of God," but rather "the God of all promises" (p. 95). Abraham is "willing to wait a quarter of a century before he first gets the chance to change diapers" (p. 96). In Genesis 14 he possesses "a peanut-sized group of men" (p. 104). Moses' weakness in Exodus 3-4 is that he thinks "in terms of his resources, not His resources" (p. 149). Happily, this style is less prevalent in the latter half of the book.

A second problem is that, for all Hamilton's thoroughness in treating major questions, there are at least two significant lacunae. For one, it is unfortunate that in a book dealing so often with law there is no discussion of *tôrâ*, either in its specialized sense of "law" or in any of its broader senses, such as "oracle," "instruction," or even "way of life." Admittedly the book's concern is with content and theological message and not with the function of *tôrâ* in Israelite or Jewish life, or "the Torah" in the rest of Scripture. But the reader could have benefited by having nuances in the term pointed out, since it does underlie the English "law" in the OT. The discussion on pp. 198-199 on the differences in purpose between covenant and law is good, but only tangentially related to this. Second, there is a regrettable silence concerning the hermeneutic involved in distinguishing moral, civil or ceremonial law: Any hermeneutical rules regarding the specific application or nonapplication of these today are unfortunately lacking.

These are only minor defects when placed against the many valuable contributions of this work, however. When one can be captivated (as I was) reading through an exposition of Leviticus or Numbers, one has a valuable book in one's hands. Teacher and student alike should find it especially helpful and welcome it heartily.

David M. Howard, Jr.

Bethel Theological Seminary, St. Paul, MN

*Jeremiah: A Commentary.* By Charles L. Feinberg. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1982, 335 pp., \$13.95.

This volume represents the first publication of one of the OT books in the *Expositor's Bible Commentary*. It will later become part of a thick volume 6 of that series, which will include also Isaiah, Lamentations and Ezekiel. This brings up a minor problem. When a commentary like this includes the text of Scripture in this day of high printing costs the author is forced to leave out too much. How Isaiah and Ezekiel and Lamentations will fare even if the volume gets to be more than 1000 pages remains to be seen. It is hoped they will be equally successful in packing a lot of solid material into a short (albeit spread-out) space. We admit this spacing may help the average reader, but in this work more notes from this highly competent author would have been welcome.

Also the shortness of the introduction creates something of a problem. Here we have only 16 pages of introduction compared with about 125 pages of introduction in Bright's Anchor Bible commentary on Jeremiah. Feinberg is to be commended on a job well done in this introduction, but his work would have been enhanced had he given some attention to the recent work that has been done in rhetorical and structural studies, an area where scholars have moved away from their preoccupation with source criticism and to a great concern for the text itself. The dismissal of text criticism with a few paragraphs at the end of the introduction is also unfortunate. While a commentary of this type should not overemphasize the subject, the thoughtful reader could have been helped with some more specifics rather than generalities. For example, if the Hebrew manuscript 4QJer<sup>b</sup> does give evidence of more than one recension of the book of Jeremiah, how does this affect one's view of inspiration (see p. 16)? The author redeems himself in this area by referring to more important text-critical problems in his notes.

One appreciates Feinberg's moderate tone regarding Jeremiah's style and the problems of the order and arrangement of the book. Critical scholars have often disparaged both. Certainly Jeremiah's hectic existence under the most trying of conditions did not afford him the luxury of finely honed architectonics. But even this should not be carried too far; cf. "Observations on the Literary Structure of Some Passages in Jeremiah" (VT 30, 1980). Why our author refers in his bibliography to William Holladay's article on Jeremiah 36 here while not referring to it in the discussion of the text and why he ignores the other articles on Jeremiah in that volume is indicative of his choice to ignore scholarly opinion of this type. It

is this reviewer's view that such articles should at least be mentioned even if one does not agree with them. They should be recognized. Since the commentary has no reference to secondary literature beyond 1980 one must assume that the author's work was completed by that time, even though the book was not published until 1982. J. F. Grothe's article, "An Argument for Textual Genuineness of Jeremiah 33:14-26" in *Concordia Journal* 7 (1981), might have been missed for the latter reason, but M. Margaliot's article on Jer 10:1-16 in the VT 30 (1980) volume, which showed how that piece was written between 627 and 605 on the basis of historical and religious as well as linguistic grounds, might well have been referred to. On the other hand, Feinberg has done a fine job on historical and archaeological matters and usually provided the major linguistic information for crucial passages. His note on 34:18-19, while far from accepting covenant theology, shows a full knowledge of the materials that have illuminated the meaning of covenant in the OT. Occasionally statements are made that one could wish were elaborated. For example, Isaiah 15 and 16 are shown to have parallel verses with Jeremiah 48, which the author says supports the early date view of Isaiah. The reader certainly should be informed how that is so.

The commentary is not heavily theological. It is much more weighted to an understanding of the text of Jeremiah in terms of its history and archaeology. That of course may reflect also the nature of the book of Jeremiah. Feinberg rejects the critical view that chaps. 50 and 51 are not from Jeremiah, although he accepts chap. 52 as a later addition. He clearly asserts the general critical opinion that Jeremiah had no revelation of life after death or of the resurrection of the dead (see the comment on 20:18 on p. 149) or of future retribution (see p. 15, top). Just how far this viewpoint should be pressed is a question that has been opened up by Dahood and perhaps should be handled more thoroughly than Feinberg does. The question has certainly not been settled as to when the first revelation of the afterlife appears in the OT. Resurrection is clearly asserted in Daniel 12, and I am certain Feinberg does not place those words in Maccabean times. Indeed, Daniel lived in Jeremiah's time.

Feinberg is on target as he recognizes Jeremiah's tendency to be a prophet whose innermost thoughts are completely revealed. His frankness with God is like that of Job in some passages, especially in chap. 20. But one might question the way Feinberg handles Jeremiah's so-called anti-theology. For example, in 20:7 where Jeremiah accuses the Lord of deceiving him, Feinberg says that this "seduction" is "the divine compulsion on his spirit." Jeremiah "is claiming that the Lord overpersuaded him to be a prophet . . . when he did not realize all it involved" (pp. 146-147). In this way Feinberg maintains that Jeremiah is not accusing God of lying to him at all. It would appear, however, much simpler to allow the prophet, like Job, to speak out his anti-theology and interpret it just as he interprets 20:14-18 as "psychologically understandable in view of the constant pressures on Jeremiah." Job cursed the day of his birth and so did Jeremiah, and neither prophet at that moment was speaking from God but was indulging in honest dialog with God. The inspiration of the passage resides in the fact that the Holy Spirit has faithfully recorded for us what the prophet truly said, as when the psalmist asks God why he has forsaken him or Job asks why God has become his enemy. We must allow Jeremiah to have his own moment of doubt without trying to explain it away.

In his notes on 33:17-26 (p. 237) our author cannot resist a short polemic against the amillennial interpretation of this passage. While this reviewer is somewhat sympathetic to Feinberg's eschatology, the passage here is dealt with much too briefly to satisfy anyone. The book of Jeremiah is not the place one should go to argue the millennial question.

This commentary is a welcome contribution to OT studies. Its clarity, scholarship and obvious dedication to the text as Scripture make it a valuable tool for pastors, teachers and searching laymen.

Elmer Smick

Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, South Hamilton, MA

*Servant and Son—Jesus in Parable and Gospel.* By J. Ramsey Michaels. Atlanta: John Knox, 1981, 322 pp., paper, n.p.

The life of Jesus continues, happily, to fascinate the attention of contemporary NT scholarship despite the skepticism that has grown up around the "quest" for an accurate historical reconstruction. Equally if not more significant is the observation, gaining growing acceptance now on all sides, that the most recent investigations into the life and teachings of Jesus of Nazareth, investigations thoroughly researched against pertinent background materials and carefully stated, have been leading us back from the Bultmannian abyss of total critical agnosticism, back toward a true portrait of the "historical Jesus" that neither ignores the nature of the gospels nor minimizes unnecessarily the evidence they provide us. Into this developing consensus J. Ramsey Michaels' new book fits quite nicely, and it will undoubtedly be welcomed as a competent and creative attempt to carry us further along in our knowledge and understanding of Jesus.

A question and an "assumption," stated initially on p. xi of the introduction, allow the reader to uncover quickly the thesis and the approach underlying this work. The question is formed against the backdrop of the methodological presumptions made within and as a part of the "new quest" for historical knowledge of Jesus, presumptions that one may work back, albeit only with care and caution, from portions of the NT *kérygma* to parallel aspects of the proclamation of Jesus, and ultimately, therefore, back to something of Jesus' own distinctive "self-understanding." Michaels wishes neither to query nor to contradict these presumptions but simply to extract from them the logical corollary: "If Jesus' self-understanding is crucial, then why not his understanding or experience of God?" Allied with this motivation is Michaels' "assumption" that it was precisely Jesus' experience of God that decisively shaped the character and contents of his teachings and his works: "What Jesus of Nazareth taught is what he himself first learned by experience." Jesus then is the one who is able, by virtue of a unique and intimate relationship to God, to "perceive God at work" (p. xiii), clearly and surely, both within and around him, and, out of his insight into God's nature and activity, Jesus proclaims his message, which seeks to share his "vision" with his contemporaries. Further he performs works that serve to corroborate his witness as they manifest in and of themselves the "inbreaking" of the kingdom of God. For Michaels, therefore, Jesus' words and actions not only reveal to us a part of Jesus' own experience of God. They also cannot be fully understood or interpreted apart from that experience. The approach is obviously somewhat circular, but not perhaps severely so.

In the body of his work Michaels builds on his introductory remarks, examining in turn several of the major events in Jesus' life and the main aspects of his teaching as these are contained in the gospels and their underlying sources. Among the events and topics investigated are the baptism and temptation, Jesus' preaching of the kingdom, the parables, Jesus' mighty works (which Michaels helpfully divides on pp. 151 ff. into four categories: exorcisms, healings, declarations of forgiveness, and symbolic actions excluding any separate category for "miracle"), and Jesus' teaching with respect to discipleship. In each instance the author's treatment of his topic evidences the long period of study and classroom teaching that apparently germinated the present work. And yet, perhaps as a consequence, these chapters are markedly individualistic, containing footnotes only on those occasions where reference to previous scholarly discussion is entirely unavoidable. This practice is obviously well-intentioned, as Michaels' book is being directed toward the beginning or intermediate level NT student and not toward the specialist. But on several occasions the reader senses that he is being drawn toward an apparently idiosyncratic conclusion.

Nonetheless, despite a lack of supporting notes, cross references and bibliography, Michaels' treatment of the works and words of Jesus is often enlightening, in places innovative and convincing, and almost always helpful in turning our attention, via a judicious use of source and redaction criticism, back to Jesus himself. Particularly instructive in this regard

are the chapters on Jesus' baptism and temptation (both of which are viewed as reworked accounts in our gospels of an original visionary experience that served to shape Jesus' self-identity and to direct the course of his subsequent mission), Jesus' parables (where Michaels builds on the arguments of R. Funk, D. Crossan and A. Wilder toward the conclusion that the parables reflect Jesus' own revelatory experience, reiterating to others images and analogies that were originally shown to Jesus in the midst of his own unique relationship with God), and Jesus' exorcisms (which are clearly and cogently shown to be both historically authentic and a brutally real part of Jesus' life: "To hear from the pit of hell the same verdict on himself that had come to him from heaven at his baptism and in the household imagery of the parables must have been an unnerving experience, a temptation to end all temptations"; p. 162).

All in all, then, this book has much to recommend it. Despite its weaknesses, it succeeds admirably at wrestling anew and afresh with the intent and content of the Biblical texts and creating from them a portrait of Jesus that at times, if not throughout, possesses a persuasive reality. In light of this, the book deserves to be widely read and discussed among evangelicals and all who continue to respect the influence and impact of Jesus upon Christianity.

James A. Davis

*1 and 2 Thessalonians*. By F. F. Bruce. Word Biblical Commentary 45; Waco: Word, 1982, xlvii + 228 pp., n. p.

Word Biblical Commentaries provide some of the best, most up-to-date, well-documented scholarly expositions of the Biblical text available in English today. F. F. Bruce's work on 1 and 2 Thessalonians takes its place not only at the top of this series but also at the head of modern commentaries on these two epistles.

Because of the commentary's distinctive format, students interested in various subjects can quickly find their way to the pertinent material. Each major pericope has an extensive, up-to-date bibliography. This is followed by a text-critical section called "Notes." Students interested in modern scholarship will wish to consult the third section, "Form/Structure/Setting." The commentary ("Comment") follows next. Finally, the treatment of each of these major sections of the epistle concludes with an "Explanation"—"a clear exposition of the passage's meaning and its relevance to the ongoing biblical revelation" (ix).

This commentary series is technical. Therefore in the NT only those with a working knowledge of Greek will find the "Notes" and "Comment" sections very intelligible. Lexical and grammatical items are richly illustrated and explained with the aid of numerous examples from the MT, the LXX, and hellenistic and classical Greek.

Bruce believes that 1 and 2 Thessalonians may be the earliest extant Christian documents. He dates 1 Thessalonians ca. A.D. 50 and supports this judgment with a carefully constructed argument (pp. xxxiv-xxxv) based on the Delphi inscription (*SIG*, II<sup>3</sup>, 801).

His discussion of authorship takes seriously the use of "we" throughout the letters and the explicit naming of Timothy and Silvanus (Silas) as co-authors. Timothy served as Paul's amanuensis. Silvanus' relation to Paul was more independent since he was not a convert of Paul's (as Timothy was), was a member of the church in Jerusalem, and enjoyed the confidence of its leaders (cf. Acts 15:22).

After carefully examining questions about the relationship of the two epistles (pp. xxxix-xlvi) Bruce defends the traditional order on the basis of the logical relation between the two major eschatological sections (1 Thess 4:13-5:11; 2 Thess 2:1-12).

The occasion of the two epistles revolved around eschatology. Bruce's discussion of early Christian eschatology (pp. xxxvi-xxxix) forms a helpful backdrop for the more detailed discussions in the commentary proper. His comments on "the coming wrath" (1 Thess 1:10, pp. 19-20) rightly challenge the impersonal interpretation of this concept. Likewise his com-



ments on 2:16c, "wrath has overtaken them (the Jews) for good and all" (pp. 48-49), include an illuminating discussion of the various exegetical attempts to relate this phrase to an historical event.

In Bruce's comments on 1 Thess 5:2, "the day of the Lord is coming like a thief in the night," two points stand out. First, he shows that there are many ways the NT uses the phrase "the day" to refer to Christ's advent (p. 109). Rightly, he sees no distinction between "the day of the Lord" (1 Thess 5:2) and "the day of Christ" (Phil 1:10; 2:16), for example. Second, he argues that "as a thief" refers to those overtaken, not to the day of the Lord (pp. 107, 109-110). This eschatological day will surprise non-Christians and unwatchful disciples, but alert Christians will be ready for that day no matter when it comes (p. 110).

On 1 Thess 5:9, "God has not appointed us for wrath," Bruce notes that this is the eschatological, judicial divine wrath that begins at the return of Christ and from which Jesus will deliver his people (pp. 20, 109-110, 112). On the day of Christ's revelation in glory, he will vindicate his disciples and judge the world in righteousness.

Also of interest to students of eschatology are Bruce's remarks on the phrase in 2 Thess 2:1, "the advent of our Lord Jesus Christ and our assembling to him" (p. 163). The "assembling" or "gathering" of Christians to Christ occurs at his advent, as Paul taught earlier in 1 Thess 4:5-17. Interestingly, 2 Thess 2:1 played a major historical role in the development of dispensational eschatology. Bruce remarks that "it is difficult to suppose that the 'day of the Lord' in this section (v 2) belongs to a different time from that in view in 1 Thess. 4:13-18, as is held by the Darbyite school of dispensationalism. It is remarkable, nevertheless, that . . . J. N. Darby recorded that it was 2 Thess. 2:1, 2 which, about 1830, 'made me understand the rapture of the saints before—perhaps a considerable time before—the day of the Lord (that is, before the judgment of the living)'."

The commentary concludes with indices of ancient and modern authors, subjects and Biblical texts.

Anyone who wishes to make a serious study of the Thessalonian epistles will be at a great disadvantage without this excellent commentary. Bruce and the editors at Word have put us in their debt.

John J. Hughes

P.O. Box 1065, Whitefish, MT 59937

*After Fundamentalism: The Future of Evangelical Theology.* By Bernard Ramm. San Francisco: Harper, 1983, 225 pp., \$14.95.

Ramm's thesis is that the enlightenment of the eighteenth century precipitated a crisis for evangelical theology from which it has never recovered, that current evangelical methodologies cannot deal with modern learning without falling into obscurantism, and that the theology of Karl Barth offers a paradigm of how to do a validly evangelical theology that comes to grips with the modern world. In order to establish Barth as such a model Ramm launches a three-pronged campaign. He attacks the current evangelical paradigm, which he characterizes as the old Hodge-Warfield synthesis as refined by the International Council on Biblical Inerrancy, as hopelessly and inevitably obscurantist. Then he tries to defend Barth against some evangelical critiques, particularly Van Til's assertion that neo-orthodoxy is really neo-modernism, by showing that a more thorough reading of Barth reveals him as less subjective, existential, etc. than often supposed. Finally, he outlines Barth's approach to several continuing theological issues to illustrate what he sees as Barth's ability to maintain Christian orthodoxy without having to deny the valid accomplishments of the enlightenment.

As a reappraisal of Barth and an introduction to his thought the book succeeds admirably (though Ramm denies that this was among his purposes). His contention that one ought not to interpret Barth apart from a systematic reading of the entire *Church Dogmatics* is (unfortunately for the finite) well taken. And he demonstrates with copious citations from

the whole Barth corpus that a more "objective," orthodox, evangelically insightful side to Barth than many conservative evangelicals were aware of does exist. Yet one often has the feeling here that Ramm doth protest too much: He continually assumes that Van Til's withering 1946 *The New Modernism*, rather than, say, Gordon Clark's more moderate *Karl Barth's Theological Method*, is the representative evangelical view of Barth, an assertion that seems unjustified to this observer. And Colin Brown's excellent *Karl Barth and the Christian Message* is a strange omission from the bibliography.

Yet even granting that Ramm's sympathetic and appreciative portrait of Barth is a more accurate one than we have yet been offered, it is precisely at the point of paradigm or methodology that Ramm's Barth will probably be found wanting. Ramm's analysis of the currently reigning Hodgian synthesis is both inadequate and misleading, and his attempt to show that Barth provides a better way out of the problems is unconvincing.

Ramm defines the central problem facing evangelical theology today in an insightful phrase as "that of the authority in a scientific age of a book (the Bible) written in a pre-scientific age" (p. 39). Hodge's solution to this dilemma was to recognize that the Biblical authors were children of their own cultures and did not know modern science, so that Scripture does not reveal the "manner" in which the physical world was created. But on the other hand, he affirmed that when these authors taught facts that have a bearing on history or science, inspiration ensured that they taught the truth. Ramm insists that "modern knowledge" has shown the impossibility of the second assertion: affirming that truth is "not the simple task Hodge imagined it to be" (p. 45). Modern anthropology has now taught us that one cannot escape his cultural conditioning, so Hodge's distinction is "not a working solution" (p. 45). Hence modern evangelicals following the old approach cannot maintain the authority of Scripture without obscurantism.

One feels embarrassed for Ramm in his efforts to substantiate these charges. Modern learning and modern Biblical criticism are continually appealed to as if they represented a monolithic and unassailable consensus of irrefutable facts untainted in their application by rationalism, materialism, or rebellion against the authority of God's Word. (Ramm does admit that these biases exist but glosses over their significance.) The facts discovered by science and its technological advances are not distinguished from the humanistic interpretations often given to those discoveries, and evangelicals who accept the one while rejecting the other are accused of "hypocrisy" (p. 44). Ramm mentions the evangelical contention that God was able to work through the particular personalities and backgrounds of the human authors to inspire them to write the words he wanted, but dismisses it lightly with the amazing charge that it amounts to a denial of the humanness of the authors (pp. 104-105). Perhaps weakest of all are his attempts to illustrate the alleged evangelical obscurantism. He accuses Francis Schaeffer in *Genesis in Space and Time* of "glossing over" the enormous body of scientific information that bears on evolution. One wonders what Ramm wants: Schaeffer's purpose in that book was to examine what Genesis says in order to set up parameters within which the scientific evidence could be interpreted Biblically, not to give the final interpretation of the scientific evidence. (I recently heard him argue eloquently and passionately against equating the evangelical position with the young-earth view—hardly an obscurantist approach.) Likewise Carl F. H. Henry is taken to task in *God, Man, and Authority* for "glossing over" Biblical criticism. Apparently, to be free of obscurantism every book must be as long as the *Church Dogmatics*. More seriously, Ramm's charge seems to assume the existence of something like the legendary "assured results of modern criticism," to which every "enlightened" scholar must abjectly bow. And it is ironic that his two chief examples are the two men who have possibly done more than anyone else—Schaeffer on a popular level, Henry on a more scholarly level—to force the evangelical movement to come to grips with modern thought.

