

BOOK REVIEWS

From Sabbath to Lord's Day: A Biblical, Historical, and Theological Investigation. Edited by D. A. Carson. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1982, 444 pp.

This is a book about the fourth commandment: "Remember the Sabbath day by keeping it holy. Six days you shall labor and do all your work, but the seventh day is a Sabbath to the Lord your God. On it you shall not do any work, neither you, nor your son or daughter, nor your manservant or maidservant, nor your animals, nor the alien within your gates. For in six days the Lord made the heavens and the earth, the sea, and all that is in them, but he rested on the seventh day. Therefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and made it holy" (Exod 20:8-11 *NIV*). It is also a book about Sunday worship and the relationship between Sabbath and Sunday. A team of seven—mostly British—scholars have undertaken to study and present a fresh interpretation of the topic that challenges the prevailing opinion throughout most of the Church on this issue.

A spate of books has been pouring out on the question of the fourth commandment and the Lord's Day in recent years (e.g. Rordorf, 1968; Francke, 1973; Jewett, 1971; Bacchiocchi, 1977; Beckwith and Stott, 1978; and others). The editor points out that this is surely due to the fact that this subject is fraught with implications involving the history of Christian doctrine, theology and ethics. In a sense it becomes a test case for one's views on the relationship between creation ordinance and law, the OT and NT, prophecy and fulfillment, and other important areas (p. 17).

In twelve tightly-packed, thoroughly-researched and well-documented chapters the authors develop their central thesis. The predominant view in the Church today holds that Sunday is the Christian day of worship and rest that corresponds to the Jewish observance of the seventh-day Sabbath. The Sabbath principle of one day in seven for rest and worship was established at creation, incorporated into the Mosaic code, and formally presented as moral law. Furthermore this view states that the Lord's resurrection on the first day of the week effected a legitimate shift to Sunday.

Contrary to the above understanding the present authors offer a reconstructed interpretation. First of all they deny four assumptions of the predominant viewpoint: (1) that the NT unambiguously develops a transfer theology from Sabbath to Sunday; (2) that the OT links the Sabbath command to a creation ordinance, thus making it a permanent norm; (3) that Sunday observance arose in the second century rather than in the apostolic Church; and (4) that the NT develops patterns of continuity and discontinuity to the OT law on the basis of the paradigm: moral/civil/ceremonial distinctions.

Instead they affirm that (1) Sunday worship arose in the NT period and that (2) Sunday worship was not perceived as the Sabbath in NT times. Furthermore the book argues that its intention is not "to challenge the value of the existing institution of Sunday as still in some form a weekly recreation and rest day, or to enter the debate about whether and how Christians should seek to have their preferences legislated for others in a pluralistic society. It is our intention, however, to challenge the view that gives biblical status to this Sunday tradition as binding for the individual or the church, and to challenge the theology that has been developed to give this support" (p. 403).

While one can grasp well the argument of the whole by reading the introductory chapter and the last chapter, the real substance of the book lies in the detailed Biblical and historical examination. In a series of heavily documented chapters (each averages 100-200 footnotes—often explanatory) arranged generally in an historical framework, the authors

have meticulously explored the question of the Sabbath day, law and Sunday (the Lord's day) worship. Some of the more significant chapters are reviewed below.

Harold H. P. Dressler sets forth a brief but excellent discussion of the Sabbath in the OT. The origin of the Sabbath and the seven-day week are traced back exclusively to the Hebrew people. It predates Sinai (no exact time is postulated) but is clearly articulated in the Mosaic legislation in commands that prohibit daily work (Exod 20:10) and prescribe death for violations (31:14). Dressler identifies two overarching purposes of the Sabbath observance: (1) It functions religiously as a sign of the perpetual Mosaic covenant between God and his people, which reminds them of his grace, his holiness and his authority over their lives; and (2) the Sabbath provides a social or humanitarian rest from work for persons and animals patterned after the seventh-day rest of creation. This rest of God in creation, the author argues, is not a creation ordinance but an eschatological mystery pointing to the final goal of all creation in the redemption revealed in the NT. The Sabbath, then, is not a universal ordinance for all mankind but a specific institution for Israel.

With equal expertise but more lengthy exposition, editor Carson explores exegetically the evidence in the four gospels. It is argued that Jesus never contravened the Sabbath itself but did set aside halakah regulations attached to the fourth commandment. Jesus views the law as prophetic of himself and his ministry. It is in this context, Carson claims, that the Sabbath rest is best understood as an eschatological sign of final salvation rest fulfilled in Jesus and hinted at in John 5. In any event the author argues that nowhere in Christ's teaching is the Sabbath viewed as a moral law and thus permanently binding on the Church, nor is there any hint in the gospels that Sunday takes on the character of Sabbath rest.

Next, Max M. B. Turner takes up the question of Sabbath, Sunday and the Law in Luke/Acts. Contrary to Seventh Day Adventist Bacchiocchi's impressive study, Turner argues against the view that Jesus identified his redemptive ministry with the Sabbath day itself in any significant way. Rather Luke sets forth Jesus as the one who fulfills the Law in the sense of promise-fulfillment by both validation of the Law and his transcending of it in his own demands (cf. R. Banks' similar thesis in *Jesus and the Law in the Synoptic Tradition*). The author also provides an extensive critique of J. Jervell's recent work (*Luke and the People of God*) by arguing that the Jerusalem council in principle made a break with the Law and instead exalted the lordship of Christ by the Spirit and its corollary, a new covenant people. Finally, Turner challenges Bacchiocchi's thesis that early NT Christianity observed the new Christian Sabbath on the seventh day (Sunday worship begins in the post-NT period in Rome) and also Beckwith's view that after the resurrection the Sabbath stripped of its casuistry was transferred from the seventh day to the first day of the week. Instead he sees in Acts 20:7 (and possibly 1 Cor 16:2) the beginnings of Sunday worship. Yet in the period covered by the book of Acts "there is no suggestion of a day of rest, nor even that Sunday has as yet an exclusive place in church worship compared to the other days of the week" (p. 137).

In chapter six D. R. De Lacey treats the Sabbath/Sunday question and the Law in the Pauline corpus. Paul's attitude toward the fourth commandment is part of the apostle's understanding of the whole old covenant Law question. After Paul's conversion to Christ the Law no longer played any role in his life. Instead of the old covenant with its legal stipulations the Christian now fulfills his obligations to God by fulfilling the law of love, by walking in the Spirit. Love and the Spirit keep Christian obedience from degenerating into formal legalism. It would have been helpful at this point if De Lacey could have told us also how Christian love might be preserved from degenerating into situational antinomianism. According to De Lacey Paul indeed did continue his Sabbath keeping (Acts 21:26; 23:6; etc.), but as a matter of individual conscience and not divine requirement. As to Sunday observance Paul neither forbids it nor imposes it on all Christians.

A brief theological and exegetical chapter by Andrew T. Lincoln explores the concepts

of Sabbath, rest and eschatology in the NT. He concludes that the mystical Sabbath rest of God on the seventh day of creation was an eschatological anticipation of the rest of salvation, fulfilled in the coming of Christ. Lincoln stresses that the theology of the NT writers did not include a transference of the rest of the seventh day to rest on the first day (p. 216).

At the core of the book are four historical chapters written by R. J. Bauckham. This material is excellent and well worth the price of the book. First, Bauckham presents a thorough exegetical and historical study on the term "the Lord's day" (chap. 8). He concludes that while it cannot be proved that Sunday worship began as early as the resurrection appearances, the evidence does tend to support the view that it began in the earliest Palestinian churches. Furthermore in all the early sources the "Lord's day" (Rev 1:10) is connected with Sunday, which is the day of resurrection.

Bauckham then examines the Sabbath and Sunday in the post-apostolic Church (chap. 9), in the medieval Church in the west (chap. 10), and in the Protestant tradition to the present (chap. 11). He argues that the Sabbath rest idea became associated with the Lord's day (Sunday) not in the patristic but in the medieval period. While the Jewish-Christian communities of Syria and Palestine as well as certain gnostic groups continued to keep the Sabbath, it is not until the third-fourth century that Gentile-Christian Sabbath observance occurs, apparently motivated by the desire of Christians to adopt certain customs from their Jewish neighbors. But the official Church leadership frowned on the practice, and the Council of Laodicea (A.D. 380) ruled against resting on the Sabbath, interpreting the Sabbath metaphorically or religiously, not as physical rest but as devotion to God of the whole life, not just one day but every day. The literal commandment to rest was for all these writers of the period a temporary ordinance for Israel alone. They do not refer to the fourth commandment at all in their paraenetic use of the Decalogue. Bauckham takes sharp issue with the principal defender of Sabbatarianism, S. Bacchiocchi, who holds that Sunday observance began in the second century primarily due to the bishop of Rome who syncretized the Christian day of worship with the pagan sun cult (pp. 269-273). Instead the author argues that in the second century the Sabbath commandment was never applied to the Christian Sunday, and there is no evidence that Sunday was regarded as a day of rest (p. 274). How the idea of "rest" on Sunday came into the Christian Church is quite complex. "Eighth-day" terminology for Sunday lent itself to connections with both eschatological rest and gnostic cosmological rest. The earliest clear reference to Sunday as a day free from work is in the fourth-century legislation of Constantine (A.D. 321), which required the total, public rest from work "on the most honorable day of the Sun." Eusebius (A.D. 330), on the other hand, provides the first extant Christian claim that the Sabbath has been transferred to Sunday. But in Eusebius it is the idea of a day of priestly worship that is transferred to Sunday, not a day of physical rest. The priests who worship, not the people who rest, provides the parallel. Most Christian writers of the third and fourth centuries ignore the "rest" idea because of antipathy to the view of Jewish "idleness" on the Sabbath.

In spite of the Constantinian legislation, Bauckham argues that true Sabbatarianism was a medieval, not a patristic, development. Although rooted in Augustine's theology, which included the central place of the Decalogue in Christian morality and the central image of the Sabbath understood spiritually as the rest in God of the restless heart, medieval theologians imposed more rigorous decrees on the strict observance of Sunday as a day of worship and physical rest (because it prevented the distraction of the mind from God). Aquinas argued that the fourth commandment had both a ceremonial and a moral aspect. The moral aspect required a man "to set aside some time for the things of God," but the ceremonial aspect, which required this time to be the seventh day, was abrogated by Christ. Thus a Sabbatarianism grounded in natural moral law became the basis of Catholic practice from the medieval age to the present.

Protestant tradition, on the other hand, in Luther first reacted against the strict Sabba-

tarianism of the medievalists, then reintroduced the practice in English Puritanism with even more rigor than the earlier churchmen. Total abstinence from not only work but all sports, pastimes and even worldly words and thoughts became obligatory for the vast majority of seventeenth-century Puritans. All of this was to allow the whole day (Sunday) to be devoted to worship and such Christian deeds of piety, mercy and charity as visiting the sick and relieving the poor as well as devotional reading, singing and prayers. However, the period also saw notable nonconformist non-Sabbatarian proponents such as John Milton (seventeenth century), William Paley (1785), Robert Barclay (1678), Philip Doddridge (1763) and J. A. Hessey (1860). At this time Seventh-Day Sabbatarianism also emerged in two major expressions. Earlier proponents of this position were mainly attached to the Seventh-Day Baptist churches (England in 1668 and America in 1671) who followed the Puritan doctrine except that they insisted on its attachment to Saturday and not Sunday (an invention of the papal Antichrist). Later the Seventh-Day Adventists (1840s) emerged as the largest group embodying these same convictions. Their chief scholarly evidence is presented in the impressive study of S. Bacchiocchi, *From Sabbath to Sunday: A Historical Investigation of the Rise of Sunday Observance in Early Christianity* (Rome, 1972). Sabbath observance, then, for over two million Christians of this persuasion "becomes a banner of loyalty to God in the last-day climax of prophetic fulfillment" (cf. Rev 14:12—a text close to the center of Adventist belief).

Finally, chap. 12 reviews the Biblical and historical evidence presented in the previous chapters and attempts to develop a theological proposal of the Sabbath-Sunday issue. Andrew Lincoln holds the anchor position, and for those who do not have the time to wade through the detailed evidence of the previous chapters this chapter provides an excellent summary of the whole work. Lincoln argues that the position in this book differs from the Adventist view not only on historical and Biblical evidence but also on the grounds that these confessedly most consistent Sabbatarians "fail to do justice to the newness of the eschatological situation brought about by God's actions in Christ and therefore to the discontinuity between Old and New Covenants" (p. 401). Equally this thesis differs sharply from those who view Sunday as the Christian Sabbath (argued for by R. T. Beckwith and W. Stott in *This Is The Day*, 1978). It differs also from the somewhat modified Sabbath-transference view espoused by the Orthodox and Roman Catholic branches of the Church, in which the most important claim made for Sunday is that it is a feast day and thus a day of rest for worship. Likewise the position finds fault with Barth's "holy day" view and P. K. Jewett's *The Lord's Day* (1971) in that the latter's Biblical exegesis and historical treatment are deficient and lead to false conclusions.

Finding W. Rordorf's work, *Sunday* (1968), close to their view they take exception to his view of Jesus' opposed negative attitude toward the Sabbath as well as to the connection he sees between the Lord's day and the Lord's supper.

Rather, the Sabbath rest of creation was temporarily and literally embodied in the Mosaic Law as a memorial of Israel's deliverance from Egypt and a sign of God's redemptive goal for mankind. Jesus fulfills the Sabbath rest in his death and resurrection. The first day of the week, the day of resurrection, becomes the memorial of the new creation of Christ. Yet the Lord's day also prefigures the future final rest of the consummation. Lincoln states that "it is the celebration on the Lord's day of the rest we already have through Christ's resurrection that now anticipates and guarantees the rest that is yet to be" (p. 399). Should Christians then rest at all? The position here advocated strongly suggests that this rest can be any day or extended part of a day, including Sunday, but that there is no Biblical or compelling theological reason why it has to be Sunday.

How should all this evidence be judged? There is a mine of historical information, but historians will have to assess the accuracy and validity of Bauckham's material and interpretation. As far as the Biblical discussions are concerned they are careful pieces of sound exegetical method. This reviewer finds on the whole only minor points of criticism in this

area. Theologically the book develops a convincing and coherent proposal based on the Biblical-historical reconstructions. However, the issues raised go to the heart of larger theological matters such as the relationship of the NT to the OT, the Christian and the Law, and ethical theory and its implications. Therefore the authors' proposals will face stiff opposition especially from Reformed, Catholic and Anglo-Catholic interpreters, not to mention Seventh-Day Adventists. Since Sabbatarianism in varying degrees has found a home in most of the contemporary Christian Church, I predict it will not easily yield to even this brilliant argumentation. However, I confess that this book has significantly influenced my thinking.

