

BOOK REVIEWS

Easter Enigma: Do the Resurrection Stories Contradict One Another? By John Wenham. Exeter: Paternoster, 1984.

For those of us who are even mildly interested in detective stories, Wenham's new book should provide some fine reading. His study is designed to provide one possible model of the passion and resurrection events based on a careful study of the gospels and 1 Cor 15:3-8. Studies of this nature are often held up to ridicule, and even strong evangelicals would prefer to stay away from forced or artificial harmonizations. Most of us are content to believe that while the different accounts are historically accurate we cannot piece together a complete story with only the available clues.

This book will probably convince the reader that with a few reasonable assumptions a picture of these events will fall together that does full justice to the texts while throwing light on seemingly casual details. The investigation centers on the identity of the participants (for example, he identifies Mary Magdalene with Mary of Bethany), the topography of first-century Jerusalem (with which the author is intimately familiar) and the viewpoint of the evangelists. To give one example, Wenham speculates that after Good Friday Peter, John and Jesus' mother stayed in John's house in Jerusalem, while Joanna and Susanna lodged in the Hasmonean palace. Mary Magdalene, "the other Mary" and Clopas returned to Bethany on Saturday night to regain contact with the rest of the apostles. The other nine apostles had fled from Gethsemane to their friends' house, and so Matthew accurately writes from the point of view of one who saw the two Marys leave for the tomb on Easter morning (Matt 28:1). The different appearances to different people on Sunday can be explained by their different routes of travel and the specific gates they used to enter and leave the city.

Wenham also gives some helpful information about the rather faceless women mentioned in the gospels. He concludes, although his reconstruction does not depend on this, that Alpheus/Clopas/Cleophas and "the other Mary" were brother and sister-in-law to Joseph the father of Jesus. Salome, wife of Zebedee, was the virgin Mary's sister. This hypothesis shows a reason why these particular women traveled with Jesus and went to the tomb: Both were mothers of apostles.

Wenham concludes that at one time he did not have such faith in these details of the gospel accounts but was in fact convinced by his own research. In fact this book was originally recommended to the present writer by one with a lesser view of inspiration but who was seriously rethinking his estimation of gospel history because of Wenham's work. Not all of the author's suggestions are of equal value, but the book is stimulating reading and well worthwhile. It is written in a clear, concise, popular style and is suitable for laypeople as well as scholars.

Gary Steven Shogren

Kings College, Aberdeen, Scotland

The Resurrection of Jesus. By Pinchas Lapide. London: SPCK, 1984, 160 pp.

Had this little book been written by a NT critic, it would hardly have merited much notice. But it was not. It was written by an eminent Jewish theologian who has stunned the world by defending historically his belief in the resurrection of Jesus. A popular treatment,

the book presents itself as an olive branch in Jewish/Christian ecumenical dialogue, but it is also of interest for Biblical scholars concerned with the resurrection.

At root, Lapidé seems to be convinced of the historicity of Jesus' resurrection on the basis of the dramatic change wrought in the disciples. "Concerning the resurrection of Jesus on Easter Sunday, I was for decades a Saducee," he writes. "I am no longer a Saducee since the following deliberation has caused me to think through this anew. In none of the cases where rabbinic literature speaks of such visions did it result in an essential change in the life of the resuscitated or of those who had experienced the visions . . . It is different with the disciples of Jesus on that Easter Sunday . . . When this scared, frightened band of the apostles . . . suddenly could be changed overnight into a confident mission society . . ., then no vision or hallucination is sufficient to explain such a revolutionary transformation" (p. 125). Indeed Lapidé believes that such a transformation, based on autosuggestion or self-deception, "would be a much greater miracle than the resurrection itself" (p. 126). Lapidé twits Christian NT critics like Bultmann and Marxsen for their theologizing of the resurrection: Their conceptions of that event are "too abstract and scholarly to explain the fact that the solid hillbillies from Galilee who . . . were saddened to death, were changed within a short period of time into a jubilant community of believers" (p. 129).