Even if Ramm's criticisms of the current evangelical paradigm are not completely justified, it might still be that Barth's approach to the same problems would be an improvement. But here Ramm is equally unconvincing. In a series of fascinating and insightful

chapters he surveys Barth's views on topics ranging from preaching and apologetics to humanism and eschatology. He succeeds in revealing Barth as a powerful thinker and a great theologian with many excellent insights to offer us: The chapters on "The Christological Scriptures" (i.e., Christ as the center) and "Ethics" are especially suggestive. But the closer we get to Ramm's central point—that Barth can help us find a way to preserve the authority of Scripture and full Christian orthodoxy while still coming to terms fully with the enlightenment—the weaker the argumentation becomes. It is difficult to see how Barth's new paradigm amounts to anything more than a fiat declaration that we can now have our cake and eat it too.

Ramm continually repeats the claim that, unlike evangelicals and fundamentalists, Barth accepts the enlightenment where it was good but rejects it where it attacked orthodox Christianity. But this begs at least two questions that are never adequately dealt with: How do we tell what was "good" from what was "bad," and how do we define what is essential to orthodoxy? Why not our Lord's own view of Scripture, for instance?

Barth's method of avoiding undue clashes with the enlightenment mentality is to posit a "diastasis," a "distance" between Scripture and the Word of God. This distance is created by the fact that Scripture was written in human language, by men who were creatures of their own cultures, and by men who were sinners. Any negative results of criticism may simply be allowed to fall into the gap created by this distance between the words and the Word—yet the Word of God can still be discerned in the text by a thorough exegesis of the text.

The pages in which Ramm presents this thesis as evangelicalism's way out of the maze of obscurantism are loaded with *non sequiturs*. It seems amazing that the author of *Protestant Biblical Interpretation* should have so inadequate an understanding of what the standard evangelical view of these matters is. An example is his equation of the emphasis on propositional revelation with the "Hegelian theory of a pure conceptual language" (p. 90). This confuses the issue of verbal, plenary inspiration with the question of whether our knowledge of God is univocal or analogical. That confusion is evident in this summary paragraph: "If theologians deny this interval, then they must affirm that the words of Scripture in every instance perfectly mirror the Word of God. If there is no diastasis, then the interpreter is not allowed to make a difference between those items in Scripture that are culturally bound . . . and those elements that are transcultural and binding. . . . Then not one trace of an old world view can be allowed to stand in the text, for that would be approving an error. It also means that the accuracy of every biblical statement must be defended down to the last decimal point" (p. 91).

Ramm seems to confuse the Word of God with the mind of God. Only so can the paragraph make sense. But no one needs to affirm that the words of Scripture perfectly mirror the mind of God, only that they are the words of God and hence teach only truth. We affirm that the words are God's words, and there is no going behind them. The fact that traces of culture or world view are present does not necessarily mean they are taught. In fact, knowledge of them helps us discover what is taught, and Scripture itself provides the contextual clues to help us distinguish what is background from what is binding. And certainly Ramm must know better than to confuse truth with "decimal" accuracy. They are not the same thing at all.

Ramm has failed to show that Barth's claim (that, even though the diastasis between the word and the Word be upheld, the Word of God can still be discerned or discovered in the text by thorough exegesis) is at all workable, much less meaningful. All exegesis can hope to do, by definition, is to determine what the text says. If what the text says is what God says, we have the traditional orthodox view of inspiration. If there is a gap between the text and the Word, it cannot be bridged by exegesis or any other means short of divination. Hence, despite Ramm's and Barth's denials, Barth's view logically leads to a total subjectivism with regard to the Word of God.

The diastasis, even if accepted, would not even really remove the onerous necessity of

saying an emphatic "No" to destructive, rationalistic criticism. Ramm discusses Barth's view of Scripture as a witnessing text, not a source for reconstruction (pp. 109-110). The historian has a right to reconstruct, and his work is valid history, but it is not a "witnessing text" to the Word of God. This emphasis is laudable in itself, but we should see that it only works if Scripture is in fact inerrant. If disagreements in Scripture do not affect its character as witness, this means that theology is independent of what really happened. Only Barth's (and Ramm's) orthodox predilections keep this house of methodologically subjective cards from falling around their heads.

In summary, the Barthian paradigm Ramm offers cannot deliver what it promises, and it exacts a heavy price. It must therefore be rejected as a bad bargain. Ramm's book is a somewhat better bargain than his paradigm: It does contain a useful discussion of Barth's contributions, and its argument is worth wrestling with. It may also be useful as an indication of a direction that may seem attractive to many young evangelicals who have grown impatient with the exacting labor required by the task of harmonization. It is the judgment of the present reviewer that what may seem to them an easy way out they will discover to be the broad path that leads to destruction. But if we must reject Ramm's proposal, let us be careful not to dismiss too lightly his concern and his challenge: to do a better job of systematically interacting with modern knowledge and affirming the authority of Scripture in that context.

Donald T. Williams

The First Evangelical Free Church, Marietta, GA

*Tradition and Testament: Essays in Honor of Charles Lee Feinberg.* Edited by John S. Feinberg and Paul D. Feinberg. Chicago: Moody, 1981, xxiv + 325 pp.

John and Paul Feinberg have sought to honor their father, Charles Feinberg, through this *Festschrift*. Each contributor has been acquainted with Charles Feinberg in a specific capacity—student, teaching or preaching colleague, friend—and their articles treat various issues in OT studies. *Festschriften* are common, but this collection is unusual in that it is a tribute from children to their father.

The *Festschrift* begins with several personal reflections concerning Feinberg's contribution to evangelical scholarship. Samuel Sutherland offers "A Tribute to Charles Lee Feinberg"; John Walvoord describes the "Years at Dallas Theological Seminary"; and Daniel Fuchs describes his appreciation of Feinberg in a short article entitled "With All Thy Mind." This initial section ends with a "Biographical Sketch" of Feinberg. Through these brief notes we glimpse Feinberg's versatility and special gifts, which have allowed him to be involved effectively in many different ministries.

The first four articles are described as "Hermeneutical and Theological." Bruce Waltke suggests "A Canonical Process Approach to the Psalms." He attempts to supply an interpretative framework for the messianic significance attributed to certain Psalms by NT authors. What is needed, in his opinion, is a "progressive perception of meaning," which culminates in the NT revelation of Jesus Christ. Walter Kaiser also pursues the hermeneutical relationship between the OT and NT in "The Abolition of the Old Order and Establishment of the New: Psalm 40:6-8 and Hebrews 10:5-10." He argues that the hermeneutic used by the author of Hebrews in the interpretation of Psalm 40 did not violate the intent of the author of that Psalm. "Salvation in the Old Testament," by John Feinberg, supports the thesis that there is only one means of salvation for all men—faith in God—no matter what dispensation they live in. The way in which faith is displayed, however, does vary. His basic purpose in this discussion is to show that a dispensational hermeneutic does not necessarily imply that different dispensations have different means of salvation. Ronald Allen discusses "The Theology of the Balaam Oracles." In his opinion the basic theme of the Balaam narrative is to be seen in "the development of Yahweh's blessing" for Israel. God in his sovereignty uses the wickedness of Balak and Balaam to communicate his blessing to Israel.

The second group of articles are detailed exegetical expositions. The "Song of Deborah" by Richard Patterson is a verse-by-verse discussion of the Hebrew text of this poem, exploring the many textual problems that it presents but generally accepting the Masoretic tradition. He concludes with an analysis of the poem and a discussion of its significance. Donald Glenn offers "An Exegetical and Theological Exposition of Psalm 139." He does a good job of demonstrating the unity of this Psalm and suggests that the theme is the expression of personal loyalty to God. Paul Feinberg concludes this section with "An Exegetical and Theological Study of Daniel 9:24-27." After reviewing and describing four interpretations of this prophetic passage, he concludes that the eschatological interpretation (as he defines it) that postulates the seventieth week as the reign of Antichrist is the only viable interpretation.

Part three includes textual and linguistic essays. Gleason Archer gives us "A Reassessment of the Value of the Septuagint of I Samuel for Textual Emendation, in the Light of the Qumran Fragments." Archer debates Cross' suggestion that the LXX used a Hebrew text very similar to 4QSam<sup>a</sup> as its text in translation. Archer indicates that the differences between the LXX and 4QSam<sup>a</sup> are almost as varied and significant as the differences between the LXX and MT. He concludes that this general unreliability of the LXX in I Samuel as a witness to the non-Masoretic tradition suggests that it should not be used to correct the MT where the LXX does not have corroborative evidence. This result then becomes a principle of OT textual criticism, that "it is best to adhere to the MT reading wherever it makes good sense in the context, even though a deviant Septuagintal reading might also seem plausible." Archer does not comment on the possible relationship between 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and the MT, nor concerning what the LXX may tell us about this. Thomas Finley contributes a discussion on "The Waw-Consecutive with 'Imperfect' in Biblical Hebrew: Theoretical Studies and Its Use in Amos." He summarizes recent research in the interpretation of the Hebrew verbal system, particularly as it relates to the meaning of the *wayyiqṭōl* form. Illustrations of his conclusions are taken from an analysis of some materials from Amos.

The final section contains two articles under the rubric "Integrative." Charles Feinberg himself reviews the current debate concerning the role of archaeology in Biblical studies in "The Value of Archeological Studies for Biblical Research." W. A. Criswell urges pastors to make greater use of the OT in their preaching ministry in his essay "Preaching from the Old Testament."

The indices are fairly full and describe Scripture, subject and name references. Transcriptional errors are present, but they are infrequent. The articles all have something to offer, although few break new ground. Perhaps their greatest value is in the review of recent literature that they provide in their respective areas.

Larry Perkins

Northwest Baptist Theological College and Seminary

*Exodus*. By W. H. Gispen. Translated by E. van der Maas. Bible Student's Commentary (BSC). Grand Rapids: Zondervan; St. Catharines, Ont.: Paideia, 1982, 335 pp.

It is with some sense of trepidation that one undertakes to read for review a work whose dust cover carries testimonials from leading evangelical scholars proclaiming its series to be "the finest commentary of its kind," "an invaluable tool," and "for all times." It might after all be a bit severe to disagree with such praise, considering the sources. The book is a translation of the 1951 edition (1st ed.: 1932-39) of the *Exodus* commentary in the *Korte Verklaring der Heilige Schrift* series, the standard Dutch evangelical exegetical commentary of the 1930s and 1940s. Zondervan began in 1981 to make this available in English under the title *Bible Student's Commentary*.

Gispen in this volume is conservative, devout (even homiletical at times), and usually thorough. Some 28 pages of introduction deal with title, authorship (Mosaic core, shaped by

a later author or redactor), content analysis, the plagues, date of the exodus (early), and historicity of Moses. He divides the book into two sections (1:1-15:21: the miraculous departure from Egypt; 15:22-40:38: the making of the covenant). He occasionally refers to extra-Biblical literature (often very helpfully), but his hermeneutical base is "the text as it stands" (e.g. p. 17). For Gispén, Christology and typology are important: "Exodus has a theo-Christocentric character, i.e., both God and Christ stand at its center." It "proclaims Christ as the Suffering One in the life of Moses" as well as in the Passover Lamb, and Satan in the life of Pharaoh (p. 4). He regularly notes typological analogies, but he sets forth a significant caveat on the tabernacle (p. 251). Gispén usually sees miracles as ones of timing, duration, or intensity of natural events (e.g. at 10:3-6; 10:21-23), but he sees some as completely unexplainable acts of God (e.g. at 7:11; 7:19) or even of Satan (at 7:12).

Gispén is aware of the standard critical questions of the book and deals creditably with them, although his answers rarely offer more than can be found in the similar (though shorter) commentaries by Cole (in the Tyndale series) or Youngblood (new in Moody's Everyman series). An occasional idiosyncrasy creeps in, as in his assignment of 20:22-26; 23:13-33 to the "words," and 21:1-23:12 to the "laws," of 24:3. However the "words" and "laws" of 24:3 are to be interpreted, it is surely not this way. Gispén's thoroughness shows much careful labor: Every page is chock-full of cross references. They are so numerous, however, that they often become irritating distractions. Furthermore, the references are frequently irrelevant to the discussion at hand, containing trivial occurrences of identical or similar words or phrases that add nothing. Many times, six or eight references will each cite the other, but only one or two will have any significant information. (I might note that this is not typical of the BSC as a whole, however.)

In sum, this commentary is a good, devout, workmanlike exegesis that will profit minister and layperson alike. However, I do not care to echo the enthusiasm evidenced on the dust cover, at least for this volume in the series. To "position" the work, I would rate it more thorough exegetically than Cole's or Youngblood's, but certainly no more perceptive in most cases than either (especially Cole's).

A word about Zondervan's edition. The English style is quite good, and one scarcely realizes one is reading a translation. The *NIV* is the Biblical version used (it is helpfully printed in full in the book), and the text is tailored to it and the *KJV* where necessary. (At 2:1, however, line 7 on p. 39 would be clearer if "the beginning of" were omitted, since the *NIV* fuses the two Hebrew phrases. Also here [line 9] Gispén himself mistakenly placed the several-years' gap between vv 1a and 1b rather than between vv 1 and 2.) A serious shortcoming here is that individual verses are not numbered, and when Gispén refers to individual verses, as he often does, the reader is forced to consult a Bible separately, thereby largely defeating the purpose of reproducing the Biblical text in the first place. Gispén's full body of footnotes is reproduced, but it is rather unhelpful in this sort of book as they are mostly in German and Dutch. There are occasional notes inserted by the publisher (to Albright, Archer and the like), but they are not noted as being "post-Gispén" and are rather sporadically and inconsistently done. I detected some 17 typographical errors, the following of which should be noted: p. 15, line 38: read "*cultic decalogue*" for "*cultic dialogue*"; p. 117, line 21: read "verses 13, 23, 27" for "verses 133, 27"; p. 205, line 2: read "21:1-23:33" for "21:1-23:3"; p. 280, line 15: read "p. 3" for "p. 000"; p. 291, line 17: read "9:9-10" for "0:9-10." Finally, I would suggest that original dates of publication be included in future volumes and editions of the BSC.

David M. Howard, Jr.

Bethel Theological Seminary, St. Paul, MN

*Exodus.* By Ronald F. Youngblood. Chicago: Moody, 1983, 144 pp., \$4.50 paper.  
*First and Second Samuel.* By J. Carl Laney. Chicago: Moody, 1982, 132 pp., \$4.50 paper.  
*First and Second Chronicles.* By John Sailhamer. Chicago: Moody, 1983, 116 pp., \$4.50 paper.

These three commentaries are among the latest offerings in the Everyman's Bible Commentary series by Moody Press. They are clearly "out of the same mold" in appearance and format, having comparable cover designs, type styles, layouts and editorial intent. Youngblood's commentary is based on the *NIV*, while the other two use the *NASB* as their Biblical text. Each of these commentaries falls in the survey class and would be best utilized by laymen, Sunday-school teachers, and pastors. While they might serve as texts in some undergraduate settings, none is thorough enough to be used as a seminary text or for scholarly study of the Scriptures.

Youngblood is professor of OT and Hebrew at Bethel Seminary West and editor of *JETS*. He begins with his own conviction that Exodus may well be the OT's greatest book, and he may be right. It certainly serves as the road map to our understanding of God's dealings with mankind through his own nature; the law, tabernacle and priesthood; and the covenant. His commentary is arranged topically and is the only one of the three that portrays itself as a manual for use as a Sunday-school text. It is divided into thirteen sections to accommodate such use. Nothing would prevent the other commentaries from being used in that way, but they are not outlined as conveniently.

After his introduction, which includes more ancient Egyptian history than most laymen will want to absorb, Youngblood presents a very clear and lucid commentary on Exodus. The text includes numerous up-to-the-minute archaeological references and lessons of spiritual import. He accepts an early dating and Mosaic authorship of Exodus without sweeping documentary questions under the carpet. All in all, *Exodus* is a fine piece of work, very suitable for its intended audience. Its occasional footnotes and bibliography place it somewhere between the other two works in terms of helps, but it is not in the least inferior in other ways.

In his Introduction (p.7) Laney indicates his intention to survey First and Second Samuel, paying attention to an early history of the monarchy, interpretive problems, geographical references, and theological issues, interspersed with practical application of Biblical principles to twentieth-century life. He achieved his objective admirably. The historical threads are easily followed, and the text is generously laced with maps, charts and footnotes. These features would make his work especially appealing to the uninitiated lay reader whose knowledge of Biblical geography and history is limited. Laney, who is assistant professor of Biblical literature at Western Conservative Baptist Seminary, has made this study clearly applicable to contemporary Christian life. He also incorporates enough theological language to present such readers with a challenge. Finally, his allusions to other sources through the generous use of footnotes and a brief bibliography make this volume somewhat more versatile than the other two commentaries under consideration here.

John Sailhamer is assistant professor of OT at Bethel Theological Seminary in St. Paul, Minnesota. Early on he confronts what he calls the "identity crisis" of the Chronicles, coming to grips with why they were written. He draws the conclusion that "they were a condensed version of the rest of the Old Testament historical books" (p. 8). In his opinion the writers of Chronicles had the twofold purpose of providing readers "another view of the history of Israel and further explanations of the events already recorded in Genesis through 1 and 2 Kings" (p. 9).

Pages 7-20 of Sailhamer's work are devoted to a careful and helpful introduction of the Chronicles. The reader is provided with an explanation of the purpose of these books, their secondary and primary themes, problems of dating and authorship, and a summary and detailed outline of the contents of both books.

Occasional sermon ideas come to the mind of the reader as he progresses through what is a rather simple straightforward running commentary of the text. The spiritual lessons to be learned from the joys and failures of Israel's kings are highlighted as Sailhamer unfolds the historical narration of Israel from Saul to Solomon and of Judah, the southern kingdom, under the descendants of David. Being straight narration, Sailhamer's work suffers from the lack of some of the beneficial attributes in Laney's work. It has no footnotes, no maps or charts to heighten one's understanding of either the places or the people seen in this vast summary of Israelite history, and no bibliography to assist the reader in searching out further information on the text. It serves a useful devotional purpose in its present format, but it might be more useful to some readers (e.g. Sunday-school teachers) if it contained a few more helps.

Robert D. Pitts

Taylor University, Upland, IN

*Encyclopedia of Bible Difficulties.* By Gleason L. Archer. Foreword by Kenneth S. Kantzer. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1982, 476 pp., \$16.95.

Given recent developments within evangelical circles, this is no doubt a timely work. Its dust jacket states that it "is intended for everyone, from scholars and students to laymen—for all who are troubled by apparent contradictions in the Bible." Such breadth in purpose is laudable, but it results in a work that is not altogether satisfactory for either laymen or scholars. Though Archer intended to "present the material in the average layman's language" (p.12), in some places he has probably overestimated the average layman. I am reminded here of Robert McAfee Brown's "average intelligent layman" who says, "Everybody writes books for me . . . I blush to say I can't understand the books" (*The Collect'd Writings of St. Hereticus* [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1964] 31).

After Kantzer's foreword the preliminaries include a brief preface, acknowledgments, instructions on using the book, and recommended procedures for dealing with Bible problems. Next there is a lengthy introduction asserting the importance of Biblical inerrancy (pp.19-44). The body of the book begins with a general section defending the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, followed by specific sections of different books of the OT. The length of the articles varies, as might be expected. To Genesis, 53 pages are devoted; but the rest of the OT books are given much less space, with Lamentations, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah and Haggai being omitted entirely. The treatment of the NT begins with brief general sections on the OT in the NT and on the synoptic gospels. Then, similar to the OT, 46 pages are devoted to Matthew, but much less space is given to the rest of the NT books. Mark, Luke and John are given only 15 pages combined, and Romans through Revelation takes only 50 pages. Seven books are omitted entirely (2 Corinthians, Philippians, 1 Thessalonians, Philemon, James, 2 John, 3 John). The book concludes with a brief bibliography and indices of persons, subjects and Scripture references.

Archer's credentials to write such a book are impressive. He is certainly well read in the relevant literature. The general appeal and style of the book should secure for it a large audience, and it should be quite helpful to serious students of Scripture. I was impressed by Archer's desire to defend inerrancy and by his assertions that inerrantists need not fear the facts, properly interpreted. His careful use of the harmonistic method, so often decried today, is appreciated, as is his brief apologetic for its use (p. 315). The section on the early date of the exodus is a helpful synthesis (pp. 191-198), as is the critique of the recent self-love fad among psychologists (pp. 335-337). The book will indeed prove to be helpful to a wide audience. Other positive comments could be made, but perhaps it will be more profitable to dwell instead on some constructive criticisms.