From Sabbath to Lord's Day will easily take its place as the work to be answered or agreed with in future discussions on the subject. The editor and contributors are to be commended for creating an excellent scholarly and careful piece. I warmly commend it to pastors, scholars and students as a must on their reading agenda.

Alan F. Johnson

Wheaton College, Wheaton, Il

Women and Church Leadership. By E. Margaret Howe. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1982, 256 pp., \$6.95.

This book has three major sections (Scriptural data, historical development, and the present situation), but it is the first section, the exegesis of Scripture, that will especially interest evangelicals who struggle with this issue. Since Howe received her doctorate under F. F. Bruce at the University of Manchester, and since she currently teaches NT and patristics at Western Kentucky University, readers might expect to find careful exegesis of the relevant passages of Scripture that bear on the role of women in the Church. However, those who come to this book hoping to find careful exegesis or further interaction with major points of conflict in the contemporary debate will be disappointed. (For further notes on the exegetical sections of the book see below.)

The historical section of the book deals with the development of the priesthood, especially in Roman Catholicism, and suggests some reasons why the priesthood should not be limited to men. It also discusses the development of the requirement for celibacy among Roman Catholic priests and the preference for married pastors among Protestant churches, and suggests that both groups have an inappropriate onesidedness in emphasis.

The final section of the book contains a survey of present-day attitudes of twelve major denominations (including Roman Catholic and Orthodox Churches) toward the ordination of women. It also reports at length the results of surveys Howe took among women in seminaries and women presently in church leadership positions.

This last section appears to have taken the major part of Howe's time in preparation for the book. Although the section is not a formal sociological study (for no evidence is given about the number of questionnaires sent out, the method by which recipients were selected, the number of respondents, etc.) the section does have value in showing quite forcefully that there are some very inappropriate and demeaning things that are being said about women by some people in our churches and seminaries. These comments should serve as a blunt reminder to evangelicals who take a more traditional view of the role of women in the Church that the orthodox doctrine of women should never be expressed in careless words or strident tones, which greatly discourage women from entering even those fields of Church ministry that people who hold to the traditional view would see as legitimate. When the theological battle becomes heated, too many noncombatants over whom the battle is being fought (namely, many of the women in seminaries and in various Church functions) are liable to be hit by the stray shots.

On the other hand, this long section contains page after page of quotations from women who share Howe's view that all areas of Church ministry, even ordained pastorates and

seminary faculty positions, are legitimate areas in which women may serve. This position is the tacit presupposition on which the entire large section is founded. Thus the chapter can have a tendency to persuade readers to accept Howe's position without ever formally arguing for it, for it merely cites the words of scores of women who assume that this position is true. Readers should be aware of this and base their decision on whether to agree with Howe's position not on the accumulated emotional force of the statements in this section (for an equal number of statements by women who hold the opposite position could well have been compiled by another author who held another position) but by the exegetical sections in which Howe attempts to prove the correctness of her position from Scripture itself.

The chapter "Biblical Exegesis" (pp. 45-65) contains Howe's analysis of most of the major Biblical texts relevant to the discussion of the role of women in Church leadership. Her most frequent conclusion on these passages is that they are "obscure" or "confusing," and she does not therefore offer her own interpretation of many of the passages or show awareness of any of the modern interpreters who have found these passages not confusing. A few quotations of her conclusions on these texts will demonstrate this point.

Her conclusion on 1 Tim 2:13 is this: "It is hard to imagine, then, why the priority in time reflected in the second creation narrative would carry the significance attributed to it in I Timothy 2:13" (p. 47). No explanation of Howe's own interpretation is given.

On 1 Tim 2:14, the next verse, Howe says, "The second line in this argument—'Adam was not deceived, but the woman was deceived'—is equally problematic" (p. 47). Then follows a discussion showing that Adam shared in guilt for the first sin. But this entire argument is a *non sequitur*, for the text mentions deception (the process leading to sin), not guilt (the result of sin). Yet the force of this line of argument is to imply that the reasoning of the author of 1 Timothy 2 (Howe avoids naming Paul as the author) is invalid.

Moving on to v. 15 Howe says, "If the writer's argument in I Timothy 2 seems obscure up to this point, his final comment occasions even more distress" (p. 48). The verse is an "enigma" (p. 48). Howe here criticizes the translations of J. B. Phillips and the *Living Bible* but makes no mention of any of the responsible presentations of the two or three most commonly held interpretations of this passage, interpretations that do make the passage comprehensible. The reader is not sure whether she is aware of these interpretations and has simply failed to mention them in order more forcefully to convince us that the passage is an "enigma" or whether she is not aware that these interpretations exist.

Of course the crucial issue in 1 Tim 2:11-15 is whether the appeal to the situation of Adam and Eve even before the fall (v 13 and perhaps v 14) means that Paul is here establishing a prohibition against women teaching or having authority over men that transcends particular local situations and becomes a timeless standard for the Church in all situations during the Church age. But Howe does not mention or respond to the claim that the appeal to Genesis establishes a timeless principle.

With regard to the curse in Gen 3:16, "in pain you shall bring forth children, yet your desire shall be for your husband, and he shall rule over you," Howe says, "It is strange that the bringing forth of children would be considered a curse when children were regarded in that society as a rich blessing from God" (p. 50). But this is surely to misunderstand what the text says: It does not say that the bringing forth of children itself was a curse, but the pain that would subsequently be associated with the bearing of children. Furthermore Howe shows no awareness of the strong argument by Susan Foh ("What is the Woman's Desire?", *WTJ* 37/3 [Spring 1975] 376-383) that "desire" means not sexual desire but "desire to conquer," the same meaning that the same Hebrew word has in Gen 4:7.

In her treatment of Eph 5:21-23, Howe attempts to explain the directive that wives be subject to their husbands just as the Church is subject to Christ: "In what way is the church subject to Christ? A difficult question to answer because the church is in fact 'His body' (Ephesians 5:23) and therefore so closely identified with him that distinctions become con-

fusing" (p. 54). No further explanation of the way the Church is subject to Christ is given.

The cumulative effect of such treatments of scriptural texts is perhaps the most distressing aspect of this book. 1 Timothy 2:13-14 is "problematic" (p. 47) and "seems obscure" (p. 48). 1 Timothy 2:15 "occasions even more distress" and is an "enigma" (p. 48). Genesis 3:16 is "strange" (p. 50). To explain the sense of Eph 5:21-23 is "a difficult question to answer" and one in which "distinctions become confusing" (p. 54). The reference to Sarah in 1 Pet 3:1-7 is "perplexing" (p. 56). The cumulative effect of these evaluations of the key texts relating to this issue is to imply that the teaching of Scripture in these crucial passages is incapable of being understood, and probably also that the reasoning of the Biblical authors in these passages was faulty. (Such a conclusion is not stated directly by Howe, but it is certainly implied by her judgments on these passages.) I fear that the actual result on readers who accept Howe's conclusions here will be a significant undermining of the authority of Scripture in their lives.

With regard to 1 Cor 11:3, "the head of every man is Christ, the head of a woman is her husband, and the head of Christ is God," Howe says, "The word *head* here must be understood not as 'ruler' but as 'source'" (p. 60). This interpretation is cited as if it were certain, and no reason is given to show why the clearly attested meaning "ruler over" (BAG p. 431) is not an acceptable meaning for the word "head" (*kephalē*). Furthermore no response is given to the formidable objection that a consistent sense of "source" cannot be applied in this verse: If "head" means "source" in the sense of "creator" or "origin of being," then this interpretation denies the eternity of Christ and says that he was created by the Father. But if some other sense of "source" is applied to the way in which God the Father is the "head" of Christ, then that sense cannot be consistently applied to the other two relationships in the verse: that of Christ to every man and that of man to woman.

Finally, Howe fails to mention the astounding paucity of solid lexical support for the meaning "source." In fact, such a meaning for the word *kephalē* is unknown to BAG (p. 430). The only instance of *kephalē* as "source" known to LSJ is one variant reading in a poetic text of unknown date by an unknown author at least four centuries before Christ (p. 945, II, d). Upon inspection even that text (Orphic *Fragments* 21a) is not unambiguous ("first" or "beginning of a series," with no necessary connotation of "source," is a likely meaning in context). Those who cite the example "source of a river" have simply been careless in citing LSJ: It is only in plural form ("heads") that it takes that connotation (from the many end-points at the beginning of a river), whereas *kephalē* in singular referring to a river means "mouth" (probably because there is only one "end-point" at the mouth of a river). Thus in spite of some recent popular articles claiming otherwise, the hard fact is this: No unambiguous instance of *kephalē* (singular) meaning "source" has yet been adduced by anyone supporting this interpretation. It is highly unlikely that such a sense would have been known to Paul or his readers in the first century.

Unless further and more certain lexical evidence is provided by those who want to make "head" mean "source" in the NT, we must simply say that on lexical grounds alone such a meaning has never been demonstrated unambiguously for any literature at or near the time of the NT and that therefore the meaning of "source" in 1 Cor 11:3 (and Eph 5:23) must be rejected both because it lacks lexical support and because it is contextually incompatible. Yet Howe shows no awareness of the substantial difficulties with her interpretation, nor does she provide any response to them.

Howe rightly sees that Paul allows women to pray and prophesy orally in the Church in 1 Cor 11:5, but then wrongly equates prophecy in NT churches with Bible teaching or preaching. She claims that because prophesying and teaching in the NT both result in "upbuilding and encouragement and consolation" for the Church (1 Cor 14:3) therefore "prophecy thus embodies the elements of Christian teaching and Christian preaching. It is teaching or preaching communicated orally to a congregation" (p. 58). She notes 1 Cor 14:31, where prophecy results in learning: "You can all prophesy one by one, so that all

may learn and all be encouraged."

But this is to make the mistake of arguing that the same result requires the same cause. (If one person is converted through reading a tract and another through attending an evangelistic campaign, the result is conversion in both cases, but that does not imply that a tract is the same thing as an evangelistic campaign.) It is true that Paul says that the congregation "learns" and is edified from both prophecy and preaching. But he clearly differentiates the two when he allows women to prophesy (1 Cor 11:5) but not to teach (1 Tim 2:12). And recent studies by David Hill (*New Testament Prophecy*, John Knox, 1979) and myself (*The Gift of Prophecy in 1 Corinthians*, University Press of America, 1982) have argued that there is a significant difference between the two in that prophecy is less authoritative, more spontaneous, and based on a sudden "revelation" from God, while teaching is more authoritative, less spontaneous, and based on exposition and application of the Biblical text.

Regarding 1 Cor 14:33-36, Howe says, "The situation involving the women, then, may well have resulted from some purely local problem that was disruptive of the worship situation. Perhaps women were chattering among themselves? More likely, a group of women were asking in a disorderly manner, perhaps challenging comments made by their husbands" (p. 63). Once again she provides no evidence from the text to support this supposition and does not explain how her supposition of a purely local situation can account for Paul's opening statement "as in all the churches of the saints, let the women keep silent in the churches" (1 Cor 14:33-34). A much more satisfactory solution to this text has been provided by James Hurley, *Man and Woman in Biblical Perspective* (Zondervan, 1981) 188-193, where he suggests that the passage prohibits the oral evaluation of prophecies by women in the congregation since this would involve assuming an authoritative or ruling function over the congregation.

Finally, with regard to 1 Pet 3:1-7 Howe attempts to explain Peter's statement that Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him "lord" (1 Pet 3:6). She says, "The reference to Sarah is perplexing, but the comment that she called Abraham 'lord' indicates that the writer has in mind Genesis 18:12. . . . Nor does the Genesis passage give any indication that Sarah 'obeyed' Abraham. Perhaps the writer of I Peter had in mind the fact that although Sarah considered herself past childbearing age, she yet 'submitted' herself sexually to her husband and as a result conceived a child" (p. 56). Howe does not mention the fact that no known instance of the Greek words *hypakouō* ("obey") or *hypotassō* ("submit") take the meaning "submit sexually." (No such meaning is mentioned in BAG or in LSJ.)

The reader should not pass quickly over such an argument. In 1 Peter 3 Howe encounters a Scripture text that is normally translated to say that Sarah obeyed Abraham. She does not find a record of obedience in Gen 18:12 and apparently does not consider the possibility that other sections of the Genesis narrative might have been in Peter's mind (such as 18:6 or much of the entire narrative of Sarah's life).

But more troublesome than this is the procedure of evading the apparent force of a text by saying "perhaps it means something else." When no evidence to support this proposed new interpretation is forthcoming, the argument takes on something of the following form: "I know it does not mean what it is always translated to mean, even though I am giving no clear evidence on which I base my knowledge; furthermore, I think it possibly means something very different, even though I am giving no evidence to support that possibility."

This is not exegesis. It is simply willful avoidance of the plain teaching of Scripture, based on a prior commitment of the will to a feminist position. If the facts of Scripture and exegetical research do not accord with that position, they are disregarded.

Where does this leave us? Does the evangelical world yet have a book that argues for a feminist viewpoint regarding the ordination of women while (1) still affirming the complete inerrancy and full divine authorship of all the NT passages, (2) seriously interacting not with absurd misinterpretations proposed somewhere in Church history but with the best

recent arguments of Susan Foh, George Knight, III, and James Hurley, and (3) not taking refuge in special pleading for hitherto unknown senses of key words? Do we yet have an evangelical feminist book that fully adheres to the inerrancy of Scripture and that responsibly and carefully uses accepted procedures for grammatical-historical exegesis? Many who found themselves unable to endorse the exegesis of Scripture texts in the earlier works of Richard and Joyce Boldrey, Paul Jewett, Patricia Gundry, Letha Scanzoni and Nancy Hardesty, and Peter De Jong and Donald Wilson, had expected that Margaret Howe, with her technical competence and excellent training, would produce such a book, but she has not done so. We begin to be troubled by a question lingering in our minds, a question painful yet perhaps now necessary to ask: If no statement of a feminist position by its best-trained proponents can meet such criteria, is it still appropriate to go on calling this position a legitimate alternative for those who hold Scripture as their final authority?

Wayne Grudem

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

The Literature of Theology: A Guide for Students and Pastors. By John A. Bollier. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1979, 208 pp., \$5.95 paper. *The Reader's Guide to the Best Evangelical Books.* By Mark Lau Branson. San Francisco: Harper, 1982, 207 pp., \$5.95 paper. *Reference Works for Theological Research: An Annotated Selective Bibliographical Guide.* By Robert J. Kepple. Lanham: University Press of America, 1981, 298 pp., \$23.00 cloth, \$12.25 paper.

The proliferation of books makes discriminatory reading in all disciplines ever more difficult. In the United States and Great Britain alone some 120,000 or more new titles appear annually, and publication in India now adds substantially to the number of works in English. Religious books constitute an impressive segment of the whole, and bibliographic control of theological literature becomes ever more toilsome.