In addition to this fundamental consideration Lapidé provides grounds for the historicity of the empty tomb of Jesus. He argues for the women's discovery of the empty tomb on the basis of the fact that a fictional narrative would have avoided making women, whose testimony counted for little in Jewish society, the "crown witnesses" of the resurrection (p. 95). Specifically the association of Mary Magdalene, who had been demon-possessed, with the narrative, as well as the women's fear and silence, are earmarks of historical credibility. Lapidé finds the women's motive of anointing the corpse to be historically plausible in light of Jewish custom, a fact that underscores their lack of expectation of Jesus' resurrection. Moreover the empty tomb was not conceived of as bringing anyone to faith in the resurrection, which presumably suggests that the reports of its discovery are not colored by theological motifs. This is confirmed by the fact that Jesus' resuscitation is nowhere described by the evangelists, an embellishment that would have been very tempting.

With regard to the appearance traditions, Lapidé appeals to the pre-Pauline formula of 1 Cor 15:3 ff. to prove that the disciples saw visions of Jesus alive. According to Lapidé the "impressive reserve and restraint" of Paul's words show clearly the subjectivity of the reality of the appearances (p. 97). "Only in later 'reports,' which easily can be recognized as secondary embellishments, are they generalized into a public event. Still later, as a polemic, spiteful reaction against those who denied the Easter faith, they were objectified into a historical event which supposedly does not need any faith to be considered as true" (p. 99). In Lapidé's view "it was faith alone that enabled people to experience what the apostles called the resurrection" (p. 118).

In the above remarks we see Lapidé's uncritical acceptance of some of the conventional wisdom of current criticism as well as the existentialist notion of faith. The supposed dichotomy between Paul's citation and the later reports is not only unproved but quite implausible. After all, the pre-Pauline formula purports to be a summary of the apostolic preaching, so that it must by nature be concise. And comparison of this formula with the sermons in Acts and the reports in the gospels suggests that this formula is an abbreviation of the stories of Jesus' crucifixion, burial, empty tomb and resurrection appearances. Furthermore, careful exegesis of Paul's teaching on the nature of the resurrection body as well as his differentiation between visions of Jesus and resurrection appearances of Jesus belie any attempt to construe Paul's understanding of the appearances as nonphysical and subjective. Nor does Lapidé offer any explanation of how traditions of original subjective, visionary experiences of Jesus could be totally corrupted in so short a time and in the face of apostolic testimony to the contrary into the unanimous gospel reports of physical appearances. Lapidé induces modern Christian theologians for being "ashamed of the material facticity of the resurrection" (p. 130), but it is difficult to avoid the impression that a similar

embarrassment has led him to de-materialize the appearances. As for his concept of faith, Lapide has clearly adopted the existentialist construal of faith in epistemological categories as a way of apprehending truth that is opposed to belief based on evidence. "If science and religion could be identified, where would the risk of faith remain? Faith is basically a 'believing-in-spite-of'; it involves the courage to endure and conquer all doubts" (p. 118). Not only does such an understanding seem at tension with his own presentation of evidence for Jesus' resurrection, but more importantly it seems unbiblical. The conception of faith as *fiducia* is not at all opposed to evidence, since evidence leads only to *assensus*, and an additional act of commitment or trust is necessary for saving faith. In any case, on Lapide's own account the disciples were characterized precisely by a lack of faith when they experienced the appearances of Jesus. The appearances produced the faith, not vice versa. Were faith a prerequisite for seeing the risen Jesus, the Christian way should never have come to be. Even in the Pauline testimony, at least James and Paul were decidedly unbelievers, so that the appearances were not for the eye of faith alone.