First, is this book really an encyclopedia? Not really. No one man, no matter how well he is qualified, can produce a truly encyclopedic work in four years (p. 11). The treatment of difficulties is quite uneven: OT critical difficulties are treated in much more detail than



NT critical difficulties. There are many common difficulties, especially in the NT, that are not even mentioned. Archer's statement that "I candidly believe I have been confronted with just about all the biblical difficulties under discussion in theological circles today" (p.11) may be true, but he has certainly not included many common problems in this work. Archer appears to be overconfident here, as he is in other places where his solutions are not as convincing as his use of such adverbs as "clearly" (p. 98) and "undoubtedly" (pp. 75; 412) would indicate. Additionally the organization of the book is rather hard to follow at times. Some topics are handled under unexpected texts (e.g. see pp. 70; 246). The indices help to eliminate this problem, but a topical arrangement would have been superior to the present textual one. Finally, the double-column format with very narrow margins in the body of the book is harder to follow than the single-column format of the introductory sections.

Second, there are places where the exegesis is somewhat simplistic. Just how clear is it that Abel was "well instructed about substitutionary atonement" (p. 76)? If the reasons for Archer's view of the sons of God in Gen 6:2 are "quite compelling" (p. 79), why is there still so much disagreement on the passage? Here and in other places alternate points of view are not really fairly presented. Another example of this is Archer's curt dismissal of the view that Jephthah's vow eventuated in the actual sacrifice of his daughter (p. 164). Later in dealing with the textual difficulties of Matt 8:28 and parallels (Gadara, Gerasa or Gergesa?), Archer concludes that Gadara "has the strongest claim to being the authentic, original spelling of the name in all three gospels" (p.325). This view may be a viable option, but a glance at a critical apparatus will show that Gadara does not have "much stronger manuscript evidence" in all three synoptics on anybody's theory of textual criticism. Archer's handling of the troublesome reference to Christ's coming in Matt 16:28 is also suspect. He spends only one short paragraph on the contextually more probable transfiguration view (pp. 326-327). How this passage could refer to the day of Pentecost (Archer's favored view) is still unclear to me.

A final example is Archer's harmonization of the two accounts of Judas' death in Matt 27:5; Acts 1:18 (p. 344). His hypothesis is possible, but at least two aspects of it are speculative. The text says nothing about a branch, let alone a dead one, or about a wind that caused the branch to break. I am not criticizing the speculations as such, for these are often necessary. The problem is the fact that speculations are put forth without being identified as speculations. Thus the resulting solution carries an unwarranted degree of certainty and dogmatism. This may be how it happened, but other equally possible solutions would fit the data just as well.

Third, theological problems are not always handled with the care and expertise one would expect. It is doubtful whether the trinitarian nature of God should be illustrated by the supposed trinitarian nature of man, based on a hasty reading of 1 Thess 5:23 (p. 359). Further, it is surprising to see Ps 33:6 used as a proof-text for the Trinity (p. 359). The verse seems to contain a simple synonymous parallelism, but Archer dubiously understands the "word of Yahweh" as Christ and "breath of his mouth" as the Holy Spirit. On another front there seems to be inconsistency in the explanation of various aspects of the sovereignty of God. On the one hand, Archer explains both infant salvation (pp. 389-390) and judicial hardening (pp. 391-392) on the basis of foreseen human response. Yet, as the discussion continues, the sovereignty of God in election seems to be grounded on God's gracious initiative, not man's faith response (pp. 393-395).

The treatment of Christological problems also leaves something to be desired. I cringed to read the unqualified statement that Jesus "had the Holy Spirit as his father" (p. 92; cf. p. 393). Similarly, Archer's discussion of the peccability/impeccability issue (pp. 418-419) is disappointing. The overly subtle distinction between physical ability (Christ could have sinned because he was human) and psychological inability (Christ could not have sinned because he "was completely in love with His heavenly Father") is inadequate. It does not consider the facts that Jesus, while perfectly human, never ceased to be God, and that God

cannot be tempted to sin (Jas 1:13; John 14:30). On the very serious current issue of abortion, Archer's position seems weak. I agree with his exegesis of Exod 21:22-25 (pp. 247-248), but I do not understand how this exegesis is compatible with a view that allows for abortion when a mother's life is in danger or when prenatal tests indicate that a "freak" (Archer's word, p. 248) will be born. No doubt these are extremely complex issues, but Archer's approach is untenable. On the one hand he believes that the Bible clearly implies that "the taking of the life of a human fetus is to be classed as homicide" (p. 248). Yet on the other hand there are times when abortion (= homicide) is permissible.

A final theological note involves Archer's strong opposition to a recent creation view of Genesis 1. It appears that in this discussion (pp. 58-65) the overall purpose of the book (defending the Bible against the charges of liberal "critics") is forgotten. Instead the emphasis is on Archer's disagreements with conservatives who hold to literal days in Genesis 1. Theistic evolution (p. 58), pre-Adamic hominids (p. 64), and the gap theory (pp. 65-66) are viable options, but a literal-day view of Genesis 1 seems "to border on sheer irrationality" (p. 60). Thus it appears that Archer is open-minded toward any generally conservative view of Genesis 1 except the literal-day view. His basis for such reasoning is quite disappointing, however. No advocate of literal days asserts that the purpose of Genesis 1 is to tell how fast God created the universe (p. 61). A literal view of the days of Genesis 1 hardly commits one to believe that Christ meant that a camel could literally go through the eye of a needle (Matt 19:24; p. 59). Why must Adam's experiences of Gen 2:15-22 be limited to the last hour or two of day six (p. 60)? Who is to say that Adam could not have named all the created kinds of beasts and birds in one literal day (p. 59)? Adam's pre-fall intelligence may have been greater than ours is today. Also the created kinds may not have been so numerous as the species that have developed within each kind since creation.

In summary, Archer's discussion is one-sided. The literal-day view is not given a fair chance to stand on its own arguments (only one of which is really mentioned [p. 62]). Archer's view requires him to translate the *wāw* consecutive of Gen 1:16 as a *wāw* disjunctive: "Now God had made the two great luminaries (on the first day)." This results in the verse being interpreted to mean that on the fourth day God "parted the cloud cover enough for direct sunlight to fall on the earth" (p. 61). I agree with Archer that "we must not short-circuit our responsibility of careful exegesis" (p. 59), but I wonder if this is careful exegesis. It appears that Archer too readily equates the "factual data" of science with "modern scientific theory" (p. 58). Genesis 1 is not only a "sublime manifesto, totally rejecting all the cosmogonies of the pagan cultures of the ancient world" (p. 60). It also totally rejects the pagan cosmogonies of the modern world. Noel Weeks was correct when he said that "we have forgotten that the church has always been under pressure to allegorize Genesis so that it may conform with Plotinus or Aristotle or some other human philosophy" ("The Hermeneutical Problem of Genesis 1-11," *Themelios* 4 [1978] 19).

In conclusion, it ought to be restated that the above constructive criticisms are aimed to make a good book better. The inerrancy of Scripture is a valid deduction from its general statements about itself. This does not mean, however, that all the difficulties attending the specific phenomena of Scripture can be easily resolved. Archer has been successful in many cases, but the weaknesses of the book point up at least two realities for inerrantists: First, the encyclopedic task of this book is too great for any one man; Archer needs help, especially in NT and theology. Second, the limited nature of our knowledge prohibits easy solutions to many problems; sometimes we should not be quite so confident in our conjectures. There are times when we must hold the data in suspension, awaiting further information. It is unwise to hastily deny historicity or to confidently posit unconvincing conjectures.

I noted typographical errors on pp. 12 ("acquainted" should be "unacquainted"), 346 ("ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΕΣ"), 397 ("matthew"), 404 ("simplifies") and 418 ("repellant").

David L. Turner

Grace Theological Seminary, Winona Lake, IN

*Ugarit and the Old Testament*. By Peter C. Craigie. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983, 110 pp., \$5.95 paper.

Dean of the faculty of humanities at the University of Calgary in Alberta, Canada, Craigie is known for his balanced studies in Ugaritology. He has provided for the student of the Bible and of ancient Near Eastern studies a valuable tool by writing this slim volume on the ancient city of Ugarit. It is a comprehensive introduction to the field of Ugaritology and affords an insight into the early days of discovery usually not found in secondary literature.

He begins with a chapter entitled "New Light on the Biblical World," arguing for the necessity of "building up a store of knowledge in order to equip ourselves better to understand the words that we read" in the OT. "The Discovery of a Lost City" offers some detailed knowledge of the early days within an historical framework. The astonishingly fast process of decipherment is included in this chapter. The socio-politico-economic picture of Ugarit, focusing on her golden age, is drawn in the third chapter (figure 11 lacks the "t" on the name "Ugarit"). In "Ugaritic Language and Literature" Craigie presents for the layman a well-balanced account of the alphabetic cuneiform language, its main features (various types of parallelism), and a brief but accurate summary of the three main literary texts: the legend of Keret, the epic of Aqhat, and the Baal cycle. When Craigie deals with the controversial issue of the impact of Ugaritic studies on the OT in chap. 5 he presents a fair assessment with his usual caution, selecting important contributions that have clearly assisted in a better understanding of the OT. The best example of his scholarly approach is his treatment on "cooking a kid in milk" (Deut 14:21). Valuable are his discussions in chaps. 6 and 7 about the new discoveries at Ebla and Ras Ibn Hani and his "Guide for Further Study and Reading."

Apparently to keep the cost of production down, this book lacks photographs of the location and of the artifacts (the best picture being on the front cover: the famous Baal stele). The reader must turn to the relevant sections in *ANEP* to satisfy his curiosity. He receives some help from the maps and figures, but the maps are rather bare. In fact there is no map that places Ugarit within the ancient context of the Indus valley, Greece or Mesopotamia. It can be argued that fig. 14 is not the best example of a clay tablet "indicating difficulties in reading (from surface abrasions)". In actual fact, the tablet looks almost perfect. Surely a much better example could have been reproduced from the thousands of damaged tablets that show not only mild abrasions but severe ones plus lacunae from broken parts and burns (in an overheating oven?). None of the reproduced tablets gives an indication of the fact that the literary tablets contain about 40 lines per column and are about as large as the page size of this book. Consequently the naked eye finds it most difficult to read these tiny wedges (were the tablets produced only for persons under 30 years of age with perfect eyesight?). Since decipherment started with the inscription on an axe handle (p. 16), it would have been more appropriate to show an axe head with an inscription beginning with the letter "l" rather than with the letter "h" (cf. figure 4). And although the author provides the reader with references to Bible passages, he never indicates a Ugaritic text reference that would be most welcome especially for chap. 5, so that the reader may compare Scripture with the Ugaritic evidence to form his own opinion.

The total absence of polemics, the fluent and pleasant style, the pertinent data and selective bibliography make this book a very useful study tool. *Ugarit and the Old Testament* should become mandatory reading for all students of the Bible.

Harold H. P. Dressler

Northwest Baptist Theological College and Seminary, Vancouver, BC

*The Bible and Archaeology.* By J. A. Thompson. Foreword by F. F. Bruce. Third edition, fully revised. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982, 438 pp. incl. appendices, \$17.95.

J. A. Thompson has held the positions of director of the Australian Institute of Archaeology in Melbourne, lecturer in the School of Middle Eastern Studies at the University, and lecturer in OT in the Baptist Theological College of New South Wales. Also he engaged in field work with ASOR at Roman Jericho and at Dibon in Transjordan. All this background gives him a solid base for writing *The Bible and Archaeology*.

The author's goal includes integrating the results of archaeological research and field work with the literary and historical background and the text of the Bible. The book presents rather technical archaeological concepts in a style that laymen can understand, and yet where necessary the author uses the technical terms found in the technical field reports, such as "ashlars," "casemate walls," "ossuaries," etc. In other words the book can be helpful to the college teacher and student as well as to the layman.

The author divides his work into four sections: Introduction; Archaeology and the Old Testament Story up to 587 B.C.; Archaeology and the Pre-Christian Centuries; and Archaeology and the New Testament. The work is rather evenly divided between the OT, intertestamental and NT periods. The book ends up with a rather brief one-paragraph general conclusion. In his introduction Thompson aptly states that this study of "biblical archaeology" will make us "better able to understand and interpret the textbook of our faith." He feels that such specialized study helps "authenticate the history of the written records which are the basis of our faith" (p. 3). He rightly observes that Biblical archaeology (1) provides a general background of the history of the Bible; (2) helps in the translation and explanation of a number of difficult passages in the Scriptures; (3) helps correct the impression that in many places Biblical history is of "doubtful trustworthiness"; and (4) helps fill in the gaps, since the Bible is not a complete record (pp. 4-5). In a refreshing note Thompson argues that the discoveries of archaeology not only apply to the OT but also greatly benefit our understanding of the NT (p. 8).

In his section on Archaeology and the Old Testament Story up to 587 B.C. the author highlights the times of Abraham, Egypt, the exodus, the conquest, and the kingship under David, Solomon and the divided kingdom, ending with a discussion of the cities of Judah and Israel. The section on Archaeology and the Pre-Christian Centuries focuses on the exile, the Persians, the Diaspora Jews, the Greeks, Qumran, and the time and achievements of Herod the Great. In the final section, Archaeology and the New Testament, the author deals with the history of NT times through A.D. 138 and highlights the archaeological evidence coming from the Roman occupation of Palestine, including a brief overview of Jerusalem and some of the towns of Palestine and Syria. He ends this section with a discussion of archaeology as it relates to Luke the historian, John's gospel, the book of Revelation, and an overview of the papyri and ostraca and their use and significance. In the brief General Conclusion, Thompson states that the evidence from archaeology and the information from non-Biblical historians confirm that the Biblical records are firmly rooted in "general world history" and that with the results of further excavations before us the future is bright for additional light on the Biblical record (p. 438).

The book includes a good many cultural elements (e.g. Mesopotamian customs, p. 32; Canaanite religion, pp. 132-133) and general historical background. Where possible it relates the results of archaeological excavations to the text of the Bible. It is to be noted that in dealing with the earlier periods of OT history the author seems to skirt the issue of miracles as he deals with Egypt and the plagues (p. 66) and the exodus (p. 68). Also he seems to be satisfied with the late date of the exodus (pp. 58-64), although he states that "the real answer to these problems is not yet available" (p. 64).

The author shows a good grasp of the archaeological facts, knows the archaeological sites and excavations and discusses adequately and, at times, in some detail archaeological artifacts that come from tells, tombs, etc. (e.g. pottery, glass, metal, coins, inscriptions, etc.).

Thompson gives helpful summaries of aspects of OT, NT and intertestamental history and relates the results of archaeology to these subjects where possible. For example he has a good summary of the Assyrians and the kings of Israel (chap. 7), of the kings of Judah (chap. 8), of the Greeks, Edomites, Idumeans and Nabateans, of the Ptolemies and the Hasmoneans and the archaeological evidence from that period (chap. 14), of the people of Qumran and their setting (chap. 15), etc.

The author is not afraid to tackle certain historical problems, especially as they relate to the NT. In dealing with Luke the historian (chap. 21) he comes to grips with Luke 2:1-2 (and the question of the census and governorship of Quirinius) and 3:1 (and the identification of Lysanias of Abilene) and relates the archaeological data of the inscriptions to the questions at hand. Likewise Thompson points up certain historical events, features and terms in the book of Acts on which archaeology sheds light (e.g. the great famine of 11:27-30; the proconsul of Paphos of 13:7; the Thessalonian rulers of 17:1-9; the Athenian "unknown god" of 17:23; Gallio mentioned in 18:12-17; the Ephesian asiarchs [officials] of 19:31; etc.). The author also tackles the question of the date of John's gospel, using papyrus, linguistic, geographical and literary evidence (the latter from the gnostic and Qumran materials) to argue for an early date (pp. 411-418).

To his credit, Thompson deals with certain linguistic matters on which archaeology has shed some light. Enlightening is his suggestion that the "linen yarn" in the *KJV* in 1 Kgs 10:28 really refers to the country of Kue (*NIV*; possibly Cilicia), and that the clause should be translated, "Solomon's horses were imported from Egypt and from Kue" (*NIV*; p. 112). He suggests Albright's solution to the understanding of the concept of "gutter" in 2 Sam 5:8: "Whoever gets up with the *hook* and smites the Jebusites" (pp. 104-105). He gives the correction that the translation "groves" (*KJV*) in 1 Kgs 18:19 should be translated "Asherah," showing that there were two heathen gods mentioned in this passage (p. 132). He helps us understand 2 Kgs 23:29 that the Hebrew *'al* should be translated "alongside" rather than "against" (*KJV*) the king of Assyria (p. 156). The author comments on the fact that the papyri of the Roman period, discovered in Egypt, show that the language of the Greek NT is Koine Greek, and that the letter format of Paul, Peter and John corresponds in general to the format of the letters of the papyri (pp. 428-432). He shows that Roman-period papyri and ostraca shed light on the social life of the times (e.g. education, slavery, etc.) and illumine the meaning of certain NT Greek words such as "invite," "Lord," "earnest" (2 Cor 1:22; 5:5; Eph 1:14), "have" (Matt 6:16), "seal" (Rom 15:28), etc. Regarding archaeological inscriptions he comments on the temple inscription warning Gentiles not to enter inside the temple barrier (cf. Acts 21:28) and the inscription referring to the building of a synagogue (pp. 331-332).

On occasion the author brings in interesting side issues, such as regarding the sodomites who were sacred male prostitutes (1 Kgs 15:22; p. 145), and regarding the possibility that the settlement at Qumran used a fortress built by Uzziah king of Judah (p. 146).

Besides discussing tells, pottery and other artifacts, inscriptions, papyri and ostraca, the author talks about tombs (especially those of the Roman times, pp. 334-339), town planning in Israelite times (pp. 162-166), water supply systems (pp. 166-170), Israelite houses and public buildings and architecture (pp. 270-274). Thompson also has quite an interest in ancient coins discovered in Palestinian sites and describes how they help date the sites involved (pp. 228-229; 255-257; 261; 270; 322-331).

At appropriate places the author points out the fact that archaeological interpretation regarding a site or item may change in the process of further excavation and study, as in the case of the Megiddo "stables" (p. 110) or the so-called "copper smelting" installation at Ezion Geber (Tell Kheleifeh; pp. 114-115).

The book has a good bibliography for each chapter, a fairly detailed index, good photographs and illustrations (including several maps), and some helpful charts on the lists of kings, emperors, procurators, a genealogy of Herod the Great's family, and a chronological outline of NT events. There is no glossary of archaeological terms.

Overall the volume is to be recommended. It is comprehensive and yet concise and easy to read. It will be a good reference tool for the teacher, student, pastor and layman.

W. Harold Mare

Covenant Theological Seminary, St. Louis, MO

*The Living and Active Word of God: Essays in Honor of Samuel J. Schultz.* Edited by Morris Inch and Ronald Youngblood. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1983, xiv + 355 pp. \$9.95 paper, \$14.95 cloth.

Sam Schultz taught for more than a generation at Wheaton College and rightly deserves this collection of essays that honor him. Erwin Paul Rudolph opens the volume with an eight-page "Personal Portrait" of the honoree. Then Schultz himself follows with the first essay, "Proposals for New Approaches in Teaching Old Testament Overview." He tells us that he has started his survey courses with Deuteronomy and that that approach has been welcomed by the students.

F. F. Bruce in "The Bible and the Environment" traces through the Bible the theme of the fallen creation and the promise of its restoration. Co-editor Youngblood has the next essay, "The Abrahamic Covenant: Conditional or Unconditional." He argues for the former against Bright and others. Robert Cooley, who worked with another former Wheaton professor (Joseph Free) on the Dothan excavations twenty years ago, brings a kind of overdue report on one phase of that enterprise in his essay, "Gathered to His People: A Study of a Dothan Family Tomb." Merold Westphal's article, "Questions From the Prophets," is a reminder that the prophets were concerned with social justice. The late Barton Payne, a former Wheaton colleague of Schultz, penned "Right Questions About Isaiah 7:14." Having dealt with many questions right and wrong, he concludes with two: "Does Isaiah 7:14 predict Jesus Christ?" "Yes." "Must it have had an immediate accomplishment?" "No." Another Wheaton colleague, Alan Johnson, writes to emphasize an oft-neglected area. His essay is "Jesus and Moses: Rabbinic Backgrounds and Exegetical Concerns in Matthew 5 as Crucial to the Theological Foundations of Christian Ethics." The last essay in the strictly Biblical section is Walter Kaiser's "The Promise of God and the Outpouring of the Holy Spirit: Joel 2:28-32 and Acts 2:16-21." His conclusion is "that the promise of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit in the last days has received a preliminary fulfillment in the series of events at Pentecost, Samaria and Caesarea. But these events and the subsequent baptisms of the Holy Spirit that take place whenever anyone receives Christ as Lord and Savior and is thereby ushered into the family of God are all mere harbingers and samples of that final downpour that will come in that complex of events connected with Christ's second return" (p. 122).