Few resources are as helpful in charting an effective reading program as indices to the important books that fall into one's area of interest. The three bibliographic works listed above perform that important service at different levels of interest.

The oldest of these resources is that by Kepple. A bibliographic tool as fully serviceable to professors as to students pursuing theological study and research, it first appeared in 1978 with fewer listings and without descriptive annotations. It now appears in its second edition, revised and expanded, and has value even for librarians. It is a bibliography of bibliographies with many additional features. Oriented to research needs, it has many more entries than the other works—almost half again as many as Bollier and more still than Branson, who focuses mainly on distinctively evangelical books. Kepple's volume includes a detailed table of contents, an index of authors and editors, and of titles. It is accurate and up-to-date and is the more useful for its evaluative comments, although these in some cases are quite broad.

Bollier offers a literary guide for pastors and theological students now often bewildered by the countless religious works pouring from the presses. He aims to aid both Catholics and Protestants. His work is well-organized. It has a detailed table of contents and an author and title index and follows a chronological pattern within each section. Its list of bibliographic resources includes guides and manuals, encyclopedias and dictionaries, and other resources available in Biblical studies, systematic theology, historical studies and practical theology. More than 540 reference works are listed, plus a few monographs containing noteworthy bibliographies. Foreign-language works are largely out of purview. Emphasis falls on recent works except for theological classics of the past. The orientation is specially to Judeo-Christian literature, although some references are given for bibliographical sources for other religions.

Although not an evangelical, Bollier includes competent works from evangelical as well as nonevangelical sources. It is somewhat disappointing to see how few bibliographic

sources are given for materials on Christology. The utility of *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, which has been appearing in revised edition under the direction of Geoffrey Bromiley, seems understated, especially since Bollier's announced concern is mainly for students and pastors. Bromiley's own *Historical Theology. An Introduction* (1978) might have called for at least incidental mention, and also the five-volume *The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible* (1975).

Branson's volume, by contrast, aims to present evangelical literature at its best in an effort to rout anti-intellectual segments of North American evangelicalism. Branson limits titles to the period 1950-1980 and shuttles between reading for beginners and for mature Christians. The selections include some by authors who do not in fact consider themselves evangelical, or who are questionably so, yet who are broadly in the camp of Christian theism. As editor of the Theological Students Fellowship *Bulletin* Branson's target audience is mainly students enrolled in ecumenical contexts rather than on strictly evangelical campuses, and his concern is to channel evangelical conviction into the secular cultural climate. The volume is not primarily a bibliography of bibliographies but is much more concerned with specific recommended reading.

Branson begins with books about the Christian life and then proceeds to books for more serious readers on the Bible, the Church and the world. Somewhat awkwardly, therefore, books on Christian ethics and on Christian professional life appear last, in the context of the world. If none of C. S. Lewis' works gets into Bollier's guide (except as these are contained in indicated bibliographical lists), Branson has more mentions for Lewis and his works than for any other author, with Barth and Thielicke next, and Jacques Ellul and H. Richard Niebuhr not far behind. Also frequently mentioned are G. C. Berkouwer, Donald Bloesch, F. F. Bruce, Carl F. H. Henry, George Ladd, Leon Morris, James Packer, Bernard Ramm and others who have carried much of the burden of serious evangelical writing. Numerous listings for R. T. France, Richard Longenecker, I. Howard Marshall and Clark Pinnock attest the growing literary contribution of younger scholars. The evangelical left is represented by works of Ronald Sider and John Yoder, and process theology is included as within the evangelical framework. Branson's own social perspectives are clear from his enthusiastic commendation of Robert Webber's *The Moral Majority: Right or Wrong?*, which regards Moral Majority positions as no less objectionable than those of the World Council of Churches.

Several comments are appropriate to Branson's selections. First, not a few inclusions will disturb students on that decreasing number of evangelical campuses that shun the writings of nonevangelical scholars. Second, the inerrancy conflict, which holds the lime-light on some evangelical campuses, is here not a major concern, and Branson seems impatient with it. Third, there tends to be more visibility for some younger scholars reflecting anti-establishment revolt than for influential champions of traditional orthodoxy. Cornelius Van Til is unmentioned, and Gordon Clark gets less mention than his works merit. Fourth, the great bulk of meritorious evangelical literature is nonetheless included. Bromiley's *Historical Theology* is here, as is *The Zondervan Pictorial Bible Dictionary*, and substantial references appear to works on Christology (although it should be remembered that Bollier's volume is a bibliographic reference resource). Branson mentions noteworthy NT guide lists by R. T. France and by Anthony Thiselton and D. A. Carson and tells of a forthcoming series of bibliographies now being edited by Aune and Branson, the first of these containing comments on over 900 books on Jesus and the synoptic gospels. Fifth, Branson's evaluative references will not elicit universal evangelical enthusiasm, especially when as now and then books designated "most helpful" are concessive, sometimes highly so, as when he touts Dale Moody's *The Word of Truth* as first-rate evangelical theology.

For all that, Branson's volume is useful for a number of reasons. While not all evangelical readers need prodding to read subevangelical works, students will need to develop lucidity and competence in dealing with them. There is a range of titles here that, if too

much neglected, can only lead to impoverishment. More than that, Branson puts the evangelical reader in direct touch with a considerable spectrum of evangelical literature in a day when not every pastor and student can be counted on to find his way through the prolific variety of religious books and when a publisher's label is no longer a guarantee of the perspective of the authors it publishes. Branson's work has additional features. One is a compilation of books evangelical leaders identify as their favorites for both personal and professional reasons. Readers may be impressed both by the agreements and disagreements. Yet evaluative comments are sometimes so broad that one gains the impression, right or wrong, that the author seeks a hearty welcome for openmindedness in a sub-evangelical environment prone to offer evangelical acceptance only on its own terms.

C. F. H. Henry

Hillsdale College

Numbers. By A. Noordtjiz. Bible Student's Commentary; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983, ix + 304 pp., \$16.95.

Since good evangelical commentaries on Numbers are too rare, any addition is welcome, especially this good work by Noordtjiz. Like his previous volume on Leviticus, this one continues the high standard of scholarship that marks this series as a whole.

The short introduction (pp. 1-16) is quite brief but packed with useful information. The author gives an admirable defense of the historicity of Moses, although his treatment of "The Origins of Numbers" is bound to raise a few eyebrows. Also questionable are certain views of his discussed in the "Publisher's Note" (pp. vii-viii), which should be read carefully. A healthy corrective to Noordtjiz's views can be found in Aalders' introduction to *Genesis* and Gispén's to *Exodus*, both in this same series.

In the exposition (pp. 17-304) a portion of the *NIV* text is printed with the comments following immediately. The exegesis tends to be brief (1 page per 6 verses), although the author will frequently discuss Hebrew words and refer to other works. Unfortunately footnotes and bibliography are lacking. Also the absence of subject and author indices diminishes the usefulness of this book.

Any commentary on Numbers may be evaluated by its treatment of certain issues and topics. First, why does 1:1-10:10 belong here and not in Leviticus? How does its being part of Numbers affect its structure and coherence as a whole? Second, do chaps. 18-19 belong where they are? Do they contribute to the theological significance of the narrative or do they interrupt the flow of the story? On these two issues Noordtjiz is hardly helpful. Third, in the light of the discussions about the "amphictyony hypothesis" one wishes for a more detailed treatment of the name and number of the tribes in Genesis 49, Numbers 1, 26, and Deuteronomy 33. The author needs to expand his brief discussion here. Fourth, the author needs to discuss the theology of Numbers as a whole in the introduction, bringing if possible a sense of coherence and unity to the book.

While the author's detailed exegesis is mostly sound, certain spots may be improved. What, for instance, is the relationship between chaps. 11 and 12? Did the giving of the Spirit cause Aaron and Miriam to challenge the uniqueness of Moses now that others have prophesied? Again, while Noordtjiz discusses Balaam's oracles well, he needs to show clearly the contrast between the "ideal" Israel in chaps. 23-24 and the "real" Israel in chap. 25.

In spite of these shortcomings, this volume is a welcome addition. It is certainly more conservative than Budd's in the Word series and more detailed than Wenham's in the Tyndale series. It complements Wenham's work well, and the two together will serve as the standard references till other commentaries appear on the scene.

Samir Massouh

Elmbrook Christian Study Center

Isaiah: The Glory of the Messiah. By Alfred Martin and John Martin. Chicago: Moody, 1983, 193 pp., \$7.95 paper.

In 1956 Alfred Martin contributed the Isaiah volume in the Everyman's Bible Commentary series. In this newer book his son joins him in producing a popular, nontechnical book intended for lay persons and beginning students. The authors put forth "a literal, premillennial and dispensational approach" (p. 5). Those who want such an approach certainly find it here.

In the introduction (pp. 11-31) the authors defend well the unity of Isaiah's book, giving the standard argument in favor of a single author. Their treatment of other topics, such as historical background, setting, style, and relationship between Isaiah and Micah, is too brief to be of much value for the serious student.

The exposition covers pages 33-171. Like Delitzsch they divide the content of Isaiah into ten sections: seven in chaps. 1-39, three in chaps. 40-66. The treatment is brief and general, mostly surveying the Biblical data. On occasion a crucial exegetical issue receives some detailed discussion. Various options for the Immanuel prophecy are discussed, although the view that the child might be Maher-Shalal-Hash-Baz is not treated adequately. The four titles in chap. 9 are discussed well, although "Father of Eternity" needs more elaboration. Might not this title anticipate John 1:1-5? In chaps. 40-48 one wishes for a more detailed treatment of the "new exodus" and its typological significance for the NT writers. The same is true for the "Servant of the Lord," especially the crucial passage 49:1-7.

In spite of these shortcomings this book is a good starting point for beginners who need to feel their way through Isaiah's magnificent opus. One can only wish that the writers will expand the introduction substantially and address the issues mentioned above.

Samir Massouh

Elmbrook Christian Study Center

Biblical Authority: A Critique of the Rogers/McKim Proposal. by John D. Woodbridge. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1982, 237 pp., \$8.95.

This book by John Woodbridge of Trinity Evangelical Divinity School is a response to a volume that appeared in 1979 written by Fuller professor Jack Rogers together with Donald McKim, a former graduate student who is now a professor at Dubuque Theological Seminary. The Rogers/McKim thesis was that the historic doctrine of inspiration was the affirmation of the infallibility of the Bible in matters of faith and practice with the possibility of errors appearing in the nonessential marginal material. It was a case against inerrancy as advanced by old Princeton and a defense of a less stringent view than that. I suspect that Fuller Seminary more or less unofficially commissioned the Rogers/McKim book to explain the basis of its own neo-evangelical moves in various fields of theology during the past couple of decades. The effort provoked John Woodbridge to produce an erudite refutation of the thesis and the experiments based on it, thus opening a new skirmish in the battle for the Bible among evangelicals. Kenneth Kantzer writing in the foreword speaks of a battle raging over the authority of the Bible and considers it "worth fighting." Evidently to this former Trinity dean and *Christianity Today* editor if Woodbridge is not right and Rogers/McKim wrong the ordinary believer would not know when to trust his Bible. It would seem that we are seeing the battles of the 1920s being refought on the battlefield known as evangelicalism.

Though he writes in a friendly spirit, Woodbridge takes serious exception to the Rogers/McKim proposal and levels basic objections to it, in particular that the authors misconstrued the evidence from the Church fathers and theologians to support a limited inerrancy position they did not hold. Rogers/McKim were out to find precedents in history for their

belief and skewed the data in their favor. They wanted to give historical justification and dignity to their own desire to limit the truth of the Bible to the areas of faith and practice and permit critical conclusions to hold in other regions. Their book is a piece of apologetics in defense of this thesis. Woodbridge contends that their apologetic goal overwhelmed their commitment to an even-handed treatment of the historical sources.

What shall I say in evaluation of this response? I think that there is much truth in what Woodbridge is saying. However difficult it may be to modern Bible scholars, the Scripture principle as it developed after Marcion located divine authority in the words of the Bible and attributed to the text a very complete infallibility and inerrancy. Though harshly critical of this development, Edward Farley has made this plain in his recent *Ecclesial Reflection: An Anatomy of Theological Method* (Fortress, 1982). It is not easy to attribute to an Augustine or a Calvin the sort of view that Charles Briggs and now Rogers/McKim want to defend in the modern situation. If I could change history around, I would wish that Woodbridge had written a history of the doctrine of inspiration first and then Rogers/McKim had replied to it. In that sequence Woodbridge would have presented the conservative line historically with which he is in close agreement, and Rogers/McKim could have explained the factors that gave them difficulties with it. As it stands, I feel badly for everyone concerned: for Rogers/McKim because they climbed so far out on a limb only to have it cut off behind them, and for Woodbridge for having to direct his amazing talents to the task of refutation when they would be better used in positive exposition. One can only stand back in amazement at these two massively documented volumes and drink in the results of marvelous scholarship on all sides. Just to have this exchange tells us something about the growing expertise of the up-and-coming evangelical scholars. In defense of Rogers/McKim I would say that although I believe Woodbridge dealt their narrow thesis a deadly blow the thrust of their work on behalf of God and the gospel is very positive and evangelical and I sincerely hope people will not write them off as if they were false evangelicals or compromisers. I have some remarks to address to the Woodbridge thesis too that may indicate some basis for their concerns.

First, as Bromiley points out in *Scripture and Truth* (ed. D. A. Carson and J. Woodbridge; Zondervan, 1983), the fathers of the Church seriously neglected the humanity of the Bible and are not such a good example for us today in that respect. In wanting to correct this mistake in the "historic" view Rogers/McKim are right to speak out, and Woodbridge gives us no help. Second, it is not so easy to contain a thinker like Luther in the Princeton framework, a man who in a preface to the Revelation could detect nothing of the Spirit in it and who challenged anyone to harmonize Paul and James on justification by faith, offering him the reward of a doctor's degree (cf. Kümmel, *The New Testament*, p. 26). On the whole though I think Woodbridge is a very reliable guide through the historical material.

The real issues that underlie the Rogers/McKim thesis and their desire to prove it are not on stage in this exchange, and Woodbridge does not have to deal with them directly. Let me list a few questions that lead them to their proposal and its defense. This is important because it would be a mistake for evangelicals to read Woodbridge and become smug in his hardline position, not appreciating the hard questions it has to answer, questions that Rogers/McKim were trying to ease for us in their suggestion. Does the Bible teach its own inerrancy? R. K. Harrison thought it did not (*Revelation and the Bible*, ed. C. F. H. Henry). But if it does not, why are we defending this tradition? Do we know what inerrancy means? Does anyone own an inerrant Bible today? How much harmonizing and special pleading do we have to do? What about the antics evangelicals go through to explain why a problem text does not say what it says? And in the end does not the Woodbridge thesis mean that unless we believe Methuselah died at age 969 we do not believe the Bible and are not submissive to God's authority over us? Is this not a tragic trivialization of our doctrine from which Rogers/McKim at least release us?