Lapide attempts to rebut two objections to Jesus' resurrection: (1) the privacy of the appearances, and (2) the parallels in the history of religions. In response to (1) he appeals to the above bifurcation between proof and faith. He also suggests that had Jesus appeared to many of his Jewish contemporaries then the Jesus movement might have remained an intra-Jewish affair (p. 117). Neither of these responses strikes me as very convincing. Surely a better answer would have been simply to point out that the want of additional evidence does not negate the evidence we do have. In response to (2) Lapide suggests that the myths of dying and rising gods helped to prepare the pagan world for the Christian message (pp. 120-122). Again, this response does not seem to get to the essential issue, which is whether these mythological analogues are really parallel to Jesus' resurrection and whether there exists any genealogical connection between them and belief in Jesus' resurrection. It is doubtful that either is in fact the case.

A further concession to contemporary theological thinking would seem to be Lapide's denial that the resurrection is a miracle. "The works of our creator are altogether wonderful—but not miraculous. They do not arbitrarily skip the natural chain of cause and effect like the works of the sorcerer in the fairytale" (p. 150). One is tempted to ask how Lapide knows this. And in what sense, then, is the resurrection any more an act of God than the erosion of a hillside or the formation of film on a pond? And why do not resurrections then occur as regularly as births and deaths? A miraculous element seems unavoidable. In Lapide's view, a resurrection seems to be the survival of the personal ego beyond death (p. 151). But this is clearly nothing more than the Greek notion of the immortality of the soul. Lapide is terribly vague here and not very rigorous in his thinking. I suspect he is trying to gain a hearing from his German colleagues by denying the miraculousness of the resurrection, but in so doing he has in fact abandoned his Jewish faith in favor of a consistent deism.

Finally, as to the theological significance of the resurrection, Lapide sees this event as the God of Israel's vindication of the rabbi from Nazareth but fails to see any connection between the resurrection and Jesus' being the Messiah. Hence Lapide can consistently remain a non-Christian. It is somewhat amazing that Lapide cannot make this connection. When I heard him lecture in Munich, I was astounded to hear him not only defend the historicity of Jesus' resurrection but also assert that Christian theologians had missed Jesus' clearest claim to Messiahship. Lapide explained that at the Passover a piece of the unleavened bread ("Matzoth") was placed under the tray to be reserved for Messiah when he should come. "I believe," said Lapide, "that at the Last Supper Jesus took this Matzoth reserved for Messiah and broke it and said, 'This is my body . . .'" It almost gave me goosebumps to hear Lapide describe that scene. Clearly, if Jesus made the sort of claims to divine authority acknowledged by most NT scholars today and if his resurrection vindicates those claims, then it would seem a small step indeed to embracing him as Messiah and Lord.

According to Lapide, it is religiously inconceivable that Christianity could be the result

of blind happenstance or human error. The Christian religion must be of God, since it "has carried the faith in the God of Israel into the whole Western world" (p. 142). Curiously enough, then, for Lapidé Christianity is a sort of *praeparatio messianica*, which readies the world for the eventual appearance of the true Messiah and the conversion of the world to God. This *bouleversement* of traditional Christian attitudes is intriguing and challenging and constitutes, I think, a significant threat to the finality of the Christian gospel in a day in which theologians engaged in Jewish/Christian ecumenical dialogue are over-anxious to compensate for past anti-Semitism by theological compromise and accommodation. In this connection one may heartily recommend C. Braaten's fine introduction to this book, with his timely warning against betraying the distinctiveness of the Christian gospel for a low Ebionitic Christology.

William C. Craig

The Second Coming: What Will Happen When Jesus Returns. By David Allan Hubbard. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1984, 120 pp., \$2.95 paper.

This small book of eleven chapters is apparently designed to give a simple, Biblically-based introduction to what theologians sometimes call personal and general eschatology. Each chapter has exactly nine pages and is introduced by an entire page of Scripture quotation, in each case a sizable portion of a single chapter. The format and content are admirably simple and clear. Where the author stands on several issues is indicated by some of the topics treated. They include the great tribulation, heaven and hell, the first resurrection, the future of Israel, the triumphal millennium and the second resurrection. The book is readable and didactic without being condescending. Nothing is approached in a controversial manner. Two or three quotations will give the flavor of doctrine promoted. Of Israel: "Their place in God's program means that, as long as history lasts, they will have a prominence beyond their size and numbers" (p. 75). Of the great tribulation: "First, the tribulation will come just before our Lord returns . . . the second thing to be understood about the timing is that we will know the Great Tribulation has arrived when the antichrist appears (2 Thess 2:1-12)" (pp. 36-37). This book has value as an introduction to "prophecy" or "last things" for beginners and as an index to the beliefs of a well-known author who has written much more deeply in several other areas of theological study.