Marvin Wilson reminds us in "Hebrew Thought in the Life of the Church" that we must beware of the pitfalls of Marcionism, individualism, dualism and otherworldliness. Next Stanley Obitts offers "Apostolic Eyewitnesses and Proleptically Historical Revelation." That is followed by Morris Inch, the other co-editor and another Wheaton colleague, and his essay, "Manifestations of the Spirit," which is a study of the 48 episodes in which the Holy Spirit was manifest. "Authority for a Going and Sending Ministry in the Christian Mission of World Evangelism" comes from Robert Duncan Culver. Julius Scott, another Wheaton faculty member, provides one of the more technical articles as he studies Acts 15:20, 29 in his essay, "Textual Variants of the 'Apostolic Decree' and Their Setting in the Early Church." Merrill Tenney, a long-time colleague of the honoree, concludes this section with a study of "The Theism of the Apocalypse."

The third and last segment of the collection, called "How God's Word Abides With Us," is a hodgepodge of various topics. Millard Erickson opens with his "Immanence, Transcendence, and the Doctrine of Scripture." His point is that one's doctrine of Scripture directly corresponds with one's view of revelation and the God who reveals himself. Bong Rin Ro presents an historical study with his essay "The Inspiration of Scripture Among the Seven-

teenth-Century Reformed Theologians." He reads those reformers as stalwart defenders of the infallible Scriptures. Norman Geisler's article "The Concept of Truth in the Contemporary Inerrancy Debate" is essentially the same as appeared in *BSac* (October-December 1980) 327-339. He contends with faculty members at Fuller Seminary against the intentionalist theory and for the correspondence theory of truth. "The Clarity of Scripture" by Robert Sandin argues against the hermeneutics of certain recent German scholars and for the historic Protestant principles of *sola scriptura* and *claritas scripturae*. The article that probably represents the most homework is Jack Lewis' on "Italics in English Bible Translation." Lewis traces the use and abuse of italics in various translations, ancient and modern, noting glaring inconsistencies and more or less concluding that they have done more misleading than clarifying. "The Bible the Foundation for a World and Life View" by Harold Lindsell reads like a sermon on how bad the world is when it does not obey the Bible. This is followed by the somewhat esoteric article by William Dyrness, "Symbolism, Modeling and Theology." "The Bible in an Age of Revolution" by Harold Kuhn cites some of the abuses to which the Bible has been put by various modern groups, political and ecclesiastical. The last essay is Arthur Johnston's "The Use of the Bible in World Evangelization." He says we ought to use it.

At the end of the volume there are 12 pages of general index, 17 pages of Scripture index, and a 7-page author index.

Robert L. Alden

Denver Seminary

*The Expositor's Bible Commentary*. Volume 12. Edited by Frank E. Gaebelein. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1981, xvi + 603 pp.

This projected twelve-volume series, written by seventy-eight evangelical contributors from various denominations in seven countries, is a major attempt to produce the best possible evangelical expository commentary set in this generation. As Gaebelein states, its twofold purpose is "to provide preachers, teachers, and students of the Bible with a new and comprehensive commentary on the books of the Old and New Testaments" and to serve as "a new (evangelical) reference work for understanding the Scriptures" (p. vii). Based on the *NIV*, five of the twelve volumes have now been published.

Those who associate the scholarship of Leon Morris with a careful attention to the text and a concern for determining the precise meaning of words will not, on the whole, be disappointed with his commentary on Hebrews. He understands the epistle as a homiletic letter addressed to a small restricted circle of Jewish Christians living in Rome who were hesitant about decisively cutting themselves off from Judaism. He dates it between A.D. 66 and 70. His commentary is clear, concise and helpful. He makes ample use of the OT, the NT and intertestamental literature, and his discussions are direct and informative.

Several weaknesses detract from Morris' contribution. Though he says that "the first twelve chapters of Hebrews form a closely knit argument" (p. 145), neither his outline nor his discussion reflect this. Therefore the reader fails to get a sense of the progression of thought as the overall argument builds to its various conclusions. Second, he does not attempt to integrate his belief that the letter was written to Jewish Christians who were hesitant about decisively cutting themselves off from Judaism with the body of the commentary. Showing how the argument of this homiletic letter was designed to address this problem would have made its teaching come to life more and have shown the reader how to apply this portion of God's Word better. Third, his treatment of the famous apostasy passage, Heb 6:4-8 (pp. 54-56), fails to come to grips with one common and widespread idea of apostasy usually based on this passage: the belief that salvation can truly be lost.

Donald Burdick has done an admirable job on James. He believes the epistle was written by James, the Lord's brother, between A.D. 45 and 50 to Jewish Christians who were perhaps among those forced to leave Jerusalem during the persecution that followed Ste-

phen's death. Accordingly he believes that James wrote this epistle as a pastor *in absentia* to exhort and instruct these Jewish Christians (who had known him in Jerusalem but who were now dispersed) regarding the problems they were facing, perhaps including persecution. Helpfully he informs us of the relation between James and the sermon on the mount on the one hand and Proverbs and other wisdom literature on the other. And he rightly describes James as the least theological book in the NT except Philemon, though he does note James' interest in the doctrines of God, sin and eschatology.

Burdick offers a good, thorough and helpful discussion of most topics. Consistently he pays careful attention to the precise meaning of words in a way that benefits the interpretation and application of the passage. His applications are sound. And repeatedly his theological insights are clear, convincing and well-founded.

The only strong reservation I have about the commentary is the fact that Burdick has an outline with twelve major headings, only two of which have sub-headings. Is James really this unstructured?

Ed Blum argues for an apostolic authorship of 1 Peter by Simon Peter and defends this traditional position against the rather common theory that the epistle is pseudonymous. Blum believes that 1 Peter was written from Rome to Christians in northern Asia Minor shortly before Nero's great persecution. Therefore he dates it between A.D. 62 and 64. Peter addressed Christians facing common problems, the most serious of which was living for God in the midst of a pagan society and facing persecution for being different. So Peter's pastoral purpose was to help those Christians "see their temporary sufferings in the full light of the coming eternal glory" (p. 213). The introductory section to the commentary also addresses the questions of literary form and theological values.

The outline is well done, and the bibliography contains a wide selection of material. Blum is sensitive to the connections in and structure of Peter's argument. His treatments of passages whose interpretation is strongly disputed are clear, concise and usually convincing.

Stylistically, the presentation of his analysis of the meaning of words often tends to intrude on the commentary rather than complement it. This makes his remarks seem fragmented rather than unified, as if one were jumping from word to word with little sense of the whole unit of thought.

Blum notes that the authorship of 2 Peter is the most disputed in the NT. After listing 11 arguments against Petrine authorship he counters with 16 arguments in favor of it. He dates the letter between A.D. 64 and 68 and suggests that it may have been written from Rome. If 2 Pet 3:1 is a reference to 1 Peter, then the destination of 2 Peter is the same as that of 1 Peter; but if not, then its destination is uncertain. The letter was occasioned by the fact that its recipients were facing many dangers and were prone to wander from the faith. Blum concludes his introductory remarks with a brief but helpful discussion of the literary relationship of 2 Peter and Jude. The strengths and weaknesses of Blum's work on 2 Peter are understandably quite similar to those reflected in his commentary on 1 Peter.

According to Blum, Jude, the half brother of Christ and full brother of James the Lord's brother, wrote this epistle between A.D. 60 and 65, possibly from Egypt or Palestine, to an unknown destination (possibly Asia Minor, Syrian Antioch or Palestine) for the purpose of denouncing the errorists who imitated the apostles but promoted a different gospel. In speaking of these errorists Blum uses phrases such as "libertine Gnosticism" and "Gnostic faith," thereby identifying them as gnostics.

But to speak so glibly of a "Gnostic faith" (suggesting a body of doctrine) or of "libertine Gnosticism" (suggesting a development within gnosticism) existing around A.D. 60 may be to make an inference unsupported by the facts. Gnosticism apparently is a second-century development with first-century roots (cf. *Le Origini Dello Gnosticismo. Colloquio di Messina* [ed. U. Bianchi; Leiden: Brill, 1967]; E. Yamauchi, "Gnostics and History," *JETS* 14 [1971] 29-40). Therefore it is anachronistic to attribute too organized a form to its first-century manifestations.



Blum never addresses the questions of whether Jude believed that (1) Michael disputed with the devil over Moses' body (v 9, with the *Assumption of Moses* as the probable source) or (2) Enoch actually prophesied (v. 14, a reference to *1 Enoch* 60:8). Did Jude use commonly known stories for theological and pastoral purposes without endorsing their historicity? Such a question raises important issues for evangelicals in the areas of hermeneutics and the doctrine of Scripture.

According to Glenn Barker, the Johannine epistles were written by the apostle John, probably from Ephesus, around A.D. 85 to 90 to combat a heresy that arose indigenously within the Church as former leaders apostasized, became false prophets, taught error and sought to win a following from within the ranks of the Church they had left. Having reinterpreted Christianity in terms of their eclectic paganistic categories and world-views, the errorists' pseudo-Christian teaching differed from true Christian doctrine at no fewer than 11 points, according to Barker.

The commentary on these three epistles is solid and very helpful. Barker consistently shows how his understanding of the opponents is reflected in the text and how John speaks to the erroneous views they propagated. He pays careful attention to the relationship between and among ideas such as love, obedience, righteousness, light, and so forth. And he clearly defines these distinctively Johannine categories. Furthermore, readers will find much valuable application.

Alan Johnson describes Revelation as "a book of prophecy (1:3; 22:7, 18-19) that involves both warning and consolation—announcements of future judgment and blessing. For communicating its message, the Lord uses symbol and vision" (p. 399). Thus the Apocalypse is different in doctrine, literary genre and subject matter from the rest of the NT. Though it contains many apocalyptic elements, Johnson rightly draws attention to the significant way in which Revelation differs from extra-Biblical apocalyptic writings.

According to Johnson, the primary occasion for writing must be sought elsewhere than in the persecution at the time of its writing, because Revelation's major thrust is theological, not socio-political. John, he argues, was "more concerned with countering heresy that was creeping into the churches toward the close of the first century than in addressing the political situation" (p. 400). John's purposes were to separate true from false belief and "to encourage authentic Christian discipleship by explaining Christian suffering and martyrdom in the light of how Jesus' death brought victory over evil" (p. 407).

Johnson argues for the literary and conceptual unity of the letter and, after careful analysis, allows for authorship by John the apostle but concludes that John's identity is uncertain. He suggests a date between A.D. 81 and 96 but warns us that the evidence is so slender that the question must be left open.

Following a brief analysis of the theological problems of the Apocalypse, Johnson summarizes the four main schemes for interpreting Revelation 4-22: futurist, historicist, preterist and idealist. Johnson ends up adopting a mixture of the preterist-futurist and idealist views. He says that the language of Revelation "describes the deeper realities of the conflict of Christ's sovereignty with satanic power rather than the more temporary historical-political entities, whether past (such as Rome) or future . . . . On the other hand, it also reveals the final judgment upon evil and the consummation of God's kingdom in time and eternity" (pp. 410-411).

Johnson has written a thorough, clear, concise, informative, well-balanced and fair commentary. His bibliographical material, found not only in the bibliography but also heavily scattered throughout the work, is very comprehensive, up-to-date and helpful. Throughout the commentary Johnson consistently provides illuminating background information for the various factual, conceptual and symbolic features of the text. His arguments are always carefully presented, balanced and fair to views he does not share. His conclusions, especially on difficult questions, are always judiciously reached and modestly held. He consistently provides a careful analysis of major interpretative options and traditions on controversial passages, lists the strengths and weaknesses of each and then cautiously argues for a particular position.

Such lavish praise notwithstanding, there is, in my opinion, one very serious hermeneutical flaw that pervades his exegesis from 6:1 onward. As do the idealist interpreters, Johnson refuses to identify references to the temple, holy city, two periods of three and a half years, the two witnesses, the beast/antichrist, Babylon and so forth, exclusively with particular events, places, times and persons in history. Rather he sees all such references as archetypal, transcultural, transhistorical symbols that refer to various places, persons and events throughout history but that do not refer exclusively to any particular place, person or event in history. He attempts to justify his idealist line of interpretation by appealing to evidence in the Apocalypse, as when he says on 11:8 ("the great city") that "John's use of the word 'city,' from the very first occurrence in 3:12, is symbolic . . . . A city may be a metaphor for the total life of a community of people" (p. 506). But it is not at all clear that "city" is symbolic in 3:12 or in 11:2; 16:19; 17:18; 18:10, 16, 18-19, 21—or in 21:2, 10 and 22:19, for that matter.

Apparently Johnson fears that an exclusively futurist interpretation of these types of references robs them of any current value or significance. Thus he seems to have equated meaning that refers to the future with significance or application that refers to the future. It is as if the statement "This volcano will erupt in one year" (whose meaning refers to a future event) has no significance or application in the present for those who live at its base. A dichotomy has been created where none need exist. Cannot a futurist maintain that though the events and personalities of 4:1-22:21 are future, they nevertheless (1) function to encourage suffering Christians by assuring them of Christ's coming triumph in history and of their vindication, (2) reveal more accurately the nature of the present conflict between Satan, Christ and his followers, and thus (3) explain more clearly the present suffering of the Church? A futurist can and should maintain a present application for 4:1-22:21.

Volume 12 is designed for preachers, teachers, and students of the Bible who are expositors. This is a very wide and diverse audience. It is difficult to imagine being able to write a work that would be as helpful to a serious lay home Bible study leader as it would be to a seminary professor, or vice versa. My impression is that the editors of this series have aimed somewhere between these extremes, perhaps closer to the former. If this is correct, they have come very near to the mark. For nonspecialists, or for pastors or teachers in a hurry, this volume commends itself as a good, solid, clear and helpful exposition of the general epistles.

Regrettably, however, this volume contains no indices of any kind. This severely limits the accessibility of some of its material. And the bibliographies at the beginning of each commentary do not include the articles cited in the notes of that commentary. Thus there is no complete bibliographical listing for each commentary.

John J. Hughes

Whitefish, MT

*Modern Hebrew for Biblical Scholars: An Annotated Chrestomathy with an Outline Grammar and a Glossary.* By T. Muraoka. Sheffield: JSOT, 1982, 211 pp., \$24.00 cloth, \$14.50 paper.

The number of articles written in modern Hebrew relevant to Biblical studies has increased to the point that, like French and German, it is becoming an important tool for Biblical scholarship. This book seeks to bring to the scholar with a good knowledge of Biblical Hebrew the ability to read scholarly modern Hebrew. Most who have never attempted unpointed post-Biblical Hebrew will find the going rather tough. The author's method of going directly to difficult articles and then progressively removing the pointing and annotations is a lot like jumping out of airplanes with progressively smaller parachutes. There is not sufficient repetition of either vocabulary or syntax to drill them into the student's mind, so the learning process is more painful and less productive than it could be. On the other hand, for those who have a basic acquaintance with modern Hebrew vocabulary and syntax the book forms an excellent bridge to the scholarly literature.

J. M. Sprinkle

Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, OH 45220

*Christ the Lord: Studies in Christology Presented to Donald Guthrie*. Edited by Harold H. Rowden. Leicester, England/Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1982, xvi + 340 pp., £8.95.

There are few Bible students who have not profitably consulted Guthrie's classic *New Testament Introduction*, and I am sure that this tradition will continue for years to come in the light of his monumental contribution, *New Testament Theology* (1981), which contains considerable valuable coverage of Christology and of earlier discussion thereon. In an especially fitting tribute to him on his retirement from thirty years of service in his home institution, London Bible College, eight of his colleagues there together with other scholars and friends have joined forces to offer him this timely collection of studies, all concerned with some aspect of current Christological discussion.

I. H. Marshall, "Incarnational Christology in the New Testament" (1-16), asks: How far is there a doctrine of incarnation in the NT itself? His reply is that in addition to the personal Word of God adopting a fleshly existence according to John's gospel there is confirmation of the very same concept of incarnation with respect to the Son of God in the Johannine epistles, even though readers of the latter had never seen the earthly Jesus. In Pauline passages like Gal 4:4; Rom 8:3; Phil 2:6-11 (taken as primarily Pauline rather than an early hymn) Marshall again detects definite incarnational language to the effect that for Paul, who was an incarnationist, the Son of God existed before his earthly manifestation through his birth as a man and was, in that preexistence, the personal agent of God in creation. Marshall's handling of the evidence is compelling, but it is surprising not to see reference to G. Stanton's equally sturdy evangelical defense of the relevant passages in M. Goulder, *Incarnation and Myth: The Debate Continued* (1979). Marshall also finds substantial evidence of incarnational thinking in other NT epistles. Concerning the gospels and Acts, a post-resurrection position does not automatically imply Christological creation on the part of the evangelists. Both Matthew and Luke understand Jesus as Son of God due to his Spirit conception in Mary. In his overall survey of the NT data, which shows that the writers thought of the Son of God who became incarnate as a pre-existent being and that the origin of this doctrine is probably to be found in the filial consciousness of Jesus himself, Marshall expectedly engages in a running debate with the positions on various passages (or possibly with the "reinterpretations") in J. Dunn's *Christology in the Making: An Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation* (1980), which takes John 1:14 as the only NT statement of incarnation. It will be helpful therefore for those considering Marshall's exegesis and rebuttal of points in Dunn to do so in light of his earlier substantial review of that work (cf. *Trinity Journal* 2 [1981] 241-245).

In a slight updating of his important article in *Vox Evangelica* 12 (1981) 19-32, "The Worship of Jesus: A Neglected Factor in Christological Debate?" (here 17-36), R. T. France demonstrates first the tenuous nature of "parallels" to NT Christological language that may be cited in other literature from Judaism/Hellenism and, second, the likelihood that it was the experience-centered devotion of Jesus that led to the deliberate estimates of him in passages like Heb 1:1-4; Col 1:15-20; Phil 2:6-11; John 1:1-18.

R. P. Martin presents an up-to-date assessment of early hymns within Christological development in "Some Reflections on New Testament Hymns" (37-49). He advances the idea that the topical content found in these fresh Christian creations was motivated by the threat to Paul's teaching posed by the incipient gnostic atmosphere within his Gentile churches. Christ's preexistence and pretemporal activity in creation were composed for early inspired and worshipful hymnody in direct response to the denial of Christ as the sole intermediary figure within the gnostic angelic hierarchy.

F. F. Bruce, "The Background to the Son of Man Sayings" (50-70), reaches six sensible conclusions from intertestamental backgrounds and gospel contexts concerning the Son-of-Man phrase and its uses by Jesus. Bruce's essay sets the NT student on a steady course as to what is most probable and helps sweep away much of the confusion in the complex field of "Son-of-Man" discussion. D. A. Carson, "Christological Ambiguities in the Gospel of

Matthew" (97-114), explores that evangelist's use of the titles Son of Man, Son of God, Lord, Son of David and Christ. Carson argues that in Matthew's case it cannot be assumed that he is simply anachronistic in his use of these titles. Although most scholars take Matthew's use of *kyrios* in the disciples' address of Jesus to have post-resurrection connotations (cf. G. Stanton, "The Origin and Purpose of Matthew's Gospel: Matthean Scholarship from 1945 to 1980," *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt II* 25/3 [ed. W. Haase; Berlin, 1983]), Carson finds this evangelist to occupy a more careful and faithful reportorial position with respect to the pre-resurrection time frame. While all the titles obviously took on new significance after the resurrection and exaltation and were fully understood in Matthew's day, the evangelist respected this difference in understanding when portraying their historical use even though he might have had some Christological preference of his own for a particular title. It would be interesting to see how Carson's approach is worked out with respect to Luke, who uses *kyrios* in his narrative portions, not only in the vocative on the lips of his characters.

D. Wenham, "'This Generation Will Not Pass. . .': A Study of Jesus' Future Expectation in Mark 13" (127-150), presents a detailed thesis supporting his contention that Mark 13:30 refers not to the parousia but to the fall of Jerusalem, which is expected within a generation by Jesus. The fall indicated that the Lord was at hand, but the period of desolation and tribulation until the parousia is of undefined length and is in fact being experienced now.

M. Turner continues his current series of significant studies in the pneumatology of Luke-Acts (cf. his earlier pieces in *TB* 32 [1981] 3-42; *Vox Evangelica* 12 [1981] 45-63; *Trinity Journal* 2 [1981] 131-158). Here in "The Spirit of Christ and Christology" (168-190) he develops further his understanding of the gift of the Spirit in the life of Christians. He concentrates on the dynamic Christological implications of Jesus' own reception of the Spirit at his exaltation. Acts 2:33, in depicting a Messiah who both gives and directs the activity of the Spirit, does indeed enter into a completely new and unparalleled messianic category within Judaism. Turner rightly asks whether Jesus could be less than God if he is Lord of the Spirit and suggests that Christians would have been drawn to a divine Christology by their experience and understanding of the Spirit as mediator of the activity and presence of Jesus. A worshipful attitude toward him would thereby have been engendered.