Woodbridge may understand the tradition better than Rogers/McKim, but there is no

proof here that he understands the Bible better or better prepares us to face the modern issues.

Clark H. Pinnock

McMaster Divinity College, Hamilton, Ontario

Charisms and Charismatic Renewal: A Biblical and Theological Study. By Francis A. Sullivan, S. J. Ann Arbor: Servant, 1982, 184 pp., \$8.50.

Sullivan, professor of dogmatic theology at the Gregorian University, attempts a clarification of charismatic experience and of ensuing descriptive terminology that is both sober and timely. Sullivan insists that a variety of operative charisms, whether the more unusual or more simple, are neither peripheral nor accidental phenomena. Rather, they are vital in upbuilding the mystical body of Christ. They may serve as well to shake the Church out of complacency, which inevitably creeps into any institution, prayer being a primary factor in the current renewal of charisms.

A charism is defined as both a grace-given capacity (not just a natural talent alone) and a willingness for some kind of service. An immediate intervention of the Spirit, sovereignly and freely given, for the purpose of equipping a believer for a specific service is what produces the experience of a charism (these charisms being distinct from the gifts of faith, hope and love, which ordinarily result from the indwelling Spirit). Sullivan rightly views contemporary experience as being helpful in interpreting the NT descriptions of charismatic activity available to us, descriptions that might otherwise seem to be the product of a remote *Sitz im Leben*.

Sullivan offers a perceptive critique of the charisms Paul has so briefly described in 1 Corinthians 12-13; Romans 12. E.g., *pneumatika* (1 Cor 12:1) should be taken as "gifts of inspiration," which for Paul were not at all confined to glossolalia and prophecy but included many other gifts of grace (*charismata*), many services (*diakoniai*), and many workings of God (*energēmata*). Contrary to Corinthian understanding it is obvious to Paul that amidst this variety the excellence of a gift is not measured by the apparent degree of inspiration but by the degree to which it contributes to the upbuilding of the community. Paul's use of *pneumatika* reflects both the Corinthian use of the term as indicating primarily tongues and prophecy and Paul's own critique of this misuse. Correspondingly, *pneumatikoi* (1 Cor 3:1) for Paul means being "spiritual people," not as for the Corinthians simply being "charismatic." Only those who live in the Spirit are spiritual people. Having abundant gifts does not at all guarantee that a person is walking in love (cf. also J. Painter, "Paul and the *pneumatikoi* at Corinth," in *Paul and Paulinism: Essays in Honour of C. K. Barrett* [ed. M. Hooker and S. Wilson; London, 1982, pp. 273 ff.]).

Sullivan briskly dismisses faulty dispensational theory (pp. 41, 115), with its refusal to recognize genuine charisms of prophecy and tongues beyond the apostolic period, as a model out of phase with Biblical scholarship. There is criticism of the presupposition of automatic sacramental efficacy re a prescribed activity of the Holy Spirit in that Sullivan wants to define a more Biblical sense of "baptism in the Spirit" as a "new presence and working of the Spirit" (p. 61). An implicit anteriority of faith to receiving an experiential element of the gift of the Spirit is apparently detected from the Acts data, but it must be said that Sullivan's attitude toward historicity in Acts is too cavalier. It is inadequate to simply follow Haenchen's skepticism re Luke's supposed creation of the various pentecostal episodes. Notice might have been taken of other points of view, like C. Hemer, "Luke the Historian," *BJRL* 60 (1977) 37 ff.; I. H. Marshall, "The Significance of Pentecost," *SJT* 30 (1977) 347 ff.

This experiential element of the gift of the Spirit (an immediate intervention) does however leave room for a growth process in application of a particular charism, but Sullivan's main stress is that a new "sending" of the Spirit need not at all be tied to receiving a

sacrament. Following Aquinas, Sullivan posits that real sendings of the Spirit occur when Christians are "baptized in the Spirit" (p. 70). These sendings are repeatable in the needed forms (with Turner and Haya Prats). Renewal and/or charisms are equated with a conscious immersion in the life of Christ, not with sacraments per se. E.g., Sullivan cuts the supposed link of charismatic gifts with water baptism. Such a theoretical dependence is cautiously challenged. Here we have a helpful amplification of his earlier piece, "'Baptism in the Holy Spirit': A Catholic Interpretation of the Pentecostal Experience," *Greg* 55 (1974) 65, where a Christian person need "not try to interpret the pentecostal experience merely in relation to Baptism and Confirmation, as an 'actuation,' 'release,' 'manifestation' or 'reviviscence' of gifts already received in those sacraments."

Charismatic leadership gains authority based on recognition of a charism for leadership rather than on being given an office to which authority is attached. The term "charismatic ministry" should describe the various kinds of services that Christians perform. Charismatic worship, both in prayer groups and eucharistic celebration, may include prophecy and tongues and/or collective singing in tongues. Congregational prophecy is a form of inspired speech and should function along with "discernment of spirits," a charism that assists in evaluating the utterance (with Dunn and Grudem). Criteria re this evaluation are context, effectiveness, timeliness and behavior (cf. *Did.* 11:8, 10), not prophetic style or decibel level.

Re Corinthian glossolalia Sullivan concludes that it was a language-like human speech, unintelligible to both speakers and hearers, useful primarily as a form of private nonrational prayer. This makes possible an inner attitude of praise and thanksgiving that could be expressed collectively as well as privately. Speaking in tongues when prayed over is insufficient evidence to determine whether a real "baptism in the Spirit" has occurred. Rather, the proof will be the subsequent transformation of a person's life.

Re charisms of healing, each healing is an individual, nonsacramental, sovereign and totally gratuitous act of grace. Sullivan demolishes the hypothesis that healing is somehow in the atonement, so that all that is needed now is "faith." Godly believers may have to contend with a cross of unhealed illness. A presumptuous ministerial theory of "faith" healing may only add an intolerable burden of guilt to Christians who are ill. Sullivan distinguishes between faith or trust in God's loving care and confidence that God is going to manifest his power to heal. The real significance of Jesus' healings is that they point to a future victory over the power that death holds over mankind. Charismatic healings give a foretaste of the resurrection of the body and are signs of God's power to raise the dead to eternal life.

Sullivan does not attempt to answer every question raised by NT texts or by Christian experience, but his discussion is always constructive in arguing for solutions. There is much that is pastorally relevant, and ideas not generally treated by commentators receive a sympathetic hearing. Overall Sullivan achieves a heuristic contribution to the role of NT charisms within the framework of applied evangelical theology.

Paul Elbert

London Bible College

Handmaid of Theology: An Essay in Philosophical Prolegomena. By Winfried Corduan. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981, 184 pp., \$7.95.

All too often theologians ply their trade without a proper understanding or awareness of their philosophical presuppositions. Winfried Corduan, professor of philosophy and religion at Taylor University, has directed his first full-length book to reminding the evangelical community of "the inevitable reliance of theology on certain philosophical concepts" (p. 9). It is a timely and relevant publication.

As the title indicates, Corduan limits his discussion to prolegomena, a form of philosoph-

ical inquiry that attempts to uncover the presuppositions and concepts that allow the appropriation of special revelation. He also distinguishes the starting points for prolegomena and theology proper. Unlike Barth who locates both from above ("in God Himself," p. 32), or Rahner who locates both from below (in man's ability to stand open to God, p. 33), Corduan views the proper starting point for prolegomena from below, with man (p. 36). Theology, however, is from above—i.e., God and his revelation.

This is a very important feature of the book: Philosophy can establish the possibility of revelation, but the content of revelation moves beyond the sphere of philosophy to theology.

There is a systematic comparison and analysis of alternative views on various problems with a statement and defense of the author's position. It becomes a rather predictable format on which the reader can depend. It is specially conducive to the dissemination of information. The several chapters can be summarized under four categories.

First, several anthropological views are rejected in favor of the Biblical "body-soul unit," and Rahner is cited in support of "an intrinsic potential in all men to hear God" (p. 68). Second, revelation is addressed in both its historical and propositional dimensions. There is an interesting discussion on the possibility of Biblical inerrancy on philosophical grounds (p. 98). Third, God's existence and revelation in Jesus Christ constitute a theological section. And fourth, new ground is broken in soteriology with a philosophical discussion on the possibility and meaning of the Biblical doctrine of regeneration.

In our opinion Corduan has accomplished his goal—viz., "to call attention to the need for serious philosophical thinking by the theologian" (p. 9). The book would be an excellent college- and seminary-level text to introduce students to the relation of philosophy to theology. Evangelicals especially will find the work challenging and helpful.

Robert W. Herron, Jr.

Southern Bible College, Houston, TX

Epistemology: The Justification of Belief. David L. Wolfe. Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity, 1982, 92 pp., \$3.95.

David Wolfe's first book is an excellent contribution. In this brief volume (70 pages of text) the professor of philosophy at Gordon College ably summarizes some of the complex issues of epistemology. Since Descartes and especially since Kant, epistemology has dominated philosophy and theology. Accordingly chap. 2, a masterful topical summary of divergent answers to this question, is required reading for all those engaged in theological study. Particularly helpful in this survey is the coverage of some of the recent discussions in philosophy of science (Popper, Kuhn, etc.).

As the subtitle indicates, Wolfe considers the justification of belief as a crucial dimension of epistemology. Not "Do we know?" but "What is our warrant for claiming to know?" is his principal concern. Consequently chap. 3 deals with criteriological questions. Wolfe advocates consistency, coherence, comprehensiveness and congruity as standards for warrant (pp. 50-55). Starting where we are ideologically, we evaluate the warrant for positions already espoused. If these are found wanting, alternatives are tested until a justifiable position is found. Such a process is never conclusive. Not every known position has been examined, some positions are not known to us, and some new positions may be devised. In addition Wolfe's position incorporates personal factors. Wolfe nonetheless rejects skepticism or relativism because of the warrantability of belief. He thus chooses a middle ground between certainty and relativism. Though our epistemic judgments are never beyond revision in the light of future examination, not all beliefs are equally justifiable.

If I have one criticism it is Wolfe's failure to set this methodology (when applied to the identity of Scripture and the authenticity of Christianity) in the larger context of the inter-

nal witness of the Holy Spirit to the Word of God in the life of the believer. For less ultimate affirmations by the believer, this methodology is very helpful. It seems less satisfactory if used as the fundamental justification of the Word of God and theological affirmations.

Stephen R. Spencer

Grand Rapids Baptist Seminary, Grand Rapids, MI

The Justification of Religious Belief. By Basil Mitchell. New York: Oxford University, 1981, 180 pp., \$4.95.

The title of this work by the Oxford professor of the philosophy of the Christian religion is slightly misleading. The book does not aim to present an apologetic for Christian theism but to explore issues in what might be called the philosophy of apologetics, such as the possibility of rational support for religious belief and the method by which it may be undertaken.

Part 1 argues that the existence of God can be neither disproved nor proved. The argument is admitted by Mitchell to be condensed and unable to satisfy either believers or unbelievers (pp. 4, 34). The superficial dismissal of the notion of necessary existence in the treatment of the ontological argument (pp. 22-23) is especially deplorable in view of the extensive discussion of this topic by Alvin Plantinga and others. Mitchell displays a distaste for rigorous proof in matters of faith and prefers to adopt a looser procedure of cumulative argument, which he defends in part 2 with considerable ingenuity.

The strategy of part 2 is to disarm the criticism by Antony Flew of the ten-leaky-buckets tactic, making an appeal to accepted practice of argumentation in the areas of critical exegesis and history. Mitchell is well aware that that the analogy between the literary and historical cases and the theological is not decisive and proceeds to advance his cumulative argument in defense of cumulative argumentation by appeal to T. S. Kuhn's doctrine of scientific paradigms, the choice of which cannot be determined by conclusive proofs.

The discussion of competing scientific paradigms and conflicting metaphysical world-views introduces issues of a fundamental nature that invite a more systematic treatment than even the carefully-argued but all-too-brief consideration in the present work admits of. While light is shed on significant features of the psychology of controversy, the upshot of the analysis is only that reasons can be given on both sides of a basic theoretical dispute while the ultimate decision is not settled by demonstrative proof or even by strict probability. This can hardly be counted as a theoretical justification of a paradigm or world-view. The conclusion to be drawn from an alleged analogy is not that religious belief is capable of rational support but that theoretical systems, scientific and philosophical, are devoid of solid foundation or rational justification.

Mitchell's methodology is in the classic tradition of Butler's *Analogy* and exhibits both the strengths and the weaknesses of that type of defense of revealed religion. Close and careful reasoning bringing into focus the weaknesses of objections to Christianity is conjoined with the presentation of a diluted version of the faith, itself admittedly incapable of rigorous demonstration or verification. He desires to defend "traditional Christian theism" but refuses to provide a precise formulation of what is to be defended (p. 3). At the conclusion of the book, however, he is quite explicit in rejecting the infallible authority of Holy Scripture while clinging to a vague notion of inspiration (pp. 152-156).

While there is much to appreciate in Mitchell's work, the outcome is disappointing. He aims at the defense of a Christianity with truth-content but allows neither the certainty of rational evidence nor infallible revelation. He is left with belief that comes short of knowledge. The theological framework appears to be lacking in which Scripture is regarded as self-authenticating and the believer assured by the testimony of the Holy Spirit that it is

the Word of God.

The heaping up of analogies with questionable procedures in various domains of theory and practice could well be regarded by Flew as an attempt to carry water in a set of sieves inserted the one within the other.

William Young

University of Rhode Island, Kingston

Money and Power. By Jacques Ellul. Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity, 1984, 173 pp., \$5.95.

Readers interested in the latest of the steady stream of books from the pen of Jacques Ellul will be happy to learn of the recent translation of one of his older works. *Money and Power*, first published in 1954 with a second edition in 1979, is a theological study that examines the most practical of subjects—money—in light of the Biblical revelation. This translation of *L'Homme et l'argent* by LaVonne Neff comes with a foreword by David Gill and an "afterword" by Ellul from the 1979 edition. Readers need not fear that the work is thirty years behind the times for, in Ellul's words, since 1950 "much has changed in appearance, little in reality." Besides, those familiar with the prophet from Bordeaux know that his creative insights and provocative analyses always make for valuable reading.

Our problem with money, writes Ellul, is that it has become abstract and impersonal. As a result we tend to subordinate the individual to the collective and look for answers in a better economic system. This search for a systemic solution is not only wrongheaded, for it overlooks the subjective element of fallen human nature; it is also hypocritical and cowardly, for it constitutes a cop-out. We blame the system and deny the importance of our personal responsibility and individual actions. Collective action is not unimportant. Far from it—but it must always be rooted in a deep sense of individual responsibility.