Robert D. Culver

The Great Reversal: Ethics and the New Testament. By Allen Verhey. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984, 246 pp., \$13.95 paper.

Verhey has employed his dual expertise in NT criticism and ethical theory to produce a remarkable volume. He not only nobly offsets the dearth of quality works on NT ethics but also integrates this with a respectable attempt to offer a new answer to the critical question of Christian ethics: How does the Christian rightly use the NT for present-day, ethical decisions? Many *JETS* readers may not be fully satisfied with Verhey's ultimate answer to this question, but his effort to answer it within the context of an analysis of NT ethics must be applauded. Verhey's pastoral concern for the moral life of those in the Christian community alongside his concern for integrity in our use of Scripture are concerns we all share. His approach and his attitude are worthy models for any contemplating the writing of a volume on NT ethics.

Verhey articulates NT ethics in four stages, which comprise his four chapters. These are titled "The Ethics of Jesus," "The Beginnings of a Moral Tradition," "Ethics in the New Testament," and "A Continuing Tradition."

In the first chapter Verhey begins by handily turning the acknowledged diversity in

interpreting Jesus' ethic into positive evidence for the importance and richness of Jesus' teachings. Next he establishes his methodology for reconstructing and analyzing the moral teachings of the historical Jesus. This includes adoption of the criterion of multiple attestation, acknowledgment of the general reliability of the disciples' memory, and recognition that any reconstruction must square with the historical fact that Jesus was put to death on a Roman cross—i.e., the message must be threatening enough to the status quo to invite this punishment. Verhey next deals with the revision of apocalypticism in Jesus' message of the kingdom of God, which leads to a vindication of the book's title. Verhey says (p. 15) that Jesus "expects 'a great reversal' of this present age" comprised of "a transformation of accustomed rules and values." The scandal to some is (p. 16) that "one's eschatological destiny hinges on the response to the present impact of God's imminent sovereignty in Jesus and his ministry." The appropriate response, says Verhey, can be summarized as repentance, which can take various shapes. He then lists these in the form of "concrete commands" of Jesus, which include: Be last of all, be not anxious, give alms, it shall not be taken from her, forbid them not, and judge not. Verhey next analyzes the relationship of Jesus' ethic to the law and concludes that in Jesus the law is brought to eschatological fruition but that there is no legalism involved. This persuasive chapter concludes with the valid assertion that Jesus' resurrection is vindication of his ethic and verifies his authority to speak.

In the second chapter Verhey carefully articulates the discernible forms Jesus' ethic took during the days between Jesus' utterances and their incorporation into the writings of the NT. He begins with imagining the thrill of the "first tellings" of Jesus' story and moves quickly through oral tradition, forms (apophthegms, controversy dialogues, scholastic dialogues, biographical apophthegms), dominical sayings (prophetic, wisdom, legal, I-sayings, parables) and miracle stories. Verhey concludes that each literary form has its distinctive role in conveying morality. In this chapter he also deals with pre-Markan collections and Q and concludes with a welcome section on parenetic tradition, its role and parameters in Christian ethics. Verhey closes with an astute summarizing observation that he will emphasize repeatedly in the book. He says, "Finally, in neither the tradition of Jesus' words and deeds nor in paraenetic tradition . . . is the purpose merely moral education. In both the purpose is to encourage and exhort Christians to the new life given and demanded by what God has done in Jesus Christ."