On the theological side H. McDonald, "The Kerygmatic Christology of Rudolf Bultmann" (311-325), effectively pinpoints the two main features of Bultmann's theological system and the two main features of his Christology. He succeeds in a brief space in placing Bultmann with the historical stream of theological thought, providing a useful critical picture for students. His conclusion seems equally fair: "By his deliberate refusal to grant to Jesus Christ the appellation *God* in its fullest and authentic meaning, Bultmann presents us with a Christology which is anti-trinitarian, unbiblical and non-historical. It is hard, therefore, to resist the verdict of Käsemann . . . that Bultmann's theology is 'no longer Christian' " (325).

Other related studies delightfully complement and closely cohere with those contributions discussed above: R. Rowe, "Is Daniel's 'Son of Man' Messianic?" (71-96); G. Wenham, "Christ's Healing Ministry and His Attitude to the Law" (115-126); G. Grogan, "The Light and the Stone: A Christological Study in Luke and Isaiah" (151-167); J. Balchin, "Paul, Wisdom and Christ" (204-219); L. Allen, "Psalm 45:7-8 (6-7) in Old and New Testament Settings" (220-242); D. Carnegie, "Worthy is the Lamb: The Hymns in Revelation" (243-256); A. Lane, "Christology Beyond Chalcedon" (257-281); F. Cotterell, "The Christology of Islam" (282-298); K. Runia, "Karl Barth's Christology" (299-310); and R. Sturch, "Can One Say 'Jesus is God'?" (326-340).

Readers will appreciate that the editor has included a select bibliography of the honoree's work. The contributors have continued in the authentic Guthrie tradition and, accordingly, their efforts will be of value to those who would base their thinking and final conclusions rather more on NT materials than on hitherto unconfirmed theories. This *Festschrift*

represents a positive evangelical contribution to Christology and is a worthy tribute to one of the most productive and widely respected scholars of our time.

Paul Elbert

University of London, King's College

*The Jehovah's Witnesses' New Testament. A Critical Analysis of the New World Translation of the Christian Greek Scriptures.* By Robert H. Countess. Presbyterian and Reformed, 1982, 136 pp., \$5.95.

With an active membership of over 2.3 million (about 25% in the United States), the Jehovah's Witnesses and their *New World Translation (NWT)* of the Bible (completed in 1960) are widely known. Using the 1951 edition of the NT portion of the *NWT*, Countess investigates the translators' claims that it is an honest, reasonable, consistent, modern, unbiased and scholarly translation that seeks to avoid the "snare of religious traditionalism" and to restore the ipsissima verba of the original autographs. His book, a 1966 doctoral dissertation, examines the claims of the *NWT* without interacting substantively with the related secondary literature. Countess determines whether the *NWT* is unbiased by analyzing the translator's principles of textual criticism, their practice of inserting "Jehovah" when the Greek has *theos* or *kyrios*, their view of the deity of Christ and the Holy Spirit, and their antitraditionalism.

The anonymous *NWT* Committee used the Westcott and Hort Greek Text (1881) as the basis of their English translation and were guided by the principles of noninterpolation (refusal to add to the Greek text), correspondence (translation of a given Greek word uniformly by the same English word), and weighing rather than counting MS evidence. It should be noticed that the textual principles of Westcott and Hort are not totally followed today in the standard *UBSGNT*, particularly with the latter's use of the longer neutral text readings where Westcott and Hort followed the shorter Western text (Western noninterpolations). Countess clearly shows that the *NWT* translators fail to weigh the MSS in their use of P. Fouad 266 (containing primarily the second half of Deuteronomy) and Aquila's Jewish version of the LXX—which contain the tetragrammaton—as a basis for the wholesale interpolation of "Jehovah" in the NT where the Greek NT MS tradition has *theos* and *kyrios*. Since no NT Greek MSS support their insertions, their religious dogmatism is the sole basis for their action. Their cry of heretical textual changes to explain the current Greek textual tradition also has no evidential base. They are searching for "missing manuscript links" even more unproductively than the resurgent majority-text movement in conservative circles.

Countess correctly points out their arbitrary translation of the anarthrous *theos* in John 1:1 as "a god" as well as their deceptive quotation of reputable grammarians (Dana and Mantey) to support their thesis. He follows the research of E. C. Colwell ("A Definite Rule for the Use of the Article in the Greek NT," *JBL* 52 [1933] 12-21) to explain the syntax of John 1:1. Colwell claimed that a definite predicate noun has the article when it follows the verb, and it does not have the article when it precedes the verb. Hence the anarthrous *theos* is definite and not qualitative. This counters the claim of the *NWT* Translation Committee that the qualitative sense of *theos* allows for their translation "a god." However, Colwell's general tendency (word order) may not explain Johannine theology. The context is a surer guide to meaning than is the use of an article. Many (including B. F. Westcott, R. Brown, C. K. Barrett, R. Schnackenburg) claim that the anarthrous *theos* is a description of the nature of the Word while *ho theos* is to be equated with God the Father (cf. P. B. Harner, "Qualitative Anarthrous Predicate Nouns; Mk. 15:39 and Jn. 1:1," *JBL* 92 [1973] 75-87). Equating *ho theos* with the Word would mean that no divine being existed outside the second person of the Trinity. In Johannine theology the eternal Logos (in 1:1), who has the fullness of divine being (*ên* in 1:1), took on the lowliness of human existence (1:14) and will reexperience the glory of the Father (17:5; cf. the Christ-hymn in Phil 2:6-11). Although the

*NWT* translators may be correct in recognizing the qualitative use of *theos*, they are unjustified in making it lead to their indefinite translation. As Countess points out, the *NWT* translators are quite inconsistent in translating the anarthrous *theos*. Of 282 occurrences of the expression only 16 are translated "a god." It would appear that we learn more of their prejudice than truth with their translation of John 1:1.

A subsequent edition of Countess' book would be enhanced by updating the materials that have been published on the Witnesses and the *NWT* since 1966 and noting *NWT* revisions, listing the currently known names of the *NWT* translators, mentioning that the illustration in the *NWT* taken from Justus Lipsius' *De Cruce Liber Primus* and used to support the contention that the cross was a stake without a crossbeam was only one illustration in Lipsius' book—most of the others show crosses with crossbeams, one of which was favored by Lipsius himself—and, finally, documenting that in the use of the "J" publications (Hebrew translations of the NT) in support of the insertion of "Jehovah" in the *NWT* the translators neglected to footnote places where these versions have "Jehovah" in texts referring to Christ.

Overall, Countess' book is a helpful and scholarly contribution that clearly demonstrates that the Jehovah's Witnesses' cultic tradition leads to biased Bible translation. The lofty claims made for the *NWT* are without substance. Dogmatism is the reason they insert "Jehovah," reject the deity of Christ and the personality of the Holy Spirit, obscure the Biblical doctrines of everlasting punishment of the wicked and the unconditional immortality of man, and promote other doctrinal aberrations.

Ronald Russell, Edmond Gruss

Los Angeles Baptist College, Newhall, CA

*Sermons on the Ten Commandments.* By John Calvin. Translated and edited by Benjamin W. Farley. Chicago: Moody, 1980, 326 pp., \$12.95.

Not since A. Golding's translation (London: Bishop, 1583) have we had a fresh scholarly rendering in English of Calvin's exegetical sermons on the moral law. Farley has selected from the 200 Deuteronomy sermons the 16 sermons on the Decalogue that were preached in Geneva on weekdays during the summer of 1555. A 1557 Genevan printing of these sermons on Deut 4:44-6:4 carried the following observation by the editor, G. Badius: "Among the excellent gifts with which God has enriched his Church in all times, one of the most useful and necessary is that of Prophecy. It exists for the purpose of clearly understanding and purely expounding to God's people the holy Scripture according to its true and natural sense (*vray et naturel sens*) and of understanding how to apply it properly to one's own time and in accordance with those with whom one has to do." Aside from a different view of NT prophecy the present reviewer from a distant position finds it difficult to quarrel with Badius' assessment.

Farley has given us an excellent introduction (pp. 13-30) to the socio-political, economic and religious backgrounds that underlie the occasion of the sermons, while the theological foundation had been developed in earlier editions of the *Institutes*. One of the strengths of Farley's edition is that he continually keeps the reader in contact with the commentaries and the *Institutes*, often with pertinent quotations therefrom, so that the unity of Calvin's thought life is more clearly before us. In the sermon on Deut 5:22, which may be the highlight of the collection, Calvin asks, "Do we think that God has forgotten the law since giving it and no longer knows what would benefit us?" (p. 243). Noting in this sermon that we can count on our ten fingers this instruction required in our life, he attempts to motivate hearers to reflect both upon the law and the character of God—e.g., "For therein he also wills to test our obedience toward him. For when he speaks he wants to know whether we will love him, whether we will receive what he says without contradicting it, whether we will find it good and ourselves in accord with it, saying 'amen' not simply with our lips but with our heart,

peaceably serving him the remainder of our lives . . . Moreover, when we want to elevate ourselves, and are tempted by self-conceit and pride, may the ardent fire, which in those days frightened the people, and that dense cloud, which came before their eyes when they beheld the smoking mountain, may all that be held by us with terror in order that all our pride might be destroyed. Indeed, may we vigorously awaken and offer ourselves to God to the end that he might rule us and lead us where he wills, we following wherever he calls us" (p. 246). This is vintage Calvin, and each sermon, of about 40 minutes in length and unpunctuated by frivolity, finds in various portions of the Ten Commandments much sober spiritual instruction for those willing to listen.

Farley assists us further by referring in his notes to words and phrases in the original French (cf. his textual method, pp. 30-33) and by providing helpful indices of subjects and Scriptures. He also includes Calvin's closing prayers at the end of each sermon (from Golding) and has assembled a bibliography relevant to the sermon material, which will be useful to students. Contemporary homiletics will be grateful for these 16 carefully edited pieces of Calvin's expository art, which abound with usable points of illustration for preachers today. A foreword by the late Ford Lewis Battles complements the volume.

Paul Elbert

University of London, King's College

*Beyond Biblical Criticism: Encountering Jesus in Scripture.* By Arthur Wainwright. Atlanta: John Knox, 1982, 154 pp.

For those who have been criticized for refusing to relinquish their faith when embarking on a scholarly study of the Bible the motivating theme of this work is a comforting affirmation of their decision: "It is not sufficient for [the Bible] to be treated as a collection of historical source-material or an anthology of works of literature. It needs to be studied as Scripture" (p. 4).

While not disparaging a critical study of the Bible ("it is a worthy enterprise, not to be despised," p. 3), the author challenges the accusation that "the study of the Bible in the light of faith is an inferior activity to academic research" (p. 4). The cause of ignorance and neglect of the Bible, says Wainwright, is not a refusal to study it academically but more often a failure to study it from the viewpoint of faith. One who can say of the Bible, "This is my Scripture," is not being naively obscurantist but rather dares "to descend into the arena, where men and women live by belief in the divine revelation to which the Bible bears witness" (p. 4).

When Wainwright descends into the arena he brandishes a method of interpretation which, he hopes, "is distinctively and unmistakably Christian" (p. 5): the criterion of the Biblical Jesus. The author discerns in the NT documents a basic agreement in their witness to Jesus. Collectively they affirm his unique relationship to God, his work as a revealer, savior, teacher and example, and his identity with the risen and coming Christ. This criterion yields other guidelines for interpreting a Biblical passage—i.e., by helping the reader "discover" Jesus, God, oneself and others through presence, similarity, contrast, etc. But Wainwright's hermeneutic turns on the contention that the Bible is to be judged by the criterion of the Biblical Jesus.

This will be the proverbial rub for evangelicals. For according to Wainwright "the biblical Jesus, not the whole Bible, is the authority for Christians" (p. 62). The reasoning appears circular insofar as the only Biblical Jesus by which one could judge the Bible would be a subjective reconstruction drawn from the very source it is supposed to judge. This is an especially tenuous venture since by its own testimony all Scripture is God-breathed (2 Tim 3:16).

Evangelicals are not naive about the problems of the relation of the testaments (pp. 57 ff.), culturally conditioned admonitions (pp. 50 ff.) or apocalyptic exhortations (pp. 53 ff.).

The answer to these problems, however, is not to forego the present canon in favor of a shorter, sleeker, newer model (pp. 62 ff.). The ongoing challenge is to perfect hermeneutical principles by which to interpret the whole Bible. Wainwright's criterion leaves something to be desired.

We must stress that it is the hermeneutical principle itself and not the author's use of it that we disfavor. Wainwright often draws conclusions that are thoroughly orthodox. Biblical doctrines often spurned are here avidly defended, including the parousia (p. 121), the incarnation (p. 122), and the resurrection (pp. 105 ff.). There is a searing criticism of that "smorgasbord theology" that accepts and rejects doctrines on the basis of personal tastes. Notwithstanding these welcome affirmations, Wainwright's method in less orthodox hands would yield quite unacceptable results.

It is with these reservations, therefore, that we recommend the book. It reminds Biblical scholars that their work is vacuous unless infused with faith. It reminds evangelicals that we are not the only ones in the arena. To this extent it attempts to bridge a chasm, and bridges are always to be preferred to chasms.

Robert W. Herron, Jr.

Southern Bible College, Houston, TX 77078

*Parables and Presence.* By Robert W. Funk. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982, 206 pp., \$15.95.

"Theology seems to have gone a-whoring after the scientific fleshpots of Egypt. It has wandered so far afield that it has forgotten the wellspring of its infancy. The antidote must be potent enough to restore sight to the blind and hearing to the deaf. Perhaps modern poetry is sufficiently strong medicine to enable the queen to shake off her torpor" (p. 111). Essays with opening paragraphs like these reveal no ordinary work on parables here. In fact less than half of this volume is on parables. Rather, Robert Funk, classicist, Biblical scholar and literary critic, has edited an anthology of nine of his previously published articles and two new ones, on three fairly discrete topics: parables and the kingdom, apostolic presence in epistolary genre, and the problems of oral and written language and God's word.

*Parables and Presence* begins with one of the new essays, "Language as Perception, Problem, Promise." In the current interdisciplinary controversy over the relationship of language, thought and action, Funk opts unabashedly for the absolute priority of language and proceeds to illustrate how the language of the tradition both clarifies and obscures the original meaning of Jesus and his words. Next follow five chapters on the narrative parables and "the temporal horizon of the kingdom." The first of these is the weakest in the book by far. Funk concludes from the stylistic phenomena (most notably assonance) of one parable (the laborers in the vineyard) that all of the narrative parables were composed in Greek. The second of these, on the other hand, is the strongest, as Funk demonstrates that the parable of the good Samaritan functions as a *bona fide* metaphor and not an example-story.

In the third article Funk focuses on parables with three main characters, classifying them according to various surface and deep structures and analyzing comic and tragic plot lines. This chapter requires careful sifting through graphs, charts and symbols, but it provides important preparation for valid exegesis (although I disagree entirely with his analysis of the parable of the wicked tenants; surely it belongs in the same group as the parable of the great supper with its almost identical plot and relationships between characters). Unfortunately Funk falls prey to the invariable temptation of structuralism to question the authenticity of those parables that diverge from the common pattern of the majority.

Fourth, the parable of the prodigal son is interpreted through the lenses of the good Samaritan: The prodigal and not the father becomes the unifying character, despite the surface structure of Luke 15:25-32 where the prodigal never reappears. The first major section draws to a close with a rejection of both realized and consistent eschatology to describe Jesus' expectations. Instead Funk favors "an ecstatic mythical intensity that dissolves and



transcends the common temporal categories" (p. 78), an exciting alternative but one that cries out for definition and expansion. Or is this to ask for the impossible, *à la* Jorge Luis Borges in the title of his essay on "A New Refutation of Time"?

Two chapters comprise this book's middle section on apostolic authority in Paul and 2 and 3 John. These epistle writers clearly viewed their words as poor substitutes for their presence. Great structural detail is unearthed, especially in Paul, to prepare the way for this conclusion, which is seemingly obvious enough without all the charts. But again there is a hidden agenda as Funk slips in two historical conclusions among the literary ones. First, Galatians must be dated later or Paul would have backed up his letter with the inevitable hint of a future visit of himself or of an emissary. Second, the unusual repetition of the sections on apostolic parousia in Rom 1:8 ff.; 15:14-33 suggest that Paul may have considered 1:1-15:13 as a general letter to be particularized with different closing remarks for different churches.

Finally, Funk includes three chapters on language and tradition entitled "Myth and the Literal Non-literal," "On Dandelions: The Problem of Language" and "The New Testament as Tradition and Canon," the last of which is his other completely new article. To adapt to the modern, scientific world view he adopts Bultmann's program of demythologizing, but Funk prefers the route of the poet rather than the philosopher, following Jesus' own precedent. Developing Northrop Frye's analysis of the decline in modes of literary fiction from the ancient myth through romance, high and low mimesis, to modern-day irony, Funk posits the next step as a move from tragic to comic irony, which is precisely the mode of the majority of Jesus' parables. Paradoxically "the parable as metaphorical but non-mythical . . . pronounces a demythologized word from God" (p. 130). In the closing chapter Funk explores criteria for canonization, the problems of plurality and particularity, the secondary role of inspiration in determining norms, and the priority of the oral over the written word, even to the extent of proclaiming that it is "preposterous that the biblical text should be confused with word from God" (p. 158).

*Parables and Presence* merits careful study if for no other reason than to bask in the brilliance of a master craftsman of the English language (the sentence fragment on p. 164 stands as a solitary exception). Two weaknesses are inherent in any anthology of this type: needless overlap (cf. e.g. the paragraphs repeated almost verbatim on pp. 50 and 62) and lack of interaction with more recent literature (how Funk can continue to endorse so uncritically the dissimilarity criterion—see chap. 6—and to use it so eccentrically—e.g. in rejecting the authenticity of some of Schmiedel's "pillar" passages—defies comprehension). Nevertheless this collection ought to be read by those not familiar with Funk's previous work. For others, however, the biggest disappointment of this volume is simply that it is not an entirely new work—the type of major study of parables (or other NT literature) that many of Funk's colleagues await from him.

Craig L. Blomberg

Palm Beach Atlantic College, West Palm Beach, FL

*The Teaching of the Parables.* By Peter Rhea Jones. Nashville: Broadman, 1982, 263 pp., \$12.95.

Evangelicals have only recently joined in the onslaught of modern study on the parables of Jesus. Having begun, however, they have contributed substantially, as the works of K. E. Bailey, S. Kistemaker and R. H. Stein all testify. Now Peter Rhea Jones, senior minister of First Baptist Church in Decatur, Georgia, and previously associate professor of NT at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, adds yet another high-quality piece on the parables.

Jones begins his study with three chapters of introduction, surveying recent parable scholarship, discussing the nature of a parable, and analyzing special literary considerations. Jones identifies the contributions of the new hermeneutic, new literary criticism,

structuralism, comparative midrash, and redaction criticism to the foundations laid by Jülicher and Jeremias. He suggests that parables be analyzed according to a triangular model, probing in turn literary, historical and hermeneutical aspects. He rightly rejects the overdrawn dichotomy between parable and allegory, he accepts the authenticity of the parables, including generalizing conclusions and interpretations (most notably that of the parable of the sower), and he adopts inaugurated eschatology as the best understanding of Jesus' view of the kingdom.

The rest of the work groups separate chapters on eleven parables under four main topical headings: (a) the sure coming of the kingdom, (b) the crisis of the coming kingdom, (c) the grace and repentance of the kingdom, and (d) the character of discipleship in the kingdom. Under (a) appear the parables of the sower and soils, mustard seed, and seed growing on its own; under (b) the fig tree, rich fool, and six brothers (rich man and Lazarus); under (c) the lost sheep/lost coin/compassionate father and angry brother, and the Pharisee and tax collector; and under (d) the unmerciful servant, compassionate Samaritan, and persistent widow (all titles his).

Few exegetical insights break new ground, but Jones has thoroughly reviewed the secondary literature and gathers together important illuminations from many sources. The parable of the sower and soils, for example, may provide a model of election: God moves toward all persons, sowing "with cheerful abandon," while reception depends on man's decision. The parable of the compassionate Samaritan teaches that one's neighbor is in the first instance neither the Samaritan nor the needy person but one's enemy. And the meaning of "Lazarus" (God helps) in the parable of the six brothers safeguards against a naive equation of poverty with piety.

More innovative is Jones's addition of a section of application and pastoral reflection at the end of each chapter. Without compromising the integrity of the parables in their original settings, he moves on to the contemporary horizon with penetrating illustrations. Alfred Nobel avoided learning the lesson of the rich fool the hard way; a premature obituary notice caused him to rethink the significance of his discovery of dynamite and to institute the peace prize for which he is now more famous. The seed growing on its own while the farmer sleeps warns against the modern obsession (especially in America) with speed and feverish activity. The persistent widow offers encouragement "to hang in there" to the eleven of twelve married women in this country who can expect to experience the helplessness of widowhood.