In the OT wealth represents God's blessing and reward. The stories of Abraham, Job and Solomon remind us of this. Wealth was even a "sacrament," Ellul suggests, a material sign of a greater spiritual reality. Wealth was bestowed freely, it represented God's superabundant grace, and it had both prophetic and eschatological characteristics. The sacramental sign, however, was always subordinated to the spiritual reality it signified, and our mistake today is to directly identify wealth with blessing.

Jesus Christ abolished the sacramental nature of wealth, for he himself is the ultimate blessing: "What would the gift of wealth mean now that God has given His Son? He is now our only wealth." Jesus also shows us the true nature of money. It is not only a material reality that raises moral issues but also a spiritual power that is both active and personal. It is a god that we are tempted to worship. The problems it raises are not only external (oppression, for example) but internal (temptation), and Jesus forces us to choose between it and the true God.

Of special interest in *Money and Power* is Ellul's fourth chapter ("Children and Money"), a discussion that is as unusual as it is needed and helpful. How can we teach our children about money? First, we must adopt a "strict realism" that rejects all idealism and abstraction. Then by attitudes and actions, examples and opportunities, parents must assume a "dialectical" position. We must show our children, for example, that money is useful and necessary, but not for that reason "good," that it is not contemptible, but not respectable either, or something that we worship. Finally we must avoid moralism and negativism and must realize that a spiritual power can only be fought with the spiritual weapon of prayer.

Ellul addresses these and a host of other practical questions. Who are the poor, and how can the Christian respond to them with meaning and integrity? What are we to make of the many Biblical passages that seem to automatically condemn the rich and bless the poor? What about savings accounts, insurance, asceticism and giving? After reading Ellul's theological study, one is impressed with the sheer number and extent of passages in the Bible

that bear on the topic of money. Readers will certainly not agree with all of his conclusions or with his exegesis, but that is no matter. As Gill writes in the foreword, Ellul never writes merely to enlighten a theoretical problem or to elicit intellectual assent. His purpose is to incite action, provoke our thinking and affect our lives. Those open to such a spiritual challenge will by no means be disappointed by Ellul's creative analysis of this sensitive and vital issue.

Daniel B. Clendenin

Drew University, Madison, NJ

Reformation: A Picture Story of Martin Luther. By Dietrich Stienwede. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983, 55 pp., \$6.95.

With the courtesy of various European archives and museums the author has rendered a valuable educational service to beginning students of the Reformation by collating this pictorial history with a running commentary. An elementary yet historically accurate text accompanies nearly 100 well-produced illustrations. Given that the eye is often the shortest route to the brain, appreciation of the period should be enhanced by the attractive coupling of an informative straightforward discussion with a selection of contemporary woodcuts, engravings, portraits, sketches and selected pages from key manuscripts. Many of these are in color, like the woodcuts of Luther as monk and lecturer and the title page of the 1546 Wittenberg NT. The workmanship of Lucas Cranach is prominent. In addition to Luther materials, contemporaries like Müntzer, Melancthon, Zwingli, Calvin and Ignatius are woven into the story. The contemporary artwork serves as a visual aid, conveying the reader into the time frame of the characters. One gains a sense of experience of this important moment in western civilization. If this was the author's purpose he has achieved it—and in a pleasant way. A chronology of events (as they relate to Luther) is complemented by a useful map of the continental scenario.

Paul Elbert

Halyard School, Bedfordshire, England

Luther: A Life. By John M. Todd. New York: Crossroad, 1982, 396 pp.

This book by a Roman Catholic scholar reflects the generally more favorable evaluation of Luther that has marked recent Roman Catholic historiography. The author attempts to give a balanced picture of the great Reformer as a "man of gigantic accomplishment, a man, however, who was rather less than the hero and rather more than the mere villain of some older biographies" (p. xix). In this I believe Todd succeeds rather well. Although he does not ignore the pronounced weakness in Luther's character, he does avoid the easy temptation to exaggerate these out of proportion to Luther's great strengths and achievements. The concluding words of the book are an apt summary of Todd's presentation: "My principal image is of a man driven, driven by a passion for the Divine, driven too, by a horror of evil; convinced of its eventual futility, he was ever conscious of its threat, and his life was one of prayer. . . . Under the rumbustious lover of life lay sensitivity, intelligence and imagination, and a failure to come to terms with a world which was never good enough, a failure he found confirmed in the crucifix" (p. 373).

While the book presents a good introduction to Luther as a man, it is less successful in giving us Luther as a theologian. One finds no discussion of some of the major emphases of the New Theology (e.g., vocation or the universal priesthood), and even such a crucial issue as justification by faith receives rather cursory treatment. This is a conscious choice by Todd, who dealt with the theological issues more directly in an earlier work (*Martin Luther: A Biographical Study* [1964]). However, the result is that the book will not serve well as an introduction to Luther's theology.

Todd writes with an easy British style and makes judicious use of primary source quotations, especially Luther's letters. One wonders at times if there is need for the continual production of biographies of Luther, but if the answer to that question is yes, then Todd's contribution is a welcome addition.

David G. Dunbar

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

Walvoord: A Tribute. Edited by Donald K. Campbell. Chicago: Moody, 1982, 353 pp.

The *Festschrift* here reviewed commemorates the thirtieth anniversary of John F. Walvoord as president of Dallas Theological Seminary. Walvoord is an acknowledged evangelical leader and publicist. He is also a past president of the Society that publishes this *Journal*. The majority of the contributors to this volume are former students of his, and most are also his colleagues on the faculty. Both as to size and content the work is impressive and thus forms a worthy tribute to Walvoord's labors.

The book is divided into three parts, preceded by a warmhearted yet soberly phrased biographical introduction by Donald K. Campbell. Part 1 deals with "Biblical" subjects. Roy B. Zuck writes about "Application in Biblical Hermeneutics and Exposition." Donald R. Glenn discusses Psalm 8 in its relation to Hebrews 2 and raises questions of a hermeneutical and Biblical theological nature. The purpose of "tongues" in 1 Cor 14:20-25 is the subject of Harold W. Hoehner's contribution, while Zane C. Hodges devotes a study to the "rapture" mentioned in 1 Thess 5:1-11. Stanley D. Toussaint concludes part 1 with a study entitled "A Biblical Defense of Dispensationalism."

Part 2 is by far the largest and deals with more theological subjects. Norman L. Geisler writes on "God, Evil, and Dispensations." The "Inerrancy of the Bible" is the topic of John A. Witmer's discussion. John D. Hannah devotes a study to "The Historical Development of the Doctrine of Christ." "Creation and Evolution" is the title of Frederic R. Howe's contribution, and Robert P. Lightner entitles his discussion "For Whom Did Christ Die?"

The remaining six studies in part 2 deal with "Universalism" (Emilio Antonio Núñez), "Contrasting Views on Sanctification" (Charles C. Ryrie), "The Gospel Message" (Thomas L. Constable), "Authority in the Church" (Robert L. Saucy), "Hermeneutics and Dispensationalism" (Elliot E. Johnson), and finally "The Biblical Covenants and the Birth Narratives" (J. Dwight Pentecost).

Part 3 is entitled "Ministry and Communication." It contains contributions by John W. Reed ("The Pastor as a Theologian"), Donald R. Sunukjian ("The Preacher as Persuader"), Frank B. Minirth and Paul D. Meier ("Counseling and the Nature of Man"), J. Ronald Blue ("The Missionary as a Theologian"), and A. Duane Litfin ("Theological Issues in Contemporary Feminism").

The reviewer has read a large part of this volume with appreciation and hearty approval. The approach taken to the question of the inerrancy of Scripture is thoroughly orthodox. The arguments of those advocating a limited inerrancy are examined and rejected. Hannah's historical survey of the doctrine of Christ, though too brief for a subject of such a scope, likewise shows the writer's commitment to orthodoxy. Donald Glenn's discussion of Psalm 8 in relation to Hebrews 2 showed good hermeneutical awareness. We wonder whether the translation "heavenly beings" for *elohim* could not be used legitimately in Psalm 8. This would be a stepping stone toward the translation of "angels" of the LXX.

Much to the point is the warning issued by Núñez about the naive openness to dialogue with other religions and about the idea that Christianity depends on these other religions to complement the truth. This, according to Núñez, can "result in syncretism and universalism" (p. 185). We also read with much approval the parallel pleas by John W. Reed and J. Ronald Blue for a thorough theological training of pastors and missionaries. One can hardly

think of a better weapon to combat the theological confusion that is prevalent today. Blue's observations concerning the "antiquated themes" of liberation theology, a theology that claims to be innovative, are much to the point (p. 323).

Among the many other things that could be mentioned we wish to applaud Robert L. Saucy's endorsement of the resurgence of "elder-rule" in churches that have not thus far practiced this Biblical system of church government. (p. 236). Another article read with a good deal of appreciation was Litfin's well-informed and balanced survey of current feminist opinion, including that of modern-day evangelicals.

The position on Christ's atonement developed in more than one chapter of this volume appears to this reviewer to be strangely inconsistent with the Biblical witness and sometimes inwardly contradictory as well. In one chapter it is stated, correctly we believe, that "Christ died to save sinners" (p. 209). Yet in another chapter one reads the baffling statement that "the death of Christ does not save" (p. 167). The same writer goes on to say that "the Holy Spirit's convicting power does not save" and that "faith does not save." Yet on page 206 we read that "only faith saves." This is bolstered with a reference to Heb 11:6.

The position that Christ's death does not save is of course the most consistent but in the reviewer's opinion also the most un-Biblical formulation of the halfway position on the atonement that is here set forth. It is consistent in that it clearly states that the very atonement in which sinners are invited to put their trust when they believe—also upon the position developed in this volume—is not really an atonement at all. It may be called a paying of the penalty for sinners (p. 211), yet there is not really such payment. Christ's death therefore does not save. To say that neither Christ's death, nor the Spirit's work, nor faith saves but that it is Christ who saves does not, in the reviewer's opinion, help matters (see p. 167). for the truth of the matter is, and we say this respectfully, that, upon the position here examined, Christ has nothing to save with. He cannot plead his own death before the Father, for it is devoid of saving efficacy. Yet the Bible tells us that when Christ died for all, the "all" for whom he died died themselves (2 Cor 5:14). It would seem to this reviewer that this shows the inherent efficacy of the death of Christ. This death most certainly accomplished the objective for which it was suffered. It caused those for whom it was suffered to "die"—i.e., to sin and corruption—and entitled them to life and sanctification. This can only be said upon the basis of a doctrine of the atonement that affirms the certainty of the outcome of this atonement for those for whom it was accomplished.

At stake is not the question of the sufficiency of the atonement to expiate for the sins of all mankind. The very Canons of Dort that were formulated to safeguard what we consider to be the Biblical position speak of the "infinite worth and value" of the atonement (Second Head of Doctrine, art. 3). At stake is the efficacy of the atonement. We believe that sufficiency without this God-intended efficacy robs the atonement of the very sufficiency that the writers of this volume wish to maintain.

It is also obvious from this volume that more is at stake than the doctrine of the purpose and extent of Christ's atonement. There is also a difference about the degree to which mankind has lost the ability to do any saving good. Is man's will equally "dead" in trespasses and sins as is the rest of him or her? We believe it is. Yet Norman Geisler repeatedly argues that "God will not force a man against his will to go to heaven" (p. 103). Ergo, it follows that this "will to go to heaven" is still there in sinful man. In the reviewer's opinion this does not agree with the dire descriptions one encounters of man's sinful condition in various parts of the Bible.

A review of this sort is not the place to argue these points extensively. The reviewer believes that God, when saving the sinner, far from forcing this sinner to go to heaven against his will, rather infuses new qualities into the human will so that it, willingly, desires to rest upon the sufficient and efficacious(!) merits of Christ's death.

The reviewer considers himself to be a moderate Calvinist, though not of the stripe developed in this volume. In fact the Canons of Dort themselves have been deemed to be a

moderate expression of Calvinism (see A. Stewart, *Creeeds and Churches: Studies in Symbolics*, 1916, p. 162).

The doctrines of election and of particular atonement must, in the reviewer's opinion, be taught in conjunction with a wholesome stress upon the conditionality of the covenants. The latter does not invalidate the former, but it gives to our approach a wholesome balance and leaves ample room for the place of faith in conversion. In this respect it seemed curious that while the doctrine of the atonement in this volume is hedged about with the provisionality peculiar to the position of an unlimited atonement, the doctrine of the covenant is presented with a rigor that minimizes conditions or rules them out altogether. On the one hand God is said to "provide a basis for the total forgiveness of sin" (p. 262). This expresses the notion of a nonfinal and nonefficacious atonement. But on the other hand, the covenants with Abraham and some of those following are said to be "eternal and unconditional" (p. 267). And this is maintained in spite of the fact that within these allegedly unconditional covenants there are conditions that must be met (p. 260) and on which the blessings "depended" (p. 258). Here obviously is a use of language that is entirely esoteric. At least the reviewer finds it most difficult to conceive of an unconditional covenant whose fulfillment is squarely based upon the keeping of conditions.

The other area of major disagreement the reviewer encountered in reading this volume is that of its dispensationalist approach to the Scriptures. We believe the only legitimate and Biblical way of speaking of dispensations in the Bible is that of the "old" and the "new" dispensation. We appreciate the emphasis upon the progressive nature of God's revelation to mankind. But the seven dispensations that are said to be found throughout the two Testaments appear to this reviewer to be foisting an artificial scheme upon the flow of revelation. What is also lacking in this scheme is a firm view of the state of everlasting glory that waits the believer after death and after Christ's return. The system ends with the temporal kingdom of an earthly millennium. The reviewer wishes that somewhere in this volume the searching critique of dispensationalism presented by Oswald T. Allis (*Prophecy and the Church*) had been examined.

One also wonders why a system that allegedly wishes to pay attention to the progress of God's self-revelation ends up with a homiletical "application" approach geared to the timeless idea of "principling" coupled with a heavy use of the example method of preaching (see the first chapter by Donald K. Campbell).

When Joshua, speaking prophetically with a "Thus says the Lord," surveys Israel's past redemptive history in Joshua 24, he does not tell the Israelites which example they can follow, which command to obey, or which error to avoid. Instead Joshua places the emphasis entirely on what God did in calling Abraham, giving him children, delivering Israel from Egypt and bringing them to the land of promise. This method of "preaching," devoid of the slightest principling or example, proves highly powerful. The people respond positively and say that it will be "far from them" to forsake this God who has done so much for them. Apparently this was a highly effective sermon, pronounced in a prophetic manner and inspired by God's own Spirit.