Verhey establishes at the outset of chap. 3 that the NT presents no unitary ethic since different situations, objectives and traditions shaped the way the gospel of Christ was articulated with respect to moral questions. Therefore Verhey probes the distinctive ethical emphases of each NT writer. *JETS* readers will not be pleased by Verhey's redactional emphasis, which leads him to deny any identification of the sermon on the mount with Jesus' ethic, describing it rather as "the quintessence of Matthew's ethic." His threefold division of Pauline literature on the basis of authenticity, even though Verhey himself only questions the pastorals, seems an unnecessary capitulation to critical opinion. It should be noted that Verhey fails to treat 2 Thessalonians. He says it will be covered alongside Colossians and Ephesians, but this is not done. The coverage of the catholic epistles and Hebrews, notably underplayed in most works on NT ethics, is adequate. However, Verhey's unquestioning acceptance of the views of Dibelius and Sanders (the only sources cited in his footnotes) with regard to James is symptomatic of his tendency to limit too narrowly the sources he uses with regard to these writings in general. For James this leads him to the radical and definitely minority view that Jas 2:14-26 is a deliberate attempt to counter Romans 3.

In his fourth and final chapter Verhey determines that the concern for using Scripture in contemporary ethical decisions divides itself into four key questions involving (1) the nature of Scripture, (2) the proper perspectives from which to look to Scripture as ethically normative, (3) the message of Scripture and (4) the relevance of non-Biblical sources of moral insight. After surveying current views Verhey offers what he calls "a modest pro-

posal." This proposal is an attempt to walk a tightrope between the tendency of fundamentalism unthinkingly to appropriate Scriptural passages for ethical situations in ways that are abusive of Scripture and the intention of passages and the tendency of liberalism to overgeneralize Scriptural emphases. One can sympathize with Verhey's task, but it must be said that his proposal is not altogether convincing. First, Verhey could help himself by expanding the explanation of his proposal. Concrete examples of what a Christian who is facing an ethical decision should do with Scripture would help. Personally I do not understand how Verhey expects limiting questions asked of Scripture to those that involve a Christian's identity and integrity to help the Christian get from Scripture to his decision. Second, I am skeptical of the value of numerous other subjective hoops he wishes a Scriptural passage to jump through before it can be applied to a present-day situation. Scrutinizing the applicability of a passage of Scripture by God's role as sanctifier of Scripture, by Jesus' role as the resurrected one, and especially by such a relative idea as justice before applying to "a changed and changing world" appears to allow Verhey to handcuff more of Scripture than would satisfy most *JETS* readers. He wants to be able to disregard "Matthew's *Halakic* rulings" as well as "Paul's concrete admonitions."

All in all, then, this is an excellent contribution in a much-needed area of research. In its design and its up-to-date critical approach it leaps far beyond the offerings of Sanders and Houlden—and even the balanced approach of Schnackenburg. The footnote documentation is excellent. The writing style is lucid. The book is carefully subdivided, making it usable as a text for a NT ethics course. Whether or not one agrees with Verhey's "modest proposal" or his view of Scripture, there is no doubt that he not only achieves his purpose of blending NT ethics with theory but also asks the right questions. Hopefully his effort will stimulate further development in this neglected area of NT research.

William R. Baker

Hammond, IN

Judaism in the Beginning of Christianity. By Jacob Neusner. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984, 112 pp. *Jesus and the World of Judaism.* By Geza Vermes. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984, 197 pp.

These two books represent the continued multiplication of literature examining the numerous intersections between the beginnings of Christianity and the Judaism of the period.

The first, written by a professor at Brown University who is undoubtedly the most prolific Jewish scholar of Judaism in this generation, is intended to serve as an introductory text for courses on the beginning of Christianity—not so much designed to describe that beginning as to describe the Jewish world of the land of Israel into which Jesus was born. The book does not so much address the sweeping historical and social settings that characterize standard texts of this sort as it deals with five topics that are generally included in any course syllabus dealing with the general subject. The first chapter is the most general and surveys the place of the temple, the relation between Herod and the Roman rule, economic life and education, social classes, and the main religious sects. The second chapter idealizes three types of piety in the Judaism of the age: sage, priest and messiah. By "sage" Neusner means to include the scribe or wise man concerned to develop wise regulation for society, regulation based on Torah and faithfulness to God. The "priest" ties religious life and aspiration to the temple and its cult. By "messiah" Neusner does not so much mean to refer to a variety of messianic pretenders as to the expectation of those Jews who anticipated salvation by some sort of apocalyptic denouement centering on a messianic figure. The third chapter discusses the Pharisees, and the fourth examines the figure of Hillel, studied in the detailed way characteristic of Neusner in order to show how flimsy the sources are when we try to construct anything like a modern biography of this famous rabbi and near contemporary of Jesus. This is designed to show us how critical study of other