The book retains only minor weaknesses. While citing many older foreign scholars, Jones neglects the recent works of A. Weiser (1971), G. Schneider (1975), H. Weder (1978) and H.-J. Klauck (1978), all of which directly affect many of the literary-critical issues that he emphasizes. Jones acknowledges Bailey's two works (1976; 1980) but does not interact with his discoveries of chiastic outlines for the parables, which often alter key exegetical stances. Occasional inconsistencies also perplex the reader. Why is the text of the parable of the Pharisee and tax collector included (p. 190) when no other texts are reproduced in full? Why is Gospel of Thomas saying 8 (the parable of the dragnet) listed with Thomas' unparalleled parables? And why must an otherwise felicitous style of writing be interrupted by the anachronistic phrase, "Luke brazenly utilized terms of systematic theology" (p. 81), the irrelevant parenthesis on Theodore of Mopsuestia, "affectionately known as 'Teddy the Mop'" (p. 119), or the repeated references to "sloppy *agape*" (pp. 122, 212)? Finally, typographical errors include "Wartbury" (p. 141 n. 17), "Lindsay" (p. 184 n. 3), "women" (p. 192), "peity" (p. 204 n. 9), "Helevy" (p. 240 n. 68), "election" (p. 248), and the three variant incomplete forms of J. Duncan M. Derrett's name (p. 25 n. 34; p. 184 n. 5; p. 235 n. 8).

Nevertheless, the concluding impression from Jones' work remains overwhelmingly positive. Jones has achieved an important exegetical balance between Calvinist and Arminian extremes: Both divine sovereignty and man's responsibility to decide for God are juxtaposed in a creative tension. Moreover, to the extent that Southern Baptist circles unfortunately remain fairly separate from other evangelical movements, this book will meet impor-

tant needs for those who will never read Bailey, Kistemaker or Stein. Most important of all, Jones has provided a rare blend of rigorous critical scholarship and fresh pastoral insights. This feature alone justifies the publication of yet another book on the parables, and it may be warmly recommended to a wide audience.

Craig L. Blomberg

Palm Beach Atlantic College, West Palm Beach, FL

*Reconciliation: A Study of Paul's Theology.* By Ralph P. Martin. Atlanta: John Knox, 1980, 262 pp., n.p. paper.

It is quite often the case in NT studies that the writing of a book will lead an author to the concurrent or subsequent production of several articles detailing his/her thesis in shorter form or drawing out some of the implications of the argument. It is perhaps less frequent, however, that the writing of an article leads one to the production of a monograph that seeks simply to reiterate more fully and completely the premises, evidences and conclusions of a prior, shorter piece. Nonetheless this is very much the intent behind Martin's most recent work, which takes up, in essence and substance, positions first set forward in two articles in *ExpTim* 91 (1979-80).

There, as here, Martin attempts to locate an idea or term capable of uniting in its scope the diverse expressions of NT theology, a theme able to "provide a synthetic formulation of the Christian message that will be true to as much of the New Testament data as a human construction can frame" (p. 1). There is a danger here, of course—the danger of constructing a forced and artificial unity from our modern canonical perspective rather than discerning a unity recognized and utilized within the NT itself. But it is a danger of which Martin seems aware.

For reasons more plainly stated in his earlier articles, Martin begins his search with an investigation of Pauline theology and, after a brief but helpful section sketching out the present state of Pauline studies, surveying previous attempts to delineate the center of Pauline theology, and summarizing Paul's analysis of the plight of humanity, we are presented with the thesis of this work. Martin finds the *centrum Paulinum* in Paul's use of the term "reconciliation," for it is this term, and only this term, that to Martin's mind functions in Paul's writings in such a way as to encompass all of the major dimensions of Pauline thought in regard to the redemption of men and women.

Thus we are launched in part two into an exegesis of texts in Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, and Colossians that focus on the theme of reconciliation. These texts are not numerous but, as our author points out, this need not deter us from the conclusion that the importance of reconciliation in Paul's thought is quite out of proportion to the use of the term. In each case Martin's exegesis leads him toward the conclusion that Paul has taken up the term "reconciliation" in response to a use of the word by his converts, who saw in it a means of expressing the notion that Christ had bridged the cosmological gap between the regions of heaven and earth (cf. p. 120). For Paul, however, this idea in its purest form is inadequate and misleading because it downplays the personal dimensions of Christ's redemptive work. Therefore in each instance Martin contends that the text reflects Paul's taking up and reworking of pre-Pauline traditions so that thus reconstructed by way of explanatory additions these reconciliation texts become repositories in the fullest sense of Paul's proclamation of the gospel in a Gentile milieu.

But the argument is not concluded even here, for in two further chapters an attempt is made to demonstrate how the "trajectory of reconciliation" proceeds out from Paul to his later followers in Ephesians (a document that, in Martin's estimation, presents us with a view of the post-Pauline era), and how it can equally well be traced in the other direction back to an origin in the life and teachings of Jesus.

This is a book distinguished, as this brief summary has perhaps shown, both by the breadth and the originality of its conception. In many places Martin's study is illuminating

and rewarding to the reader who spends the time and the effort required to follow the exegesis, as indeed it can only be followed, with Biblical text in hand. His work will certainly serve to bring prominence to the theme of reconciliation in Paul's thought, but I am not in the end convinced that it will serve as he hopes to prove that this is the theme around which all others revolve.

For one thing, I am not sure that Martin's study does not lead us in practice to define the term "reconciliation" so broadly as to lose much of its meaning and distinctiveness, particularly in relation to the concept of justification. I am not persuaded, for instance, that Martin has reckoned adequately with the observation that in Rom 5:1-11 Paul's thought moves out from justification to reconciliation. Does not this indicate that justification, at least here, is the broader term and reconciliation its more specific and well-defined appositive? For this reader, therefore, Martin's study does not quite manage to escape from the criticism that he seeks to deflect at the beginning of his work—namely, that "it is inadequate to use one single expression to comprehend satisfactorily all the teachings of the New Testament in its multiplex expression" (p. 79). Perhaps not only inadequate but also inappropriate, for this is not in fact the way in which the NT sets about doing the work of communicating its insights to its readers.

Another point of contention will, I suspect, concern Martin's readiness to read so many of the elements of "the gnostic religion" (as it is called on p. 22) into the pre-Pauline tradition. More detailed studies of gnosticism are revealing that its emergence and influence lie beyond the NT age. Furthermore, careful exegesis is also beginning to demonstrate that suspected traces of gnostic influence in the Pauline churches, found for example in talk about the "rulers of this age" in 1 Corinthians 2, are equally well, if not more accurately, read against the historical background of Judaism, Paul's concept of the two "aeons," and the New Testament kerygma (cf. Acts 3:17; 4:26). Nonetheless, these criticisms fail to diminish significantly the value of an important exegetical work, a work worthy of the careful consideration its author seeks for it.

James A. Davis

*Josephus: The Jewish War.* By Gaalya Cornfeld, general editor, with Benjamin Mazar and Paul L. Maier, consulting editors. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1982, 526 pp., n.p.

Josephus is consistently a fascinating historian. Nowhere is this more true than in his *Jewish War* (seven volumes, translated in Rome from Aramaic to Greek ca. A.D. 75-79), which intrigues the mind and captures the imagination. And nowhere can the events he chronicled be better savored than in this new translation. This volume, a lavish and elaborate labor of scholarly love, offers readers interested in the *Jewish War* a truly scrumptious feast.

Visually the work is stunning. It contains almost as many pictures (522) as pages (526)—thirty-two of which are in full color. Additionally Cornfeld has provided forty-two maps and seventy-eight illustrations. But the *pièce de résistance*—what makes the work so intellectually satisfying—is the running commentary that occupies 50% to 75% as much space as the translation. Josephus brings the events of the great debacle of the Jewish revolt to life, and this new translation and commentary together animate Josephus.

The easy-to-read translation is a simplified but not simplistic one. The commentary, helpfully cross-referenced to the text, clarifies obscure and difficult words and passages and explains many historical, geographical and cultural points. Each page is formatted in double columns: The commentary (in smaller type) appears on the outside half and the translation on the inside half. Boldface summaries appear as headings above each major paragraph.

References to relevant primary and secondary Qumran material are judiciously used in appropriate passages of the commentary. Not surprisingly, Josephus' account of the Essenes is remarkably accurate. But Josephus is not without his historiographical faults. One

of his fundamental theses—"that a minority of extremists, the Zealots, overcame the moderate party in Judea and drove the country into rebellion" (p. 7)—overstates the case. The sympathetic majority, perhaps reluctantly, nevertheless followed the leadership of this minority group. Nor does Josephus give much weight to the importance of contemporary messianic movements that preceded and accompanied the Jewish War. But, generally speaking, when his own personal attitude and behavior are not involved Josephus is "a source of undeniable integrity" (p. 7).

One of the interesting and helpful features of the commentary is that it seeks "to delineate the responsibility that history has allotted to the parties in a situation in which the underlying essence of the Roman-Jewish conflict was between minds incapable of any mutual understanding; for this conflict was between the Jewish ideal of a Jewish state subordinate to the national religion and to the nostalgic messianic dream of the House of David on the one hand, and the cosmopolitanism of imperial Rome, in which religion itself was subordinate to the state, on the other."

In addition to a table of contents, this work contains a thirteen-page general index referenced both to the original paragraph numbers of the seven volumes of the *Jewish War* and to the pages of Cornfeld's book. The editors have also included a two-page index of passages in the OT, NT and intertestamental literature that are referred to in the text and commentary. Finally, the volume concludes with a bibliography of authors quoted in the commentary.

John J. Hughes

Whitefish, MT 59937

*Jewish and Christian Self-Definition I: The Shaping of Christianity in the Second and Third Centuries.* Edited by E. P. Sanders. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980, 314 pp., \$15.95.

Since the work of W. Bauer and the contributions of J. Dunn and others, the working assumption of NT scholars and historians of early Christianity is now that in the beginning there were varieties of Christianity. As G. W. MacRae puts it (p. 127): "It is now as much a dogma of scholarship as its opposite used to be: orthodoxy is not the presupposition of the early church but the result of growth and development."

The thirteen contributors to this volume seek to address the question of how Christianity during the second and third centuries consciously and unconsciously defined itself by ruling out certain expressions as "heretical."

R. A. Markus, "The Problem of Self-Definition: From Sect to Church," notes that there were three clear developments in the third century: (1) the rapid increase of Christians, (2) the diversification of their social composition, and (3) unprecedented crisis in the fabric of Roman society. These changes were accompanied by a "fuller doctrinal self-definition" that led in the fourth century to an insistence on conformity.

R. M. Grant, "The Social Setting of Second-Century Christianity," notes that though the evidence is indirect and scattered we are in a better position to assess Christianity than other religious movements inasmuch as Christians wrote and preserved their writings. From this evidence it appears that in many respects they were just like their neighbors with two differences: "Their moral goals are different from those of pagans generally, and they refuse to take part in the idolatrous worship of so-called gods" (pp. 28-29).

W. R. Schoedel, "Theological Norms and Social Perspectives in Ignatius of Antioch," seems to tarnish the heroic stature of the martyr by accusing the bishop of being the one who polarized the situation with the docetists (p. 32) and of being so concerned about the threat to his own authority (pp. 37, 41). On the other hand the author argues that the bishop was open to certain aspects of society. I would doubt that Ignatius' position on marriage (p. 50) can be cited as evidence for such an "open" attitude.

An illuminating sketch of the growing split between the Western and Eastern churches

is provided by J. Pelikan, "The Two Sees of Peter." The east steadfastly insisted on tradition and custom, e.g. in the Quartodeciman controversy over the date of Easter. "At Rome, on the other hand, apostolicity early began to refer to an apostolic foundation in the capital city that allowed for dispensation even of ancient practices for the sake of good order and conformity" (p. 68).

In "The Self-Definition of Christianity in Relation to Later Platonism," A. H. Armstrong describes the attempts of Christian thinkers from c. 150 on to define their teaching in relation to various philosophical movements. He explains why Middle and Neo-Platonism—not Stoicism, Epicureanism, etc.—provided models for Christian thinkers.

R. L. Wilken, "The Christians as the Romans (and Greeks) Saw Them," provides fascinating reflections and impressions gleaned from hostile sources. Most pagans characterized Christianity as a foreign *superstitio* that undermined Roman society. Celsus, who was well informed, accused Christians of abandoning Judaism. Galen described the behavior of Christians with grudging admiration but then noted that the Christians did not offer cogent reasons for their behavior but appealed to "stories and parables."

G. W. MacRae answers the question of "Why the Church Rejected Gnosticism" by noting objections to the gnostics' radical nonconformity in ethical behavior (possibly reflected already at Corinth). MacRae assumes on the basis of the Nag Hammadi texts that gnosticism was a non-Christian movement, which at least in an "incipient phase" influenced the NT. As proof he cites striking parallels between Nag Hammadi texts and John. On this latter assertion, however, see my "Jewish Gnosticism?: The Prologue of John, Mandaean Parallels, and the Trimorphic Protennoia," *Gilles Quispel Festschrift* (ed. R. van den Broek; Leiden: Brill, forthcoming) 264-282.

J. E. Menard, "Normative Self-Definition in Gnosticism," discusses a number of Nag Hammadi texts, the most interesting of which is "The Testimony of Truth." This document contains not only attacks against the Catholic Church but also against fellow gnostics. The latter are criticized for not living up to the ascetic standards of true gnostics.

B. A. Pearson, "Jewish Elements in Gnosticism and the Development of Gnostic Self-Definition," on the basis of his researches posits that "Gnosticism . . . originated in sectarian Jewish circles independent of, and perhaps even prior to, Christianity" (p. 152). While Pearson has succeeded in identifying numerous elements in the Nag Hammadi texts as Jewish, he has not yet been able to demonstrate how and when such a radical reutilization of Jewish elements in the anti-Jewish framework of gnosticism took place. See my "The Descent of Ishtar, the Fall of Sophia, and the Jewish Roots of Gnosticism," *TB* 29 (1978) 143-175.

In contrast to the current tendency to accept Eusebius' account of the flight of Christians from Jerusalem to Pella, G. Lüdemann, "The Successors of Pre-70 Jerusalem Christianity," argues against the authenticity of the tradition for three reasons: (1) The attestation of such a flight is extremely scarce and limited to the region around Pella; (2) the sources are rather late; and (3) they stand in conflict with other versions about the fate of the pre-70 Jerusalem community. He is inclined to believe that the story was made up by a Jewish-Christian community (cf. the Ebionites) to lend legitimacy to their links with primitive Christianity. None of these arguments is beyond debate, however. Lüdemann does not take into account the arguments in favor of the tradition adduced by R. H. Smith, the excavator of Pella.

According to G. Vallee, "Theological and Non-Theological Motives in Irenaeus's Refutation of the Gnostics," Irenaeus was an effective adversary of the gnostics. Irenaeus stressed unity against the many dualisms of gnosticism, which divided the Godhead and separated Christ from Jesus, the OT from the NT, pneumatics from simple believers, etc.

R. Mortley, "The Past in Clement of Alexandria," shows how Clement attempted to refute the charge that Christianity had no roots. He discusses a remarkable passage in the *Stromateis* (1.21 ff.), which is an example of Hellenistic/Jewish historiography. The text alleges that the antiquity of Moses demonstrates the superiority of Judaism/Christianity over Hellenism.

P. M. O'Cleirigh, "The Meaning of Dogma in Origen," focuses on *dogmata*, general principles of action deduced from Scripture. By presenting Christianity as wisdom, Origen "extended the universal mission to include the world of understanding" (p. 216).

E. Yamauchi

Miami University, Oxford, OH

*The Life of Antony and the Letter to Marcellinus*. By Athanasius. Translation and Introduction by Robert C. Gregg. New York: Paulist, 1980, 166 pp., \$7.95.

Unfortunately this early contribution to the growing Classics of Western Spirituality series is not the best introduction to an excellent collection. Gregg's critical introduction is crisp, avoiding the minutiae of the monographic literature, and his translation is both faithful and readable. However, there is simply too little book for the pretensions of the subject and the price. Very large print, generous margins, translator's introduction, notes, index, and the two selections of the book all together stretch to only 166 pages, yet somehow justify the series price tag. Unfortunately, the all-too-mysterious but historically vital field of Egyptian monasticism (and its spirituality) is served to the general reader, in this instance, in less than satisfactory form. Or perhaps the hefty feel and weighty content of other volumes in the series tend to heighten—or at least spoil—the reader's expectations.

Nevertheless the two works presented in this volume are significant and repay, each in its own way, the attention even of the nonspecialist. This is particularly true for the evangelical nonspecialist, for whom the literature of Alexandrian Christianity is bound to present a frustrating melange of the familiar and the bizarre. The *Life of Antony*, for example, reflects that unique Alexandrian milieu of mixed shades of Neo-Platonism, stoicism, gnosticism and Christianity, a milieu that Athanasius skillfully blends with an alien desert inhabited by myriad demons and the monks. The similarity between the miraculous powers of perceiving and thwarting the demonic, claimed by Athanasius for the Christian saint and by Porphyry for the pagan wise man, is as disturbing in its way as Athanasius' Christocentric soteriology is comforting, even when articulated by so improbable a theologian as Antony. Also unsettling is the over-delicate balance that Athanasius' Antony strikes between the work of Christ, with frequent protestations that all of God's gifts come from him, and the work of the monk, detailing the rigors of *askēsis* necessary to the monk's salvation. Such imponderables are held in tension under one profoundly theological roof, imprinted by the personality of the fourth-century "lion of orthodoxy" and left to influence not only the development of monasticism but also the genre of hagiographical literature. The exemplar provided for both of the latter by the *Life of Antony* must surely qualify any attempt to separate Athanasius and his theology from the tradition of Alexandria and the conflicting cultures of fourth-century Egypt, especially if those attempts tend to draw Athanasius across the centuries to stand as a "proto-evangelical." In other words, the Athanasius seen in the *Life of Antony* is one who breathes more of the atmosphere of Origen than of the trinitarian formulations of classical Protestantism with which his name is so often associated.

The *Letter to Marcellinus*, on the other hand, proves something of an interesting exception to the common view of fourth-century exegesis as shot through with allegory. Written to a young deacon under his care, this letter attempts to explore the proper meaning and use of the Psalms for Christians. Thus it is written without polemic overtones, either doctrinal or apologetic, and wants the impetus to some of the higher flights of allegory. The *Letter*, included in this selection as a devotional and therefore spiritual piece, is nevertheless more a boon to the historian of Biblical interpretation than to the historian of spirituality. While there is something of the mystical in Athanasius' insistence that the Psalter is peculiarly a "pray-er's" book, especially when chanted, any attempt to classify this work as mystical exegesis would have to be strongly slanted toward exegesis. Moreover Athanasius' insistence that the Psalter is a garden containing all of Scripture, from OT history to messianic prophecy, in which the individual Christian may experience the profoundest emotions por-

trayed in the Word, leads to a handling of the Psalms, particularly the messianic Psalms, that is not at all out of step with the more lyrical passages in many Protestant commentators. Who knows? Perhaps such similarity might mean that there is less of Origen in Athanasius' exegesis of the Psalms than one might expect, or that there is more of Origen in much traditional Protestant exegesis of the Psalms than one might hope. At any rate the *Letter to Marcellinus* provides an interesting counterpoint both to Athanasius, pastor and theologian, and his period.

Daniel Swinson

Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, IL

*The Dialogue*. By Catherine of Siena. Suzanne Noffke, O. P., editor and translator. New York: Paulist, 1980, 363 pp., \$7.95. *The Interior Castle*. By Teresa of Avila. Kieran Kavanaugh, O. C. D., and Otillo Rodriguez, O. C. D., translators. New York: Paulist, 1979, 196 pp., \$7.95.

In 1970 Pope Paul VI granted the title Doctor of the Church to both Catherine of Siena and Teresa of Avila. In the opinion of the reviewer, the honor reflects not only the undoubted importance of these two mystics in the history of Roman Catholic spirituality but also the currents flowing through, around and beneath Vatican II. In a number of ways Catherine of Siena, Teresa of Avila, and indeed many of the mystics in the classical tradition speak to the children of this post-conciliar age. First, a search for vital piety has led to the juxtaposition of some older forms of Roman Catholic spirituality with those familiar forms that have reigned supreme in the life of the Church since the renewal under Pius IX. Second, a new sense of purpose among many in religious orders is finding expression in the paradigm of the contemplative social activist, a paradigm that fits the Dominican Catherine quite well and can be made to fit the Carmelite Teresa also. Third, a highly visible surge of activity among Roman Catholic women, particularly those in religious orders, adds significance to the fact that this is the first occasion on which this honorific title has been bestowed on a woman. Fourth, the heralded new openness among many Roman Catholics to common ground between traditions and faiths provides an interesting new use for the mystics. The tendency among many specialists in mysticism, especially since Evelyn Underhill, has been to view the mystic's experience of union as somehow a core phenomenon in the human experience, varying in interpretation and expression from mystic to mystic, culture to culture, religion to religion, but somehow transcending those differences.