Even in such places where seemingly the Bible tends toward the example method, such as Hebrews 11 and 1 Corinthians 10, there is a note of distance, a redemptive-historical distance, between the audience and the facts recalled; see Heb 11:13-16, 39, 40; 1 Cor 10:11b (Paul's readers are those on whom the "end of the ages has come," a thing that cannot be said of the Israelites in the wilderness). In the reviewer's opinion, this kind of redemptive-historical perspective gives a dynamic thrust to our preaching today ("how much the more . . .") that cannot be achieved, or less effectively so, with the method advocated in this volume. But we agree that the method we are favoring is feasible only if one adheres to the existence of two dispensations and not of seven.

We regret that it was necessary to speak at greater length of the areas of disagreement than of agreement. Yet, as was stated earlier, there is much in this volume we wholeheart-

edly endorse. (See e.g. also Frederich Howe's article on creation and evolution, pp. 145-156.)

We congratulate the editor and contributors for this volume and also extend, as one past president of the ETS to another, our sincerest good wishes to the one in whose honor it was published.

Marten H. Woudstra

Calvin Theological Seminary, Grand Rapids, MI

The Authoritative Word. Edited by Donald McKim. Grand Rapids. Eerdmans, 1983, 270 pp., \$10.95.

This book consists of excerpts from previous works by several scholars of the "limited inerrancy" school. On one hand, this is good: It brings together a lot of diverse material on the subject of Biblical reliability and authority. On the other hand, this is not so good: It contributes nothing new to the discussion of Biblical inerrancy.

The book is divided into three major sections: "Authority: Sources and Canon," "Authority: Doctrine and its Development," and "Authority: Current Views." The tones in the essays range from outright hostility to any conservative view (Achtemeier on "How the Scriptures Were Formed") to a bland treatise that is little more than a systematic word study (Beegle on "The Biblical Concept of Revelation").

Nearly all the authors take potshots at inerrantists, but they actually quote surprisingly few sources to support their criticisms. Dulles, in the final essay ("Recent Protestant and Catholic Views"), lumps everything inerrantist under the question-begging label "fundamentalist"; Ridderbos ("The Inspiration and Authority of Holy Scripture") engages in some rather unscholarly ridicule of any and all conservative views; Achtemeier, as noted, is openly hostile, claiming that critical scholars are more "literal" with the Bible than conservatives. Most of his examples of this, though, are more manufactured than real Biblical difficulties.

On the other side, the essay on the canon by F. F. Bruce is highly informative and well worth reading, and the historical survey entitled "The Church Doctrine of Biblical Authority" by Jack Rogers, while concentrating more on inerrancy than on authority, gives an interesting and challenging view of the Church's attitude toward Scripture through the ages. Dulles' essay gives an excellent survey of current attitudes toward Scripture and is quite useful if only to demonstrate what a befuddled jumble of views exists to confound the minds of the errantist camp.

The low point of the book is "The Theological Significance of Historical Criticism" by James D. Smart. The essay is riddled with philosophical speculations, non-sequiturs, and complex arguments that lead nowhere and frequently contradict one another. The most ponderous chapter is "The Testimony of the Spirit" by Berkouwer, but this is due largely to the style in which it was translated from Dutch. The essay is worth reading, the sluggish style notwithstanding.

The title of the book is somewhat confusing, since many of the essays (especially in the first division) say nothing about authority. Those that do address it do not reach any conclusions. The book draws no overall conclusions about Biblical authority, which is understandable in a compendium of previous and diverse works. The most distressing thing is that a reader who takes the time to read the entire book will probably understand better what the questions are but will also probably conclude that these writers do not have the answers. All the authors agree that the Bible has some inherent authority, but none of them say why, nor do they say over what the Bible has authority or how it exercises that authority.

The book is, in fact, an excellent illustration of the fallacy of believing in a Bible that is inspired but errant. Most of the authors take a blind leap beyond the words of the Bible to the "message" of Scripture (Christ and salvation) but never give any sound basis for doing

so. They never say why we can believe in Christ in spite of the limited value of the Bible, when the Bible is our only source of information about Christ. They are also at a loss to explain how this "message" can be accurately conveyed by inaccurate language. They agree that the theology of the Bible cannot be separated from its historical propositions, yet they artificially do so for the sake of convenience of doctrine. None of them ever gives a sound philosophical basis for claiming that Scripture is accurate in theological matters but not in historical or scientific matters. The question of the inerrantist—"If the history and science are in error, how do you know that the theology is not in error, as well?"—has never been answered, and the reader will not find an answer in this book either.

In summary, the reader who wants to know what the errantists are saying and how their arguments are formulated will find this book an excellent anthology of such work. But the reader seeking sound information on the nature and authority of Scripture will not find it here.

David L. Washburn

The Ark Bookstore, Denver, CO

Biblical Words and Their Meaning: An Introduction to Lexical Semantics. By Moisés Silva. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983, 201 pp., \$7.95.

Almost a quarter century ago James Barr forcefully turned the attention of Biblical scholars to the implications of modern semantics for the field of Biblical studies. Since then a near revolution has occurred in the areas of hermeneutics and exegesis, where the by-word has become "structure," and even the disciplines of linguistics and semantics are making room for stylistics, rhetoric and drama in the interpreter's toolbox. Off in a corner, as it were, a more fundamental work is going on—fundamental to hermeneutics and exegesis, and more fundamentally semantic, in the sense of Barr's criticisms. For basic to the interpretation of a text is a knowledge of the text's language, its phonology, syntax, discourse techniques, and—what is almost absurdly obvious—its vocabulary.

In spite of this obviousness (or perhaps because of it), comparatively little attention has been given to the bearing of modern theories of semantics on Biblical lexicology. It is here that Moisés Silva has placed his book. A NT professor at Westminster Theological Seminary and editor of a forthcoming new series on hermeneutics (Thomas Nelson), Silva has already demonstrated in a number of articles his skills in linguistics and semantics. These he now applies to the subject of determining meanings for Biblical vocabulary.

The book is organized according to F. de Saussure's distinction between language change (diachrony) and language states (synchrony). Silva devotes his first three chapters to historical (diachronic) semantics and the last three to descriptive (synchronic) semantics. While making it clear that historical study is secondary to and dependent on descriptive, he offers in chaps. 1 and 2 a balanced appraisal of the usefulness and the limits of historical approaches such as etymology and the use of the language of the LXX. This first half of the book closes with a chapter on semantic change in the NT, covering the expansion and contraction of areas of meaning for given words as well as the phenomenon of semantic borrowing. The latter is especially significant for bilingual areas like first-century Palestine.

Interesting and useful as historical semantics can be, it is the descriptive approach that really constitutes lexicology proper. The first two chapters of this second half of the book discuss the foundational concepts of this approach. A distinction is drawn between word-meaning as denotation and word-meaning as a function of the interrelation of the senses of many words in a semantic system. The former has its importance especially with technical terms since it is based on the relation of a word to an extralingual entity, but the latter is a more linguistic-based concept and constitutes a major advance in the history of lexical theory. This distinction between denotation and structural relations pertains primarily to

the language system assumed to lie behind all language use. The varying ways in which language is actually used, then, give rise to the question of style.

Chapter 5 attempts to organize the several semantic relationships that words contract within a semantic system. Silva sees two major types: relations based on similarity of meaning, and those based on oppositeness. The former can be due to the overlapping, contiguity, or inclusiveness of the senses; the latter is either binary or multiple opposition. There is some confusion at this point in Silva's scheme, however, since his categories of contiguous similarity and multiple opposition are actually the same relationship viewed from opposing poles. The latter is theoretically grounded in John Lyons' use of logical implication and the former in the concept of componential analysis (E. Nida, E. Coseriu, etc.), which is also treated, separately, in chap. 5. The confusion arises from an apparently unconscious use of both these analytical procedures without noticing how they interact. Nevertheless, this is not a major problem for Silva's purposes nor for the value of the book.

The final chapter takes the reader through a practical discussion of the issues and process involved in the actual determining of meaning for a Biblical word. Various levels (circles) of context, types of ambiguity, and the importance of synonymy for questions of style are analyzed. An appreciative and critical note on W. Bauer's lexicographical method as well as a step-by-step summary of the process of analyzing word-meanings form the conclusion.

While the subject is not an easy one, it is extremely important, and Silva has helped the reader by placing succinct summaries of the chapters at their heads. He has also included a useful annotated bibliography of recent literature, both Biblically oriented and not. This is an important book, well done, and one responding to a growing need. Silva is to be thanked and Zondervan congratulated for stepping out into new territory.

Richard J. Erickson

Fuller Theological Seminary in Extension, Seattle, WA

The Old Testament and Criticism. By Carl E. Armerding. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983, 134 pp., \$6.95.

Some sixteen years after George Ladd's *New Testament and Criticism* Eerdmans publishes its sequel.

The book is divided into five major chapters entitled "An Evangelical Old Testament Criticism," "Literary Criticism," "Form Criticism," "Structural Analysis" and "Text Criticism." Each chapter is prefaced by a short introduction describing and/or defining the particular approach. The emphasis is put on method and generally well illustrated by examples from practitioners of it. The chapters are independent of each other and can be studied in any order.

This review starts with the last chapter ("Text Criticism"), which is the longest and also one of the best. Just the title is somewhat confusing. The current usual term for the study of various copies of the OT original is known as *textual* criticism. This chapter is concise, yet complete, chronologically arranged, well illustrated and perfectly intelligible even to nonspecialists or persons who do not know Hebrew—in short, an excellent shortcut for the busy pastor or student having no time to read the fuller treatments of E. Würthwein, B. J. Roberts or D. Barthélemy. It is also a considerable improvement over R. Klein's *Guide to Biblical Scholarship* (Philadelphia, 1974), which is unduly preoccupied with the importance of the LXX and Qumran.

Nonspecialists interested in knowing what textual traditions are at the basis of the innumerable English versions will appreciate the excellent up-to-date discussion as to whether the "original" has been tampered with or "translated from obsolete texts."

"Structural Analysis" (chap. 4) is a somewhat new approach, especially to the English-speaking evangelical. As a matter of fact, it is "the province of only a select number of

initiates" (p. 78). Armerding is well-versed in the matter, as his excellent article in *Themelios* 4/3 (April 1979) has shown. A complex method is presented in an understandable way for most readers. This chapter is a considerable elaboration of that article (second longest chapter, 30 pages). Does this method deserve such a close scrutiny, especially in a book of this size? It is up to the reader to judge. This reviewer is afraid that Armerding will not succeed in enticing English-speaking evangelicals to apply this method. True enough, structure can be a conveyor of meaning, but the given structure must be evident to any careful reader. Furthermore, there still is a need for a clear-cut distinction between "structuralism" and form criticism on the basis of the OT text.

The third chapter deals with form criticism. After the classical description, the history and evangelical responses to the method, Armerding applies it to Joshua 24, Psalm 2 and Amos 5 (pp. 56-63). These examples are most helpful and show that "form" is a matter of fact to which, fortunately, evangelicals slowly awaken. The chapter ends with a cautious but favorable critique, amply illustrated again with texts.

By "Literary Criticism," the subject of the second chapter, Armerding means "source criticism" of the classical kind, which began, as commonly accepted, with Astruc's distinction in 1753 of the two names for God, YHWH and Elohim in Genesis. Armerding's goal is to probe the question "in what sense and to what extent the methods and conclusions of traditional literary criticism in fact lead us to a better understanding of the function and import of the text" (p. 23). Again the method is actually put to the test on the basis of Genesis 1 and 2. He concurs with the majority of scholars: They clearly represent two separate literary units (p. 26). He then points out how two scholars (Kidner and Habel) come up with widely divergent answers to the question as to how to account for the origin and distinctiveness of Genesis 1 and 2. Happily, Armerding does not leave it at that but ventures his own viewpoints. First, as to the divine names, he considers them "a clear and useful criterion in analyzing the literature of Gen. 1-4." Not so for chaps. 6-9, where it leads to an "undesirable fragmentation of the text" (pp. 31-32). Second, as to "doublets," Armerding sees three types of them: the Samuel-Kings-Chronicles type, the Genesis 20 and 26 type (wife-as-sister motif)—i.e., parallel accounts of the same tradition—and lastly the type of combining two or more original accounts. The first and second types are traditionally explained with the affirmation concerning the second that "literary analysis has not been able and cannot prejudge the question of historicity" (p. 35). As to the third type, applied again to the flood narrative, Armerding agrees with Allis: The final shape has an integrity of its own, all its repetitions notwithstanding. Third, Armerding discusses a few "differences of detail" such as the two accounts of building an altar (Exod 20:24-26 and 27:1-8). It is refreshing to note that Armerding is not content with platitudes or mere harmonizations of the texts: "It is only by isolating the literary units by means of the dual criteria of structure and style that we understand the separate roles of the altars in question." The first text relates to the common people, whereas the second relates to the formal cultic structure of Israel's worship (p. 37). Fourth, theological viewpoints demonstrating varying accents are discussed. Avoiding extremes, Armerding contends that there is great unity within diversity and that literary criticism is precisely suited to discover that. Several case studies follow such as that of Deut 24:16 in the light of Exod 34:6-7 (case-law precedents). They are given the traditional evangelical explanations. Fifth, the study of style or distinctive vocabulary is not to be carried too far—i.e., as evidence for a documentary hypothesis such as JEDP. They only point to separate literary or formal units, often reflecting two different subject matters. The main handicap of the stylistic criterion is its inconsistency when actually applied. Armerding closes the chapter by inviting conservatives to a constructive literary criticism. "Our task, while avoiding subjective schemas, is to use all the tools of the true literary critic to appreciate more fully the background, the forms, the development of thought and the role of each unit in its context" (p. 42).