ancient figures in first-century Palestine (as the land later came to be called) serves as a model and in some way confirms the historical skepticism in which we must engage as we study Jesus. The last chapter examines the impact of the destruction of the temple on Judaism, in particular the theological response of Yohanan ben Zakkai. The book ends with a moving "Final Word."

Like everything Neusner writes (or at least everything I have read—I cannot pretend to read all he writes), the book is lucid and sympathetic. It includes many extraordinarily suggestive parallels and comparisons and is certainly stimulating to specialists as well as to students just entering the field. Nevertheless readers should be aware that Neusner's position on many points is not shared by many of his colleagues, both Christian and Jewish. For instance, his essay on the Pharisees, based on his three-volume *magnum opus*, is considerably more skeptical of the sources than many others allow. His Pharisees are supremely focused on questions of ritual wholeness and the extension of that cultic purity into the sanctification needed for everyday life. Ultimately he argues that their concern and the concern of Christians for salvation are ultimately so different that they are dealing with mutually exclusive categories, and so "there really is no debate between Christian and Jew on the character of the Pharisees, and no apologetic is needed. Understanding supersedes dispute, respect for the deepest concern of the other takes the place of the need to justify and defend oneself. An issue between the Pharisees as we know them in rabbinical writings and the Christian critics of the Pharisees as we know their views in sayings assigned to Jesus is a simple question of how salvation is to be attained. That question endures, although in this very different century of ours the old bitterness is gone and a new sense of shared humility before God flourishes" (p. 61). The gentleness and humility are admirable, but one cannot help feeling that certain crucial issues are being ducked. Or again, in the detailed source-critical and form-critical study of the texts that describe Hillel, I am instantly drawn to comparisons with Bultmann's *History of the Synoptic Tradition*. The same mental agility is found here—along with the same tendency to pile speculation on speculation and to depend on too many disjunctions. For example, in his treatment of Hillel's alleged ordaining of the *prozbul*, Neusner finds an irreconcilable conflict between the justification for Hillel's action in his exegesis of Scripture and the justification of his action in the needs of his contemporary society—and on that basis he develops a source-critical analysis that results in a sublime skepticism as to how Hillel was involved, if at all. I confess I remain unpersuaded that the initial disjunction is valid, and so the ensuing source criticism is similarly suspect.

The second book is rather different in intent and level. The Jewish scholar Vermes has brought together the ten chapters of this book from material already published. Some of the chapters have been only lightly revised, others somewhat more so. Vermes rather engagingly tells us that the title of the book was chosen by the publishers: He himself would have preferred something like *Jesus Within the World of Judaism* since his entire approach demands that we interpret Jesus within the maelstrom of first-century Judaism.

The first chapter, "Jesus the Jew," sums up the thesis of his rather important book by the same title. The next three chapters need to be read together under the general rubric "The Gospel of Jesus the Jew." The first of these is "A Historian's Reading of the Gospels," in which there is just a bit too much self-protestation that his approach is likely to be less biased than that of others, whether Jew or Christian. The next is "The Father and His Kingdom," in which Jesus' authentic teaching revolves primarily on those passages in which Jesus presents himself as devoted to his heavenly Father. The third is "Jesus and Christianity," in which a contrast is drawn between Christianity as outlined by Paul and the teaching of Jesus as reconstructed by Vermes. There is no discussion of the famous work by J. G. Machen, *The Origin of Paul's Religion*, or of the book by Ridderbos, *Paul and Jesus*, or of more specialized treatments along the same line. Chapter 5 rather movingly (and correctly) stresses the importance of Jewish studies in mature NT interpretation. The same theme is further developed in chap. 6, which focuses a little more on questions of