Lest these currents, and books representative thereof, seem peripheral to Protestant interests it should be noted that each has a corollary, at least among mainline denominations. Recent stirrings indicate that a kind of spirituality grounded in such mysticism as is represented by the *Dialogue* and the *Interior Castle* is finding a favorable hearing in Protestant circles. Seminars on contemplation and meditation, frequently led by members of religious orders or Roman Catholic scholars, are gaining a mainline following. The piety of such mystics as Catherine and Teresa, always respectful of the formal structures of the Church, provides an appeal to the liturgical leanings of many ecumenists that could never quite be met in the now waning talk of detente with the charismatic movement. Further, women of such stature as Catherine and Teresa may find easy entry into the mainline feminist perspective, just as the paradigm of the contemplative social activist may recommend itself to mainline activists, who as often as not have foundered in their attempt to find an appropriate piety. Finally, the possible correlation of the mystical experience from culture to culture, religion to religion, may lend new life to the sagging interfaith dialogue. Such an entree for a well-developed, disciplined form of spirituality may portend a new wrinkle in the old, comfortable dichotomy between cool (as in liberal) and warm (as in evangelical).

Indeed, some within the pale have been reading and appreciating the mystics. Among the classics the name of John of the Cross, younger protégé of Teresa of Avila and also newly



honored Doctor of the Church, has been appearing among the credits of evangelical authors. Moreover the penchant of some younger evangelicals for the contemplative style, not to mention theological content, of Thomas Merton, as well as the appearance of semi-monastic intentional communities in what has been called the evangelical left, indicate a movement too important to pass unnoticed.

All of this is to say that the publication of Catherine of Siena's *Dialogue* and Teresa of Avila's *Interior Castle* in such readily available form should interest a broader spectrum of evangelical scholarship than specialists in the history and theology of spirituality. Such is especially the case since the term "mysticism" continues generally as a designation of whatever is vague, out-of-sorts, or even reprehensible in opposing systems. This usage not only condemns by association but does the far more serious harm of impeding the task of studying and evaluating systems with a current influence. And, as is the way with vicious circles, such impediment will do nothing to convince nonspecialist scholars to improve upon the smatterings of Loyola, Eckhart, *et al.*, received in brief forays into the field.

The volumes under review are peculiarly suited to the task of sparking new study and definition on two counts. First, there is the excellent presentation. The scholarship undergirding both volumes is impressive. The editor/translators bring substantive credentials and expertise, sharpened by the fact that they speak as heirs of the tradition. Each book has a critical introduction that is generally well written, informative (for the general reader) and (for the specialist) pertinent to current developments in the field. There is a fine blend of the biographical, historical, theological and literary that informs without overwhelming. As scholarship within the tradition there is also advocacy, though generally more civil than that which used to fall under the *imprimatur*. Indeed the advocacy extends beyond old boundaries to the new interests noted earlier. For instance, the preface of the *Interior Castle*, written by Raimundo Panikkar, explores the relation of Teresa's mysticism to a universal "ontic" quality called sanctity. On another plane the editor/translator of the *Dialogue*, in order to tone Catherine's unabashedly masculine Italian down to contemporary vogue, has the saint sounding somewhat more modern than she ought. Such marks of involvement with the text, which may garner criticism from an academic world shy of fideism, serve rather to spice the investigation of the work of scholars who stand self-consciously within a tradition.

Second, there are the systems presented respectively by Catherine and Teresa. Both women were literate, though neither could be considered a scholar. When imparting the fruits of theological speculation or fine points in Biblical interpretation, their debt to others becomes obvious—though occasionally startling in its range. Catherine's intellectual debts are recognizably Scriptural and patristic, generally refracted through a scholastic lens. Teresa adds to a similar background the work of such theologians of Spain's Golden Age as Pedro Ibáñez and Domingo Báñez. Their doctrinal teaching thus shares both the strengths and weaknesses of the contemporary Catholic orthodoxy. Further, as active participants in the socio-political events of their times both women are easily placed in an historical milieu. Catherine of Siena (1347-1380) during her brief life was called in to umpire disputes ranging from petty disagreements of a local variety to the perennial Guelph/Ghibelline controversy and the intricacies of the Avignon papacy. Teresa of Avila (1515-1582), though less cosmopolitan in involvement (her primary goal was the reform of the Carmelites), nonetheless bears the marks both of Spain's cultural efflorescence and the renewed zeal of the Counter-Reformation. Both women display the manner of teachers whose students are semi-literate, and are thus able to turn a striking phrase, an intense image, a happy mnemonic device. This last quality largely accounts for the continuing freshness of the prose style of both women. Finally, both women are indebted to the language of Roman Catholic mysticism. Like most mystics before them they are awed by an experience, protesting its indescribability. But also like most mystics before them they tend to use certain phrases (spiritual marriage, ecstatic union, rapture, etc.), share certain concepts (recollection, contemplation, etc.), and experience certain phenomena (locutions, stigmata, etc.) in

common. This common base will, and perhaps should, prejudice a reading of either mystic in the direction of traditional Protestant judgments of mysticism—though such are frequently based on the evaluation of more suspect characters, like Eckhart.

However, for all that is shared there are also dissimilarities both between Catherine and Teresa and between each mystic and the "tradition" of mysticism. Catherine, who died at age 33 as much from the intensities of her asceticism as from the rigor of her service, has the greater intensity. Her *Dialogue* moves throughout under the compulsion of the fervid soul. She stands invariably breathless, awaiting the next answer. Given her style and the fragmented manner of composition, there results occasional repetition and sometimes a lack of clarity as ideas pile on one another helter-skelter. Further, Catherine has a penchant for speculative concepts. In her system Christ is Holy Truth, faith is light, reason is the basic human quality, and intelligence is the soul's eye. These concepts are somewhat softened by Catherine's fascinating habit of personifying them by strong emotion (such that, for instance, Truth becomes Beloved Truth), but still sound suspiciously like that which one would expect from a mystic. There is also a key idea, underlying Catherine's commitment to service, of participatory redemption. So much does the community of faith share life and merit that true saints may, by their acts of contrition and suffering, pave the way for salvation (or at least forestall divine retribution) for others.

Teresa, on the other hand, entered her most intense period of mystical union following a new experience of conversion (the word bearing for both Teresa and Catherine its medieval, largely monastic meaning of entry on a higher stage of religious life through some specific experience) in her thirty-ninth year. Because this experience involved an intense new commitment to the Person of Christ, much of Teresa's mysticism has the quality of utter devotion to the second Person of the Trinity. Thus while her practice of contemplation includes such potentially neutral concepts as passive recollection and the prayer of quiet, her mystical experience does not lose its focus or wander into a "higher" plane of speculation. Indeed her one attempt to enter such a plane by abandoning her central motif of the Person of Christ resulted in failure and was abandoned as fruitless. When in her travels to the final, inner room of the soul's castle Teresa sets forth what is for her the capstone of the mystical experience of union, she intentionally undergirds that experience with theology and Scripture. Such union is for Teresa continual communion with and experience of the Trinity. Doctrinally the experience adheres scrupulously to the creeds. Biblically Teresa perceives her experience as an outworking of the promise of John 14:18 ff. This concept of the mystical experience is combined with an attitude more irenic if no less intense than Catherine's, though a similar difficulty in manner of composition leads to a similar result of repetition and some lack of clarity.

Daniel Swinson

Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, IL

*Paul's Faith and the Power of the Gospel: A Structural Introduction to the Pauline Letters.* By Daniel Patte. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983, xxiv + 408 pp., \$21.95.

This volume will play a significant role in the intensifying debate over the validity and limitations of structuralism for the study of the NT. Building on the work of A. J. Greimas, Patte utilizes a simplified structural approach to the "universally unquestioned" (p. 28) authentic letters of Paul (Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, 1 Thessalonians, Philemon) as a means of identifying and characterizing Paul's "faith." For Patte, Paul's "faith" is to be distinguished from his theology. In a distinction that undergirds his treatment, Patte characterizes the former as that "system of convictions" that most basically motivates a pattern of thinking and behavior, while the latter involves the "logical" outworking of those convictions. Faith gives meaning to life; it answers our most basic questions about what is real and what is not, and about what is good or bad. How can Paul's faith be uncovered? By a structural analysis of Paul's discourse, Patte answers. Such an

analysis will concentrate on what Paul assumes and on the way he seeks to motivate (the "warranting level") rather than on the central statements (the "dialogic level") because Paul's faith is to be discovered in the former. Patte is careful to refrain from claiming that his reading of Paul is final or definitive. He clearly regards his work as exploratory, as an invitation to read Paul. On the other hand he is convinced that he has succeeded in establishing the central characteristics of Paul's faith.

This faith, Patte claims, is charismatic, eschatological and typological. By charismatic Patte means that present experience (of Paul, or of his readers) is that which establishes one in relationship with God. Tradition, Scripture, even God's act in Christ are subordinate to the revelations that individuals experience. The justification for this is found by Patte particularly in 1 Thessalonians, where Paul concentrates not on the death of Christ but on the new converts' own experience of grace and forgiveness.

Patte calls Paul's faith eschatological because it is oriented to the future. Only at the parousia will the final revelation be vouchsafed (appeal is made constantly to 1 Cor 13:12 in support). Until then Paul's faith, in contrast to Pharisaic faith, is open-ended and continually in process. Systems that are closed are idolatrous, because they make a previously established relationship the ultimate good.

Finally, Paul's faith is typological in the sense that the validity of one's own experiences of God is established by comparing them with the experiences of predecessors in the faith—most importantly with the experience of Christ, who is the normative type. In this regard, Patte stresses the theme of imitation: Paul and believers imitate Christ, Paul's converts are to imitate him and others like him, and so on. Paul's own authority lies not in his apostolic status, in his inherent right to give commands, but in his life and teaching as a pattern for others (cf. Philemon).

What does it mean to become a Christian according to this model? Since conversion is basically a change in convictional system, Christ's redemptive work is to be understood in terms of his destruction of the Jewish idolatrous convictional system. By first identifying with what is considered evil according to that system (e.g. the scandal of crucifixion) and then identifying with what is good (the resurrection), Christ forces a reevaluation of the validity of that system and, hopefully, leads one to abandon that system in favor of another (the gospel). The negation of other idolatrous systems must be accomplished by others. Paul, for instance, by identifying with weakness yet demonstrating strength (in Christ) attacks the Corinthians' particular system.

Such is a brief and very general description of the sort of approach Patte demonstrates in this volume. The conclusions to which Patte comes suggest to me that something is very wrong with this approach. It is not simply that his conclusions fly in the face of orthodox theological formulations. It is rather that his reconstruction so obviously fails to explain—indeed, distorts—the plain meaning of the texts he deals with. Paul's faith is ultimately a reconstruction of what lies behind the text on the basis of a contemporary theory of discourse structure and function. Such a methodology enables one to opt out of serious grammatical-historical exegesis. For while Patte firmly maintains the need for such traditional approaches, he in fact denies the need to use them in describing Paul's faith. Thus the curse, sin, freedom and other key Pauline terms are understood solely on the basis of their alleged function in a limited number of texts (sometimes only one) and reflect twentieth-century notions much more than first-century ones. Equally disturbing is Patte's tendency to skew the evidence in favor of a certain pattern and then read that pattern into numerous other places. Thus, for instance, the idea that a right relationship with God depends not on what Jesus did on the cross but on one's present experiences is based on the emphasis in 1 Thessalonians 1-2 on the way that God intervened in the Thessalonians' experience. Now Paul's emphasis on the Thessalonians' experience is clear. But where is that set in contrast to the work of the cross? Does Paul's failure to emphasize the cross in 1 Thessalonians justify the conclusion that this was not important for him or the Thessalonians? Is it not possible that the message of the cross was so much an assumption after Paul's preaching in Thes-

salonica that it was unnecessary to mention it clearly (and, contra Patte's most unconvincing exegesis, 5:10 does seem clearly to mention it)? And does not Paul trace the value of the Thessalonians' experience to their response to Paul's message ("the Word of God," 2:13)? Yet having reached such a conclusion in his survey of 1 Thessalonians Patte consciously seeks to find the same pattern in other Pauline letters. It is not surprising that he succeeds.

In making these criticisms I am not suggesting that structural approaches *per se* are invalid. But I would suggest that a book such as this one demonstrates the need to be much more cautious about assuming that a particular modern discourse theory can validly be read into any literature of any time and place and to refrain from accepting any reconstruction of an author's convictional system that is not willing to justify itself by explaining how it gives rise to what the text actually says.

Douglas J. Moo

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

*Commentary on James*. NIGTC. By Peter H. Davids. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982, 226 pp.

Within a period of six years three expertly written commentaries on the epistle of James have appeared in English. This must be a record of some kind. All three are the outcome of doctoral studies done at English universities: James Adamson's in the NICNT (1976), the result of his work at Cambridge; Sophie Laws' in the HNTC (1980), the result of her work at Oxford; and now Peter Davids' in the NIGTC (1982), the result of his work at Manchester. All three are major contributions to our understanding of the epistle. Certainly it can no longer be said that there is a dearth of first-rate commentaries on the epistle of James.

James has always been a puzzle to scholars (A. Meyer entitled his book *Das Rätsel des Jakobusbriefes* and suggested a solution that unfortunately was more baffling than the riddle itself). On the one hand there is direct external evidence and much internal evidence in favor of the traditional view of authorship and date. The latter include (1) the self-designation of the author, (2) the strong Jewishness of the letter, (3) the use of the pre-literary tradition of Jesus' words, (4) the situation of the churches addressed, and (5) no mention of the issue of the reception of Gentiles into the Church. These of course are not of equal weight, nor are they, according to Davids, conclusive. On the other hand there is some evidence (although not so impressive) that points to a later date, and since James the Just died in A.D. 62 any date later than that rules him out as author. This evidence includes (1) direct external evidence, (2) the good Greek of the letter, (3) its similarity to the apostolic fathers, and (4) the possibility that the epistle interacts with Paulinism.

How is one to solve this puzzle? Enter the redactor. He may be James the Just himself (as late as A.D. 62) or an unknown redactor (as late as 85). The underlying material, however, belongs to James the Just and originated sometime between A.D. 40 and the Jerusalem council. Thus "James is a two-stage work, an initial series of sermons and sayings which ostensibly come from James the Just (i.e. we assume the redactor believed all the material came from James, but we cannot be sure that all of the smaller units belonged to the same stream of tradition: some of the proverbs, for example, may have been favorites of the redactor), and a later redaction of these units into an epistle by either James or a member of the church."

Davids, against Dibelius, argues that James is not a series of unconnected or jumbled-together sayings and proverbs. On the contrary, the epistle gives evidence of being a carefully constructed work. "No matter how fragmentary and disunified the sources may have been, the end product is a redacted whole." An excellent analysis of the epistle strongly supports this thesis.

Davids explores briefly seven areas of theology in James: suffering/testing; eschatology; Christology; poverty-piety; law, grace and faith; wisdom; prayer. The one theme that ties

the epistle together is suffering/testing, "although like the thread of any necklace, the pattern of the specific ornaments is more often seen than the thread itself."

The commentary proper is incisive and thorough (138 pages on five chapters) and reflects a wide knowledge of the best works on James in German and French in addition to English. One will not be disappointed in going to it to find out what the author of the epistle meant. The only criticism I offer is that at times so many references are made to extra-Biblical literature (often obscure) that the flow of the exegesis is interrupted or at best hard to follow. Most of these references are available in other sources, so why repeat them?

Peter Davids' work on James has much to commend itself. The author has done his homework. He has assimilated and made available to his readers a vast store of material. The bibliography (17 pages) at the front of the volume is the most comprehensive I have seen on material relating to the epistle. At the end of each section in the commentary proper there is a "see further" heading that refers the reader to other materials. This is a helpful feature, especially for those who might want to delve more deeply into a particular exegetical problem or theme. Davids also has come up with a solution to the *Rätsel* of James. It is not a completely original solution, but he has brought to bear on it more relevant material than has to my knowledge ever been assembled before. And, most important of all, he has skillfully used contemporary critical and exegetical tools to produce a first-rate commentary in the evangelical tradition. For this I salute him.

Walter W. Wessel

Bethel Seminary West, San Diego, CA

*A Living Hope. A Commentary on 1 and 2 Peter.* By Robert H. Mounce. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982, vii + 159 pp.

Robert Mounce, president of Whitworth College and author of *Revelation* in the NICNT series, has written a concise yet richly stimulating commentary on the Petrine epistles, designed for the serious Bible student and busy pastor. The commentary concentrates on the elucidation of the message through the study of the lexical richness of the Greek text. The author delights to show the subtleties and nuances of meaning as a key to unlock the message of Peter. The analogies discerned help the reader to transfer Peter's message to his personal situation.

Each epistle is prefaced with a short introduction in which the Petrine authorship is supported and the historical context is briefly sketched. The chapters of the commentary are divided according to the chapters of the epistle. The respective chapters are then divided into paragraphs or sections with titles designed to communicate the relevance of their contents to the modern reader. Each verse is discussed with the italicized text of the *NIV* printed clause by clause as the interpretation proceeds. Mounce does not hesitate to criticize the renderings of the *NIV*. This interaction extends to many other modern versions, which are constantly referred to in the hope of casting better light on the text's meaning. Greek words are transliterated, and the nonspecialist is never buried in jargon or technical terms.

The focus of the commentary, however, is on understanding and applying the message. Suggested implications for the twentieth-century Christian are liberally offered throughout the book. "Questions for Discussion" conclude the volume. A short index of subjects allows for quick reference to Peter's comments concerning a specific issue. Since this is not a commentary for the scholar, footnotes are nonexistent.

Any criticism of Mounce's work must be made in the light of his intended purpose. Two things would have been helpful. Short summaries of Peter's message at the end of each chapter would have aided the reader in grasping the totality of Peter's message. The second aspect has to do with the assumed relationship between 1 and 2 Peter and the literary connection between 2 Peter and Jude. Mounce states that the Petrine epistles were written to

the same congregations, yet this fact does not significantly engage his attention in the exegetical process. In addition the disputed relationship between 2 Peter and Jude, though mentioned in the preface to 2 Peter, never plays a part in the exegetical discussion. Perhaps these issues were felt to deviate from the purpose of the commentary.

This commentary is a good addition to the Bible student's and pastor's library because of the insights Mounce gives into the lexical richness of these two epistles of Peter.

L. Perkins

Northwest Baptist Theological Seminary, Vancouver, BC

*Theology of the New Testament, Vol. 1.* By Leonhard Goppelt. Translated from *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (1975) by John E. Alsup. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981, xxvi + 292 pp., \$15.95.

Leonhard Goppelt was a well-known German theologian who died in 1973, two years before the publication of his major work on NT theology. The appearance of an English translation of this important work is to be welcomed. It presents an opportunity to form some assessment of the contribution it has made.

In order to appreciate the value of Goppelt's work it is necessary to see it against the background of the German theological scene, particularly in the wake of the Bultmannian position. Indeed the author has provided his readers with a useful appendix in which he has given his comments on the different German approaches to NT theology. It will not in fact be out of place before considering his own contribution to note his relationship to other leading German theologians. Goppelt criticizes the basic approach of Bultmann because he placed too much emphasis on "the national presuppositions of modern times" and on "the principles of historical analysis" and not enough on "the unique claim of the documents" (p. 266). Goppelt's view was that the first two of these components should be subjected to "a perpetual critical dialogue with the third." He is equally critical of the subsequent modifications of Bultmann's position within his own school.

In commenting on other alternatives Goppelt devoted most space to the salvation-historical approach, with which position he was clearly most in sympathy. He defined his own task in the following way. He felt he could not fix in a static way his own hermeneutical principle. Rather he regarded it as circumscribing his intention and task. His general view of NT theology was to see it as attesting a fulfilment event from the God of the OT and having Jesus as its center (p. 281). In this way Goppelt's approach marks a significant movement away from the historical skepticism of the Bultmann school and a movement toward a greater appreciation of the uniqueness of the NT revelation. In view of the theological context in which this book was written, it is not surprising that the author takes pains on many points to criticize more radical views and to establish the historical viability of many of the sayings of Jesus. His sometimes tentative conclusions must be assessed against the prevailing skepticism in German theology.

Our next consideration must be an examination of Goppelt's method. The volume is devoted to the ministry of Jesus in its theological significance. After outlining the historical and theological bearings of the study, Goppelt develops his understanding of NT theology in the following way. He begins with the kingdom of God, and in line with his declared aim he approaches this from the background of OT and Jewish antecedents. He notes that the idea of a future kingdom was not new in the teaching of Jesus, but the idea of a kingdom that had already arrived was lacking in his contemporaries. Goppelt therefore sees that the teaching about the kingdom as present as well as future is a unique contribution of Jesus. He speaks of the "coming of the Kingdom" as even now "like a refracted light" manifesting its influence on the existing world order (p. 71).

It is perhaps surprising that Goppelt proceeds next to discuss the ethics of Jesus. He deals in fact with such subjects as repentance, the law, ethical demands and salvation be-

fore considering the all-important question of the identity of Jesus. He even discusses the miracles before coming to Jesus' self-understanding. It is notoriously difficult to decide on matters of priority of this nature, but it must be questioned whether the ethics of Jesus can be properly appreciated until some knowledge of his person has been attained. Nevertheless, it is significant that Goppelt considers that practical challenges to human behavior are an essential element in NT theology. It is rather odd to put practice before doctrine.