The first chapter, suggestively entitled "An Evangelical Old Testament Criticism,"

starts off with the traditional controversy between conservative and liberal approaches to the OT. Does a critical reading of, say, 1 Kings 8, claiming that the highly developed view of God therein is post-Solomonic, necessarily undermine its authority as an historical record (p. 2)? Not inevitably, says Armerding. All depends on one's presuppositions or assumptions. The problem is not so much the tools or the methods, but how they are employed. There are basically three approaches: (1) "Traditional conservative"—the Bible is such that any critical investigation, any use of critical tools is wrong because of a wrongheaded doctrine of Scripture (viz., the Bible is not really the Word of God). "Thus, any meaningful discussion of post-Mosaic elements in the Pentateuch, any attempt to find human life-settings for the Psalms, or any question of literary development in the prophets is viewed as tampering with a sacred text" (p. 5). (2) "Rational critical"—while the first term, in our view, merits a closer definition, the method applied by this category of scholars is clear enough. "The task of a critic . . . is not so much to discover normative truth as to determine the process by which the writing arrived at its present state, and then to determine the influence it had on its own time" (pp. 6-7). Elements that the text relates to direct divine disclosure or activity are explained on other (i.e., human) grounds. (3) "Evangelical"—as a "via media" or middle path (p. 4). Armerding acknowledges that "it is a view of revelation theoretically shared by many whose critical approach is either traditionally conservative or liberal critical" (p. 7). What is at stake is "the Word" and "the words." The problem is an apparent tension between the two. How can Scripture be both "Word of God" (a divine revelation) and that in the form of human words? This question has, of course, always separated the conservative from the liberal. Since the latter rejects the idea of divine disclosure as a matter of fact and that by means of the usage of critical tools (various criticisms), the former accepting the idea expects to find supernaturally given insight often contradicting the natural or allows for ideas "too advanced for their time." The difference lies in the disposition of each. Armerding seeks to bring the two closer together by inviting the conservative to an openness to consider, for instance, literary development over a given period of time as part of the inspirational process. Example: Exod 15:13-18 as a possible later liturgical addition to vv 1-12. This, Armerding contends, in no way affects its truth-value or its message. "How evangelicals use the song, and what kind of doctrine, reproof, correction or instruction they will take from it is a hermeneutical question, but their doctrine of revelation views the entire song as Word of God" (p. 8). But Armerding challenges also the liberal critic via historical criticism as such—i.e., the question of historicity. It is inherently and methodologically wrong to dismiss revelatory history from the outset. "The phenomenon of history which is in a special sense revelatory does not put that history outside the realm of investigation for it would then no longer be history. It demands, rather, that the critic-historian prepare to recognize in this unique history, and in the literature which expresses it, a special kind of reality" (p. 2). So it is different from mythology, which is less than real, whereas "divine history," so to speak, is more than real (suprareality), yet so genuinely linked to human history that its study would be unthinkable without critical tools. Armerding concludes: "Criticism is a must, but the presuppositions with which we employ it will vitally affect the outcome of its application" (p. 5).

Undoubtedly, this chapter will draw the heaviest criticisms (both positive and negative). It shows clearly that evangelicals are far from being boring monolithic fundamentalists deaf to anything new. As many of them think more and/or are trained to think more on the basis of the Biblical text, a new day may dawn on evangelicalism. Armerding will have contributed to that new day. At an earlier time, when another day had dawned, Galileo Galilei said: "The same God that endowed us with sense, reason and intellect did not intend us to forgo their use." May this book contribute to end the sad phenomenon of many evangelicals—viz., using Scripture like a drunk would a lamppost: for support rather than for illumination.

Daniel Schibler

European Bible Institute, Lamorlaye, France

Leviticus. By George A. F. Knight. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1981, viii + 172 pp., \$12.95.

This volume is one of the first in the Daily Study Bible Series of commentaries on the OT, intended to complement the popular NT commentaries by the late William Barclay. As with that series, this book offers no analytical outline as such but provides successive headed portions of the Biblical text suitable for daily study.

While one aim of this series is to introduce the reader to some of the most significant insights and conclusions of modern OT scholarship, the primary purpose is expositional and devotional. Although Knight has given us a very readable and interesting investigation of this much-avoided book about sacrifice, his interpretation of Leviticus consistently follows a liberal-critical perspective. He does not mention opposing viewpoints on the technical aspects of authorship, date, and other matters of special introduction. For example, Knight believes Leviticus contains material "deriving straight from Moses" but that the final text was a post-exilic composition by various authors (editors?). Also, conservative scholars will quickly notice Knight's humanistic orientation when he comments on such topics as homosexuality (chap. 18) and adultery (chap. 20).

On the other hand, however, Knight's exceptional exegetical ability is evident throughout the book, including his discussion of the "unholy fire" of chap. 10 and the Day of Atonement in chap. 16. The reader will also be impressed with Knight's keen insight into the "theology of Leviticus" included in his 9-page introduction.

In short, *Leviticus* is a stimulating work well worth reading, but one must exercise caution concerning the less-than-balanced "results of OT scholarship."

Ramon A. Madrigal

Bridgeview, IL

Ruth: An Expositional Commentary. By Cyril J. Barber. Chicago: Moody, 1983, 176 pp.

Though often ignored in evangelical circles, the book of Ruth was read in Judaism on Pentecost. Barber laments this neglect and has produced a significant contribution born out of practical ministry.

No commentary is perfect, because it is written by man. Many previous treatments, if critical, are written to teach beginning Hebrew. Other treatments, if devotional, are written without demonstrable facility in the original languages. Yet previous works that try to bridge the extremes tend to comment sparsely on the problems in the book.

This work is written transparently. It is readable, like the author's commentary on Nehemiah. Unlike that commentary, Barber has relegated technical discussions to endnotes. Also, Barber does not consistently trace the theme of friendship throughout his book, unlike Nehemiah's dynamics in spiritual leadership.

This work is written expositionally. Such works are important for pulpit ministry to guide, to help in communication level and impact. Weaknesses include lack of full-orbed discussion of the covenantal implications in Ruth, lack of discussing structural analysis, and word-by-word analysis of the text.

This work is written thoughtfully. For advanced students the endnote discussions are pointed and punctuated with particulars for further research. While these discussions are not exhaustive, they are extensive. Barber's deft ability forces the reader to grapple with the message and relevance of Ruth to a materialistic society and the Church of Christ.

Earl L. Brown, Jr.

Philadelphia, PA

Bible Study Commentary: Ecclesiastes. By Louis Goldberg. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983, 144 pp.

E. H. Plumptre noted that Ecclesiastes was "pre-eminently enigmatic." Three recent evangelical commentaries adopt the major life views attributed to the book. Michael Eaton's work in the InterVarsity series (1983) makes the author to be a cynic. Derek Kidner's volume in The Bible Speaks Today series (1976) describes the author as a critic. Walter C. Kaiser, Jr., in the Everyman's Bible Commentary series (1979) develops the celebration of life view. With all these popular commentaries available, why another work?

This series of commentaries tends to mediate between the Jensen study guide type of literature and the popular commentary as described above. This work is intended to be useful for Bible study groups.

When compared with the previously mentioned commentaries, it contains some serious disadvantages. First, unlike Kaiser's, there is no annotated bibliography or full-orbed discussion of structure. Second, unlike Kidner's, there is no attempt to capture the poetic flair of the book. Third, unlike Eaton's, there is no comparison of authorities where alternate views exist.

Goldberg has furnished provocative questions at each chapter's conclusion. References to the Hebrew text are suggestive. If this book is used for its intended purpose, it will not disappoint. Those looking for multiple authorship or non-Solomonic authorship will be disappointed. This work is of the same quality as Goldberg's on Leviticus in this same series.

Earl L. Brown, Jr.

Philadelphia, PA

The Faith of Jesus Christ: An Investigation of the Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1-4:11. By Richard B. Hays. SBLDS 56. Chico: Scholar's, 1983, x + 305 pp., \$15.00 paper.

Since the onset of structuralist approaches to the NT, it has repeatedly been emphasized that this new literary technique is an adjunct to, not a replacement for, traditional exegesis. Yet, caught up in the excitement of the new technique many scholars have paid lipservice only to this disclaimer. New interpretations based on a structuralist method are advanced with little or no regard for the conclusions of more traditional exegetical procedures. Richard Hays avoids this pitfall. His study of Gal 3:1-4:11, a dissertation written under W. A. Beardslee at Emory University, combines structural methods and traditional exegesis in as careful and balanced a manner as I have seen.

Hays' study advances two basic theses, one methodological, the other theological. Methodologically, Hays claims that Paul's letters must be understood against the background of a "narrative logic." At the heart of Paul's theological reflection lies a "story," the rehearsal of the redemptive acts of God in Christ. This story provides the constant, indispensable foundation for the narratives in which Paul develops his theology. Therefore the "narrative element" cannot be cast aside in the assumption that the real heart of Paul's gospel lies elsewhere. On this point, then, Hays sides with Cullmann against Bultmann. The application of this narrative logic to Gal 3:1-4:11 is a key support for Hays' theological thesis. It is that the faith mentioned so often in this passage is not the human act of believing but the faith(fulness) of Christ himself. The key antithesis of the text lies not in two different human activities—believing and doing—but in a human activity and a divine one. The thesis that Paul sometimes uses *pistis* to mean this is not new, but Hays presents perhaps the most powerful argument to date for the idea and applies it with a new consistency to all of Galatians 3.

The specific structural method that is the starting point for this interpretation is the "narrative grammar" developed by A. Greimas. Applying Greimas' scheme of "actantial roles" to the brief Christological formulations in Gal 3:13-14; 4:3-6, Hays argues that Christ

fills the role of the "subject," the hero or protagonist whose actions enable the "sender" (God) to communicate the "object" (justification, adoption, redemption, etc.) to the "receiver" (Jews and Gentiles). The law, and its curse, clearly function as the "opponent." But who, or what, fills the remaining role in Greimas' scheme—the "helper"? Hays argues that "faith," the instrument by which the promise of the Spirit is communicated to the Jews according to 3:14, must play this role. An analysis of Gal 3:22 shows that "faith" is the power that enables Christ to carry out his "mandate"; it is not the human action of believing, but Christ's own faith(fulness).

From this point Hays turns to more traditional exegetical methods to seek confirmation for the results of his structural analysis. He argues that the phrase *akoēs pisteōs* in 3:2, 4 is best taken as a reference to divine activity, the message or proclamation of faith. Similarly, the quotation of Hab 2:4 in Gal 3:11 serves not to describe the means by which "righteous people," generally, attain life, but how the righteous one *par excellence*, the Messiah, provided life for everyone—by his faith(fulness). Hays then returns to 3:22 where he argues extensively in favor of the subjective genitive interpretation of *Iēsou Christou*. Building on the investigations of G. Howard and S. Williams, he claims that an objective genitive following *pistis* is extremely rare and that the subjective genitive interpretation makes better sense of Rom 3:21-26 and Galatians 3 than the alternative.

Recognizing that Gal 3:6-9 could provide a major stumbling block for this interpretation of Galatians 3, Hays devotes considerable attention to it. He suggests that Paul is not here (as in Romans 4) comparing our faith with Abraham's but attributing our status as his children to our participation in him (v 8). Abraham's faith is not, then, a pattern for ours but for Christ's. Only with some such interpretation, claims Hays, can the conceptual unity of Galatians 3, with its strongly participationist argument in vv 15-26, be preserved.

Hays is to be commended for his careful, balanced and often persuasive exegesis. Nevertheless, a monograph with so novel a conclusion is inevitably open to criticism. I have two major areas of concern. First, Hays provides little justification for his choice of Greimas' narrative model as a basis for his exegesis. He denies that the model is one that is universally applicable, but rather lamely suggests that "Paul's gospel story lends itself readily to analysis in terms of this structure" (p. 93). Why is this so? Why choose this model over others? Would other models have resulted in a different interpretative structure? And would this have affected the exegetical results? These are questions that Hays has not adequately dealt with.

Second, I still have serious questions about understanding "faith of Jesus Christ" as a subjective genitive. For one thing, Hays is unclear in defining what, precisely, this means, as is evident from his sometimes referring to the "faith of Christ," other times to the "faithfulness of Christ" and most often to the "faith(fulness) of Christ." Does this variation suggest some lack of clarity in grappling theologically with the significance of the phrase? Another fundamental difficulty remains the contextual factor. *Pistis Iēsou Christou* consistently occurs in contexts where "faith" means the act of human believing. Despite Hays' arguments, the shift to faith as a divine activity in texts such as Galatians 3 and Romans 3 is somewhat awkward. In Galatians 3, for instance, the quotation of Gen 15:6 in v 6 clearly speaks of human believing. This provides a strong presumption in favor of understanding *pistis* in v 7 in a similar way. Yet Hays claims that the latter part of Galatians 3 and his "Christological" interpretation of 3:11b are more important for understanding this reference. Not only does the argument become somewhat circular here—the Christological interpretation of 3:11b is at best improbable—but selective also. Generally, I found Hays' exegesis of 3:6-9 the least persuasive of any in the monograph. Yet this has damaging consequences for his interpretation of "faith" throughout Galatians 3 to mean Christ's faith(fulness).

Douglas J. Moo

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

Jesus als Lehrer: Eine Untersuchung zum Ursprung der Evangelien-Überlieferung. By Rainer Riesner. WUNT, 2d series, 7. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1981, 614 pp.

In a land that has been traditionally (by evangelicals, at least) viewed as productive of skepticism a new wind is blowing: a positive yet critical approach to the gospel traditions and the historical-Jesus question. No scholar can ever impugn Rainer Riesner with an acritical, credulous method, and, on the other hand, no evangelical can fail to appreciate the value of his learned work for both academic research and faith. As a result, his work earns a spot among the very best of critical works available today on Jesus, with works like those of Joachim Jeremias and Ben F. Meyer. For a decade or so, evangelicals have pleaded for a positive use of critical tools, and in Riesner this plea has been answered. In the following review I will center largely on Riesner's methodology for, in the present state of research, it is here that progress is needed and where the author makes a contribution.

Riesner's first chapter is a comprehensive, 96-page introduction to gospel criticism that presents the issues and his conclusions as groundwork for his study. As Riesner observes, the question of the historical Jesus is really the question of the reliability of the sources (p. 1) and, in particular, a question on the reliability of the canonical gospels (pp. 1-2). After summarizing the current views of the synoptic problem, Riesner concludes, somewhat against the grain, that the synoptics must be treated as separate entities. As he notes later, this naturally has great implications for the criterion of multiple sources (pp. 87-88). In agreement with much gospel research of today, Riesner also recognizes that priority in an individual tradition may be found one time in Mark, another in Luke and yet on another occasion in Matthew (p. 5).

Because sources by themselves are not all-determinative, Riesner examines carefully and critically both the presuppositions and practices of classical form criticism, one of the finest aspects of this work. Riesner evaluates the currently accepted dictum that early Christian prophets made no distinction between words of the earthly Jesus and risen Lord with penetrating criticism: Most of this theory is merely postulation. In fact, Paul quite clearly distinguishes between words of Jesus and prophetic communications (pp. 8-10). Prophecy was restricted by the apostolic tradition, and the word of Jesus had precedence over the instruction of Paul (p. 8). Another feature of form criticism has been the so-called "laws of transmission." Both E. P. Sanders and, as Riesner argues, modern scholars of folklore have demonstrated persuasively that these "laws" are unsound and that the gospels themselves often betray countertendencies (pp. 14-17).

The heart of Riesner's approach is found in section 3 of chap. 1, entitled "Der Weg der Überlieferung," in which he analyzes how it was that the saying/narratives of Jesus were transmitted. This section begins with questions of dating. Contrary to form criticism, the element of eye- and ear-witnesses simply cannot be eliminated from a scientific approach to the gospels (pp. 19-20). Riesner concludes that Mark, the companion of Paul and interpreter of Peter, wrote our second gospel in Rome before the destruction of Jerusalem. The third gospel was written by Luke, author of Acts, physician and companion of Paul. Matthew was written by the apostle, and Riesner seems to date the gospel before 70 (cf. pp. 20-28). Not only are they early, but both Mark and Luke were in contact with eyewitnesses (p. 28). Riesner's demonstration that the gospels originated early is further enforced by considerations of the historical intentionality of the gospels. The evangelists intended to write "didactic biographies" (genre), and their redactional alterations betray great respect for tradition (pp. 29-35). Furthermore, historical intentions are seen in salvation-historical perspectives (in contrast to the rabbis) and in the unique concentration of religious traditions on one person, Jesus (pp. 35-40). Although Riesner recognizes the limitations of rabbinic parallels (as propounded by Neusner), his work is firmly based on the values of rabbinic techniques in learning (as well as those of the school and house; pp. 40-54). This transmission process did not occur so much in the sermons or in paraenesis but mostly in catecheti-

cal and worship settings (pp. 55-60). The major burden of Riesner's work, then, is to show that transmission process began with Jesus' instruction of the disciples and was carried on in a responsible fashion (pp. 60-70).

After sketching various treatments of Jesus as teacher (pp. 70-79), Riesner returns to hermeneutical issues. Several of these need to be noted: With others (Marshall, Jeremias) the author argues for a "critical sympathy"—that the burden of proof is on the shoulder of the one who denies authenticity (pp. 80-86). Riesner uses normal indices/criteria for assessing authenticity (multiple attestation in both sources and form, dissimilarity, tradition-redaction tension, unnecessary details, coherency, Semitisms, typical speech patterns of Jesus, redactional constructions, contemporary color, narrative logic) but does so with the warning that such must be used in a positive manner (pp. 80-96). I have presented the author's methodical conclusions in greater detail than is customary in a review of this length simply to show that it is not just American and British evangelicals who hold to such conclusions.

Riesner then analyzes popular education in Judaism, describing the house (where the father's responsibility of Torah instruction predominated), the synagogue and the school. Jesus grew up in a pious, Davidic, priestly tradition, attended synagogue and visited Jerusalem. As a result of this regular contact with instruction, Jesus was both accustomed to teaching/learning techniques and prepared to instruct his followers in a similar manner. One method, constant throughout all the forms of education, was memorization (pp. 97-245). (This section was published in condensed form in *Gospel Perspectives 1* [Sheffield: JSOT, 1980, pp. 209-223].)

The remaining three chapters of this work discuss the authority of Jesus (pp. 246-352), Jesus' public instruction (pp. 353-407) and the instruction of the disciples (pp. 408-498). I can but sketch the major lines. Jesus presented himself to Israel (especially those who had been neglected by the Jewish leaders) as the prophetic teacher who was also Messiah. The latter designation, he argues, was associated with teaching in intertestamental Judaism (pp. 304-330). With such a self-consciousness, coupled with the disciples' commitment to him, the transmission process began (pp. 351-352).

As a wandering (itinerant) preacher, Jesus was a teacher of the masses, doing so by interpreting the OT and in teaching his ideas in a short, mnemonic summary form. These are noted by the characteristic "amen" and "listen" formulae. These crowds were also provoked into thought by his parabolic teachings. All of this was done primarily in Aramaic (cf. pp. 353-407).

It is accepted by all that Jesus formed a group of disciples around himself whom he taught by word and example. But it was particularly the mission of the Twelve that occasioned the need to repeat the teachings of the Master (pp. 453-475). This circle was also the group that received the esoteric teachings of Jesus (pp. 476-487).

From all this, Riesner competently concludes that classic form criticism erred when it argued that little of Jesus could be found in the gospels. Instead, we can confidently return to the gospels with the hope that we will discover who Jesus was and what he demanded.

Of Riesner's work in general I can only offer a few evaluations. His method is unquestionably refreshing in its positive thrust. His comprehensiveness, both of primary and secondary sources (his bibliography is 66 pages long), provides gospel students with an up-to-date account of numerous issues and exegetical difficulties. I have but three criticisms: (1) Although many scholars today have noted difficulties in the two-/four-document hypotheses, the criticisms have simply not given occasion to abandon the usefulness (and, I think, correctness) of the Markan hypothesis. To opt for the more atomistic approach of assessing each pericope on its merit avoids the decisive data that there is a relationship of the synoptics on the gospel/literary level as well. (2) One of the nagging problems in all research today is the multiplication of hypotheses; the more hypotheses that are assumed/accepted, the less probable one's conclusions become (e.g., pp. 66-70). Even though we cannot avoid

the use of others' work, at times it can become a severe handicap. (3) Perhaps the most notable contribution of Riesner is his argument that Jesus taught the Twelve to memorize his teachings. And yet the evidence offered (cf. pp. 364-365, 369, 440-448), though certainly plausible, is almost always inferential from current practices. The best evidence is in Luke 11:1, which does not appear to be typical, and perhaps Matt 13:24, 31 (when compared to 2 Tim 2:2; Deut 4:8 and Philo, *De Pot. Ins.* 65). I would not want to deny that Jesus' disciples did memorize some (at least) of Jesus' teaching, but it is probably beyond the evidence to argue that Jesus taught them to do so consistently. If he did, we still have the difficult problem of all the variations. However, my criticisms do not diminish at all the importance of this massive monograph for the method of Jesus' teachings and its methodological rigor.

Scot McKnight

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

Erkenntnis des geschichtlichen Christus bei Martin Kähler und bei Adolf Schlatter. By Johannes Heinrich Schmid. *TZ* Sonderband 5. Basel: Friedrich Reinhardt, 1978, XVI + 456 pp., 68 Swiss francs.

A perennial nodal point in NT studies is the relationship of the pre-resurrection Jesus to the post-resurrection Christ. This painstaking study delineates the handling of this problem by two underrated German-speaking exegetical theologians. Kähler (1835-1912) taught for well over forty years at Halle. Schlatter, born in Switzerland in 1852, spent time in various universities, most notably Tübingen, where he was active from 1898 until his death in 1938.

Schmid provides us essentially with two monographs. The first explicates Kähler's reconstruction and interpretation of the *geschichtliche* Christ (pp. 1-238), the second Schlatter's (pp. 239-412). Schmid's focus is hinted at in the ironic title, which combines *Erkenntnis* and *Christus*. Biblical criticism this century has generally insisted that our "knowledge" is restricted to the historical Jesus; what is asserted about Christ is presumed to be strictly a matter of faith, not knowledge. Neither Kähler nor Schlatter accepted this epistemological dualism.

Both men faced an historical criticism that increasingly eroded the historical grounding of the traditionally understood Biblical picture of Jesus—namely, as he who was (is) just as much the transcendental Christ as he was the earthly Nazarene rabbi. At the same time many were embracing a Christ of religio-intellectual abstraction; here Christ received his identity, not out of the NT documents, but out of the creative religious consciousness of contemporary critical thinkers. This state of affairs is still very much a part of the critical theological landscape.

How did Kähler and Schlatter meet these challenges? "The weapon" with which they "battle against the impending dissolution of the faith is the Bible" (p. 413). Schmid guides the reader through a close reading of their salient works, showing in clear detail how they conceived of the relationship between the NT and history on the one hand and the person of Jesus Christ on the other. Neither Kähler nor Schlatter espoused Biblical inerrancy, though in effect their work conforms to the Chicago Statement to a considerable degree. Yet they managed to set forth a cogent picture of NT Christology without giving in either to a formally liberal "from below" or to an excessively dogmatic, historically irresponsible "from above" handling of the NT data.

Those familiar with Kähler only by way of the post-Bultmannian hermeneutical debate and with Schlatter only by way of Peter Stuhlmacher will find this work indispensable and fascinating. Schmid not only evinces an encyclopedic command of his subjects; he also displays an inner understanding of the spirit of their writings. This is not the usual critical rehash and fresh berating of past thinkers whose viewpoints are caricatured and then roundly condemned from contemporary theology's latest critically unimpeachable and most

fashionable vantage point. On the contrary, Schmid gives a sympathetic if lucidly incisive interpretation in a way that lets Kähler and Schlatter challenge Biblical criticism today as they did decades ago. Nor is Schmid concerned to serve up a bland Kähler-Schlatter conceptual comparison. He wants rather to facilitate an understanding of these two in which the courage is found "to depart from all-too-familiar tracks of one's own thinking, in order to let oneself be carried along with these distinctive thinkers and researchers who are whole-heartedly oriented according to the concrete reality of the historical Christ" (p. XVI).

First published some six years ago and largely overlooked in Biblical studies, this is an important work. Of special note are Schmid's conclusions regarding "features of a true-to-the-Bible (*bibelnahe*) Christology" (pp. 414-431). Schmid pulls the work of Kähler and Schlatter into focus vis-à-vis the axiomatic Kantian or neo-Kantian epistemological tenets that today largely dictate to Biblical criticism (whether it cares to admit it or not) how it interprets the Bible. Schmid knows that "Kant's influence in science and theology is now as ever great, and one is thus not at liberty to distance himself facetly from him" (p. 427). Schmid does not champion a simplistic repristination of Kähler and Schlatter. Yet he does imply that they point us along the way that must be traversed if men's understanding and presentation of the historical Christ is to capture the hearts of peoples in this age as it did in an earlier one. Schmid's analysis has much to contribute to current discussion in almost any area of NT exegesis, hermeneutics, and theology.

Robert W. Yarbrough

King's College, Aberdeen, Scotland

What the Bible Says About God the Creator. By Jack Cottrell. Joplin: College Press, 1983, 518 pp., \$7.95.

The creatorship of God is a live subject these days, what with the evolutionists' strenuous effort to denounce it. They have created Committees of Correspondence in every state to fight creation science—they are taking it that seriously. And they are losing out in their debates with creation scientists. This book is designed to deal with the issue not from the scientific viewpoint, however, but from the Biblical, theological and philosophical viewpoint.

But it does deal with the "Implications of Creation" in chap. 4, the subdivisions of which are "Creation in Nature," "Creation and Man," "Creation and Worship," "Creation and Ethics" and "The Primacy of Creation." It is these implications of creation, which of necessity imply and demand a Creator, that worry the evolutionists. "Mind-boggling" is the way the author speaks of these implications (p. 143). The irony of the whole situation is that it is nature itself with which the evolutionists are so completely engrossed, and they accumulate unscientific arguments to take it out of the realm of creation.

Contrary to the dualisms of Gnosticism and Manichaeism, the Bible teaches that nature and matter are good instead of evil. The author quotes in that connection 1 Tim 4:4: "For everything created by God is good, and nothing is to be rejected, if it is received with gratitude" (p. 144). The dependence of matter is another factor that separates the creationist from the evolutionist. For the latter, matter is dependent on an unknown origin, a theoretical and scientifically unsound development, while, as the author insists, "Matter owes its existence to God; it is completely dependent upon God" (p. 146). Consequent to this, then, "Matter is not only dependent; it is dependable. That is to say, material existence is rational and predictable" (p. 147).

The author gives attention to pagan alternatives to creation, the transcendence of God, the infinity of God, our knowledge of God, the living God and the fear of God. A little over half of the book is given over to these theological considerations. There is an extensive bibliography of over 20 pages and indexes of names, subjects and Scripture references.

Scientists as well as theologians could profit from reading this book. Truly the creation/evolution controversy is operating as a watershed of both science and faith (Heb 11:3).

Arnold D. Ehlert

The Institute for Creation Research, El Cajon, CA

Cities of the Biblical World: Jericho. By John R. Bartlett. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982, 128 pp., \$6.95 paper.

John Bartlett, lecturer in divinity and fellow of Trinity College in Dublin, has contributed a volume to the Cities of the Biblical World series that has a wealth of information and illustration about one of the most interesting cities of the Biblical period.

The author tells the story of Jericho as it may be learned through the historical remembrances of the ancients and the stratigraphy of two mounds: Tell es-Sultan and Tulul Abu el-'Alaiq. He takes the reader from Jericho's first foundation (ca. 9250 B.C.) to her existence under the Hasmonaeans and the Herods.

Bartlett begins with a geographical description of the site of ancient Jericho, acquainting the reader sufficiently with H. B. Tristram's *The Natural History of the Bible* (1898) and its vivid portrayal of the place. He then moves successively through the history of archaeological researches there and on to the various levels of occupation. From the Mesolithic Age and upward through the stratigraphic record, Bartlett recounts the archaeological evidence as unearthed and interpreted by Kathleen M. Kenyon.

Early on, however, Bartlett sets as one of his intentions in the book to push the interpretation of the finds at Jericho beyond Kenyon, as some other scholars have done. He argues that the Biblical story of the collapse of Jericho's walls in Joshua cries out for archaeological corroboration, and that corroboration has not been forthcoming. "It is now clear," he writes, "that there is no archaeological evidence to support the idea that the town of Jericho collapsed about the date usually assigned to Joshua, in the thirteenth century BC, and it is clear from scholarly examination of the biblical account that Joshua 6 cannot be interpreted as a simple chronicle based on eye-witness report" (pp. 6-7). It is therefore impossible to relate with any confidence the Biblical account and the archaeological evidence of the destruction of Jericho. He surmises that the Deuteronomic historian, writing several centuries later, may have enlarged on a comparatively small event that occurred in the twelfth or eleventh century when the Benjamites settled the region. "At all events, the solution to the problem is more likely to be found in the correct evaluation of the literary evidence than in further excavation of Tell es-Sultan" (p. 107).

Bartlett dismisses the explanation of Kenyon, who conducted the excavations at Jericho: "Jericho, therefore, was destroyed in the late Bronze Age II. It is very possible that this destruction is truly remembered in the Book of Joshua, although archaeology cannot provide the proof. The subsequent break in occupation that is proved by archaeology is, however, in accord with the biblical story. There was a period of abandonment, during which erosion removed most of the remains of the Late Bronze Age town and much of the earlier ones, and rainwater gulleys cutting deeply into the underlying levels have been found" ("Jericho" in *Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land* [ed. M. Avi-Yonah], 1. 564). Kenyon also surmised that the Middle Bronze Age defenses, having lasted till the sixteenth century, could have survived sufficiently to be repaired for use in the Late Bronze Age towns. But since so much of the Middle Bronze Age defenses have disappeared, "it is absolutely certain that nothing at all of the later town, to the period of which the entry into Palestine must belong, can survive. Archaeology will thus never be able to provide visual evidence of the walls that fell down in front of the attacking Israelites" (*The Bible and Recent Archaeology*, p. 38).

Daniel Hayden King

Florida College, Temple Terrace, FL