Goppelt rejected Bultmann's reduction of ethics to an individual ethos of decision on the grounds that it does not do justice to Jesus' word or to social realities. He takes a more positive approach because he is prepared to give credence to more of the teaching of Jesus in the gospels. He concentrates on Jesus' emphasis on love in human relationships and brings out its social implications, especially in relation to marriage and the state. Jesus' demand for total repentance and the consequent setting of life in a tension involving extreme possibilities show the true nature of Jesus' ethic. While there is undoubted truth in what Goppelt says, the tension would be expressed more sharply if related more closely to the self-claims of Jesus.

When dealing with miracles Goppelt makes use of tradition-critical analysis by which he maintains that miracles stories were multiplied through reduplications, that the miraculous was often heightened, that Easter appearances were occasionally projected back, and that graphic words were transformed into stories. This is one of the less satisfactory sections in this book, although Goppelt does affirm that Jesus performed some healing miracles. From the theological point of view, Goppelt centers on the importance of faith. His explanation of this faith was that people came to Jesus and found help, and when Jesus told them their faith had saved them it was a declaration of mercy. But he admits that this does not explain faith apart from the person of Jesus. It would again have clarified the position if Goppelt had dealt first with the self-understanding of Jesus.

When he does eventually confront the problem of Jesus' understanding of himself, he approaches the matter in a conventional way by dealing with the titles attributed to him. He considers rabbi, prophet, son of David and Messiah. When discussing the last of these Goppelt denies that in the confession of Peter "Christ" meant the messianic king. He thinks that in the context it meant that Christ was more than a prophet. He does not here do justice to the later Church understanding of Jesus and to the fact that it may have its roots in the earthly life of Jesus. But Goppelt is here strongly influenced by his acceptance of the Markan hypothesis, which he takes for granted and which allows him to explain his terms without reference to the fact that Matthew and Luke contain authentic tradition. He gives far too little attention to Matthew's record of Peter's confession, which he thinks could not possibly have come from Jesus (p. 213).

Goppelt has a section on the messianic secret, in which he points out the weaknesses of Wrede's original submission of this hypothesis but nevertheless accepts an understanding of Mark's gospel based on it. He accepts four layers in the tradition. The oldest layer was an element in the structures of Jesus' ministry, the next is seen in the sayings about the secret of the kingdom, the third is Mark's development of the silence commands to the disciples, and the fourth is Matthew and Luke's suppression of this complex (p. 177). It will be seen that Goppelt is strongly influenced by the prevailing view about the redaction of each of the gospels. The total impact of his book must be judged accordingly. It should also be noted that throughout this volume Goppelt gives far less attention to John's gospel than to the synoptics.

It is within the discussion of the Son-of-Man sayings that he brings in the significance of atonement, basing it on the Son-of-Man sayings that speak of suffering. In contrast to Bultmann and Conzelmann, Goppelt does not regard these sayings as *vaticinia ex eventu* (except Mark 10:33-34). He therefore poses the question how the concept of the suffering Son of Man developed, and in answer he appeals to Isaiah 53. He shows this to be connected with the idea of the new covenant. He comments: "As the One who atoned, Jesus stood as a human being over against God, and yet in making atonement he also belonged completely to

God." This leads Goppelt to discuss the sonship of Jesus, which he finds structured on OT usage. He rightly points out the distinction between Jesus as Son and the disciples as sons. It is clear from his approach that Goppelt presents a more positive view of Christ from the gospels than Bultmann had done in his NT theology.

In discussing the Easter event, he begins with the formulaic tradition in 1 Cor 15:3-8 and attempts to show how the Easter stories developed. He finds the explanation of developments in the context of proclamation (what he calls the Easter kerygma). Even 1 Cor 15:3-8 he claims "did not reproduce the direct impression of the Easter appearances, but was the product of fundamental theological reflection." It is not precisely clear what historical significance Goppelt attaches to the Easter event, although he is critical of Bultmann's view that the resurrection of Christ happened only in the kerygma. He makes clear that the "resurrection body (of Jesus) was not the revived earthly body, but certainly a fully new corporality" (p. 247).

It is refreshing to find a German author who has produced a work on NT theology that has so many positive contributions to make. For those who require a study within the limits that Goppelt has set himself, this book will prove valuable.

Donald Guthrie

London, England

*Jesus and the Constraints of History.* By A. E. Harvey. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1982, 192 pp., \$23.00.

Harvey's study begins from the skepticism of NT scholars concerning the historical Jesus. Archaeology helps establish verisimilitude, but it is beyond its power to contribute to the question of whether the gospels are true (p. 4). More promising is the argument that the overall picture of Jesus that emerges from the gospels may be more confidently affirmed than any individual item of the account if, as is the case, a consistent, original and believable person emerges (pp. 4-5). This provides us with a set of general facts (bare biographical statements) about Jesus, but does not finally escape the judgment that "the kind of information about Jesus that theology has looked to New Testament scholars to provide is not available" (p. 6, quoting Maurice Wiles).

Against this background Harvey introduces the thesis of his monograph: These confidently affirmed bare biographical statements may be made to yield a great deal of information of prime theological relevance if we consider them in relation to "the constraints imposed by the rhythm of human activity and the conventions of culture and civilization" in first-century Palestine (p. 7).

Harvey's first attempt to fulfill the promise of his thesis is a study of political restraints in relation to the events leading to the crucifixion (pp. 11-35). Harvey is impressed by the tension between Jesus' execution for sedition and the patently contrary character and activity of Jesus, and between what he sees as the Lukan view that Jesus was not found guilty by any Jewish court and the Markan view that he was. Harvey concludes that Jesus' "teaching and conduct were such that legal questions were raised by it, on which different views might be taken" (p. 35), but that the decision to hand Jesus over to Pilate was a political one and not the consequence of a judicial verdict of the Sanhedrin. The possibility of linking Jesus with sedition is probably to be traced to the linking of *Christos* to his name during his ministry. The former is argued more extensively but the latter carries greater conviction, especially as buttressed in the later chapters.

The next chapter (pp. 36-65) is presented under the title "The Constraint of Law" but cuts a far broader swath than this might suggest. It begins by considering the question: "Did Jesus or did he not perform actions which constituted an offence under the law" (p. 37) as then enforced? (The disciples' eating of grain on the sabbath did constitute such an offence.) On the rather artificial basis that "all teaching [in first-century Judaism] was



given within a framework imposed by the law" (p. 41), attention then moves to Jesus' identity as a teacher in relation to the possibilities available in the culture. Jesus has much of the prophet about him, but he transcends the categories provided by his contemporary culture. Prophetic symbolism and the sense that a critical moment of history has now dawned account for much of Jesus' identity as a teacher. The chapter is full of stimulating insights, but the approach is not recognizably the announced one of using the constraints of history to tease out the significance of bare biographical statements.

This leads us into a chapter on "Jesus and Time: The Constraints of an Ending" (pp. 66-97). Harvey provides an elaborate apologetic for viewing things in terms of an end. However arbitrary it may be, the identification of an end or crisis point enables an ordering of our experiences that creates intelligibility. Prophetic credibility rests not on accuracy of timetable but on the validity of its interpretation of the present in the light of an imminent end. The juxtaposition of wisdom and prophetic elements of Jesus' ethics almost requires him to speak in terms of an end point within roughly one generation: If the immediacy is too great, it will create the suspension of all routine activity and leave no room for the application of wisdom ethics to present life; if the end is too distant, there will not be relevance to the here and now. The prospect of a near end enables us to discover possibilities in the present that were not there before. While it is scarcely Harvey's intention, I suspect that he turns eschatology into mythology in the process of rescuing it from oblivion.

A briefer chapter on "The Intelligibility of Miracles" (pp. 98-119) presents them as centrally the overcoming of constraints that stood as intractable and inexplicable barriers in the way of mankind attaining to a better world. Only the category of miracle allows us to be called to act beyond limits that have never been surpassed before and, in hope, to undertake the impossible. Powerful—but modernizing.

The concluding chapters become overtly Christological: "Jesus the Christ: The Options in a Name" (pp. 120-149) argues centrally for an application of *Christos* to Jesus during his lifetime on the basis that he was anointed by the Spirit as in Isaiah 61. "Son of God: The Constraint of Monotheism" (pp. 150-173) uses "agency" as a major category for expressing a post-resurrection commitment to Jesus as God's true representative and for understanding Jesus' own self-description as Son of God. The notion of agency allows for the expression, without violation of the constraints of monotheism, of the conviction that it is as if God himself were present in Jesus. Some valuable insights here are marred by questionable exegesis of Johannine material and a failure to clarify the uniqueness of Jesus' role as representative of God.

The book as a whole is weakened by an excessive tendency to offer general arguments to overturn judgments based on careful analysis of texts. The central thesis is not sustained, but the work deserves attention for its creative freshness and insightful perspectives.

John Nolland

Regent College, Vancouver, BC

*Following Jesus: Discipleship in the Gospel of Mark.* By Ernest Best. Sheffield: JSOT, 1981, 283 pp.

Ernest Best has been cultivating his ideas on discipleship in Mark in scholarly journals for over a decade. Now we may reap the fruit of his labor in this full-length exposition of the subject.

Assuming the Markan priority and a life situation in Rome ca. A.D. 66, Best suggests that the problem confronting Mark's community was neither heresy nor persecution. It was rather a problem common to Christianity from its inception: an inability to grasp the significance and accept the consequences of following Jesus. Mark put pen to papyrus in order "to build up his readers as Christians and show them what true discipleship is" (p. 12).

As human examples Mark could have presented the disciples either positively or negatively. He chose to do the latter. The failure of the disciples is a pastorally motivated liter-

ary technique that served to instruct and encourage the weak in his community.

With this judgment of Mark's motives, Best makes (probably intentionally) a statement in the ongoing debate regarding Mark's negative portrayal of the disciples. Wrede attributed their obtuseness to Mark's constructed messianic secret. Best's position is between those who see in the disciples Mark's heretical opponents (e.g. Weeden and Kelber) and those who would emphasize the disciples' failures as primarily embedded in the tradition (e.g. Lane and Gnlika). Mark, contends Best, was more interested in "discipleship" than "the disciples." The same claim is true of Best's book.

The heart of Mark's instructions on discipleship is 8:27-10:45. The reader is carefully instructed on the requirements and disposition of a true disciple. While the twelve consistently misunderstand, the reader identifies with blind Bartimeus who "sees" Jesus correctly and follows him to the cross (10:46-52).

Best sees in Mark a commission to serve as well as evangelize the world. The metaphors of flock, house and ship do not permit one to see schisms in the Church. "The community as a whole is being instructed through the failure of the disciples and the teaching they are given" (p. 244). For those who have failed or misunderstood, the example of Peter and the disciples consoles them and the open invitation of Jesus encourages them (14:28; 16:7).

The work addresses the technicalities of grammatical syntax, redactional seams and the order of pericopae. It is also meticulously documented. However, the format is outlined well enough to allow the nonprofessional to work through the argument with little difficulty. Evangelicals will not agree with all the conclusions, but it is a well-reasoned work of scholarship yielding thoughtful conclusions. For anyone who has ever identified with the failure of Peter, the gospel of Mark takes on new pastoral meaning.

Robert W. Herron, Jr.

Rice University, Houston, TX

*Call to Discipleship: A Literary Study of Mark's Gospel.* By Augustine Stock, OSB. Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1982, 208 pp., \$7.95.

This work is the first volume in the Good News Studies series by Catholic scholars. The book sets a respectable pace for the series for it represents the latest trends in Markan scholarship both methodologically and thematically.

The author approaches the text as a literary critic. Literary criticism is a new movement in Bible interpretation that has grown out of and as a response to form and redaction criticism. The determinative principle of literary criticism is to allow the text to speak for itself without concern to separate tradition from redaction or to seek the interpretative key to the text from some source outside the gospel—e.g., a hypothetical reconstruction of earliest Christianity.

Taking his cue from the literary theories of Plato and Aristotle, and also from the prevalence of Greek drama in the first century, Stock concludes that Mark shaped the gospel traditions that had come down to him according to a kind of tragedy specifically written for oral presentation. He concurs with the evangelical scholar Bilezikian that the genre of Greek tragedy was "the most influential and enduring aesthetic form designed by men to portray the great dilemmas of existence, and the torments brought upon mortals by their mysterious passions" (p. 27).

With this foundation the author addresses the problem that has become the focal point of interest for Markan scholars in the last decade: the incomprehension of the disciples. According to Stock the author of the gospel intends the story to operate on two levels: that of the characters, and that of the reader. The reader is given knowledge that is hidden from the characters who, because of this, are viewed as making ridiculously false judgments. The reader's feeling of being on the inside is challenged, however.

"After identifying with the disciples early in the gospel, the negative turn in the disci-

ples' story leads the reader to reexamine his own discipleship. The purpose of the author of Mark was not merely to present ideas about Jesus but to lead his readers through a particular story in which they could discover themselves and thereby change" (p. 207).

*Call to Discipleship* has much to commend it. Evangelicals have always held the basic conviction of the literary critic: "that the critic is not free to alter, or deny, or ignore the text in order to suit his own presuppositions or needs or desires" (p. 13). Of course no one is without presuppositions, but we should welcome this new appreciation for the integrity of the text. We should feel challenged to apply this methodology with the highest standards of evangelical scholarship.

Stock is to be further commended for turning to the question of genre for a solution to the problem of discipleship in Mark. It is this reviewer's growing conviction that the two are vitally connected and that the answer to one depends on answering the other. Unfortunately Stock is unconvincing in his contention that Mark is a form of Greek tragedy. Mark did not borrow a literary form; he created one. The result of that literary genius has yet to be fully appreciated or adequately defined.

As an author Stock is sometimes repetitive (cf. the opening paragraphs of chaps. 19 and 20), although this might facilitate comprehension of the material by the nonspecialist. The publisher allowed too many printing errors and omitted possibly valuable indices. Overall, however, the book merits favorable recommendation as an example of literary criticism at work and as a responsible discussion of Mark. Moreover, pastors will find that the theme and format lend themselves particularly to preaching.

Robert W. Herron, Jr.

Southern Bible College, Houston, TX 77078

*Yahweh Is a Warrior: The Theology of Warfare in Ancient Israel.* By Millard C. Lind. Herald, 1980, 232 pp.

*Yahweh Is a Warrior* is a study of the OT concept of holy war. The basic thrust of the discussion is that Yahweh fought for Israel "by means of miracle, not through the armies of his people" (p. 23).

In the first chapter the author discusses representative views of holy war and agrees with an element common to all of them—that is, that the concept of holy war in the OT deemphasizes the role of human participation. However, he disagrees that this concept is a product of late theological speculation and finds the root of the concept in the exodus.

Lind argues that the concept of holy war is also at the heart of Israel's theo-political structure in that Yahweh, Israel's only war hero, became Yahweh, Israel's only king (p. 32).

At the heart of Israel's understanding of her role in history is a tension between the revelation of Yahweh through prophetic word and Near Eastern myth in which kingship and military power were the vehicles by which the gods were related to history. Israel's victory over Egypt came about "by means of a prophetic personality," not by overt military activity.

The body of the book consists of a consideration of the relevant texts from the patriarchal period to the Deuteronomic materials. The discussion is carried out within the parameters of source-critical methodology. It is thorough, and an effort is made to represent the texts fairly.

In chap. 2, "Warfare in the Patriarchal Period," the author observes that the land was given by promise. The promise is thus "an alternative to violent political power. If one truly believes in the promise of grace that God will *give* the land, then one has no need to take the way of works by fighting for it" (p. 38).

There are a few accounts of violence in the patriarchal era, such as Abraham's battle with the kings of the plain. However, this is not connected with the promise of the land and is primarily a rescue operation.

In his discussion of the conquest of Canaan in chap. 2 the author engages in a lengthy discussion of the Song of Deborah. Since there is no mention of the actual participation of the tribes in the battle he concludes that the song represents an early witness to the fact that "human fighting was not efficacious in the winning of the battle" (p. 71). "Yahweh fought, not through his people, but through a miracle of nature" (p. 71). The concept of a synergistic relationship between Yahweh and his people in the battle is rejected by Lind.

In his discussion of the period from the Judges to David the author gives attention to several important Israelite battles in that period and concludes that the paradigm of the exodus obtains in this period as well. It is Yahweh's participation in the fighting that is basic to Israel's political structure.

The author notes a change in the theology of holy war in the period of the monarchy. The emphasis shifts from "Yahweh's miracle" to "the technology of the professional army" (p. 119), reflecting a change in the theo-political structure of Israel. Yet even though such a change took place there is evidence that the Davidic theology made an effort to retain the ideals of holy war established in the event of the exodus. The prophets were the conservative force that challenged the infusion of nationalistic ideals into the political structure at this time.

In his discussion of the Deuteronomic concept of holy war Lind observes that it is Israel's powerlessness that is paramount, and the "prophet rather than the king is seen as the successor of Moses" (p. 167).

This work represents a significant and refreshing approach to the concept of holy war, a concept that has often caused the OT to be characterized as cruel and barbarous. The reader may wish that the author had gone on to apply his thesis to the question of Christian pacifism, or to such perplexing questions as the treatment of the Canaanites, but this evidently was not consonant with his purposes.

The work is consistent and well thought out. While conservative readers may question the rigidity with which the author applies source-critical methodology, he has attempted to base his conclusions on a careful examination of the appropriate texts. It is the chronological development of the idea of holy war that is most affected by his methodology.

This work does not carry the concept of holy war outside the Former Prophets, but it establishes a basis for further work in the rest of the OT.

Thomas McComiskey

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

*Analytical Greek New Testament.* Greek-Text Analysis edited by Barbara Friberg and Timothy Friberg; Greek text edited by Kurt Aland *et al.* Baker's Greek New Testament Library 1. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981, xiii + 854 pp., \$19.95.

This volume is the first in a series of tools planned by the authors in connection with research conducted at the Computer Center of the University of Minnesota. It consists of the *UBSGNT* accompanied by a grammatical "tag" under each word. Not only are all verbs parsed; every part of speech receives some kind of identification. The abbreviations used may appear strange and even forbidding at first, but a few minutes of practice enable the reader to use the system with ease. The production—if my selective checking may be trusted—is remarkably free from error.

Of the various comparable tools already available for students, the two-volume work by M. Zerwick and M. Grosvenor, *A Grammatical Analysis of the Greek New Testament* (Rome: Biblical Institute, 1974-79), is surely the most helpful. The Fribergs' work has some distinctive advantages, such as the convenience of including the Greek text with the analysis. Furthermore these authors have applied to their work a sophisticated understanding of linguistics. In particular, their attention to discourse analysis sets this effort apart from all others.

I am not persuaded, however, that the work will be more appealing to students than Zerwick-Grosvenor. The latter includes useful comments on lexical, syntactical and even exegetical matters that are missing in Friberg. Conversely Friberg includes a great deal of information that is not particularly useful to someone with even an elementary knowledge of Greek. (What value is there in tagging *eis* as merely PA [preposition with accusative] every time it appears?) Indeed, after working through about a chapter most users will find that they can predict what the tag will be for a large majority of the words.

In a 57-page appendix, however, the authors have provided a remarkable outline of Greek grammar that every teacher of the language should carefully read. It is a largely successful attempt to combine traditional concepts and categories with contemporary linguistic insights. Particularly illuminating is a substantive discussion of deponent verbs (pp. 811-816).

Precisely because of its originality, this appendix raises numerous questions. We may briefly note one of these: the authors' treatment of articular participles, such as *ho pisteuōn*. The tag for the article gives the following information: determiner nominative masculine singular used as pronoun ("the one" = antecedent) and as relative pronoun ("who"). The authors state that this interpretation "represents the semantic structure, not a translation" (p. 808), and they seek to defend their view by showing the parallels between the articular participle and the relative pronoun used with finite verb (pp. 829-832). One cannot help wondering, however, whether their analysis of the article as both antecedent and relative pronoun would have occurred to them apart from the standard English translation ("the one who"). More substantiation is needed here.

In addition to theoretical questions, practical applications to specific texts will often prove controversial. This reviewer was surprised in particular by a few brief comments on tense (pp. 810-811). In view of the prominence given to verbal aspect by contemporary linguists, it is difficult to understand why the authors would use the traditional but unacceptable category of "punctiliar action" with reference to the aorist. And their claim of being able to determine (from the context, I assume) the aspectual sense of imperatival futures in specific passages suggests that they are not sensitive to the complexities of this topic. Note, for a striking example, how the aorist infinitive *pathein*, rather than the expected present, is used with *pollakis* ("many times") in Heb 9:26.

The issues raised by the Fribergs' approach are too important to be ignored. We eagerly anticipate their further contributions to Greek grammatical studies.

M. Silva

Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, PA