methodology. This chapter usefully criticizes Str-B and Kittel, and even some of the recent work of Fitzmyer. Among its more useful arguments is that the "sectors likely to benefit most from comparison with Jewish sources are those of religious concepts and motifs" (p. 81) instead of mere word studies and the like. Chapter 7 restates Vermes' well-known position on the "Son of Man" debate. The final three chapters represent his latest views on the impact of QL on the study of the OT and NT and on Jewish historiography. The book has wide usefulness for specialists both in NT and in Jewish studies.

D. A. Carson

Woman in the Bible. By Mary J. Evans. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1983, 160 pp., \$5.95 paper.

In her investigation of the Biblical material on women, Evans purports to steer clear of the Scylla of assuming we already know what the Bible says about women and the Charybdis of explaining away the Biblical teaching concerning women as the result of cultural conditioning. Evans is thorough and well-read on her subject.

Beginning with Genesis 1-2, Evans sees no distinctions between the man and woman. She critiques the usual reasons for understanding the woman as subordinate to the man in Genesis 2. Though Paul refers to the prior creation of the man in 1 Tim 2:13 (the most conclusive argument for the woman's subordination), he does not draw any conclusions from it, Evans argues. And Adam's "naming" the woman in Gen 2:23 does not use the usual formula and so does not qualify as an exercise of dominion. In Genesis 3, subordination is introduced—as one result of the fall. "Where there had been equality there would now be domination" (p. 20).

In her survey of the bulk of the OT material Evans, in the section "Woman in Society and the Family," relies too heavily on what others say the Bible says about women. The Biblical references are often relegated to the endnotes. If they had been included in the text it would be easier to check them. In a few instances the references do not seem to support the thesis, as in the case of the wife's being seen only as a means of obtaining children (n. 70: Prov 12:4; 14:1; 19:14; 31:10-31) (p. 25). Evans concludes that woman was a full member of the covenant community yet subject to her husband or father, and that patriarchy is not God's will for all time.

Evans' discussion of the NT cultural influences (Judaism, Essenes and the Qumran sect, the Greco-Roman world) acts as an excellent foil to Jesus' relationships with women. Evans agrees with almost everyone else that Jesus broke with the customs of his day and treated women as persons of worth. She emphasizes that Jesus saw each person, regardless of sex, as a sinner in need of repentance and forgiveness (p. 56). Jesus related to men and women in the same way.

According to Evans, the key to understanding the relationship of man and woman is found in the doctrinal teachings of the epistles. Evans points out that since Gal 3:28 affirms that men and women stand in the same relationship to God, no passage can be interpreted to teach otherwise.

The key concept for Evans is "head," and she challenges its traditional interpretation as one having authority over another. She suggests that authority was foreign to the Greek understanding of head and that Paul would have had to specify such connotations for his Greek audiences in Corinth (1 Cor 11:3) and Ephesus (Eph 5:21-24), though in Hebrew such connotations exist. It is difficult to be sure what was in the minds of the Corinthians and Ephesians when they heard the word "head," but there were Jewish Christians in Corinth who would have been familiar with the OT usage. Evans then examines how "head" is used in 1 Cor 11:2-16; Eph 5:21-24 and prefers the meaning "source" or "origin" in both (1 Cor 11:8; Col 1:18). Evans sees the removal of subordinationism in the Trinity as a plus, but the subordination of the Son to the Father is taught in 1 Cor 15:28. In addition, one wonders

how the Father is the source of the Son and how the Son as opposed to the Father is the source of the man.

Evans' exegesis of Eph 5:21-24 is more problematic. She emphasizes the "but" at the beginning of v 24 and interprets vv 23-24 in this way: "Even though the husband as 'head' of the wife is to serve her and give himself fully on her behalf, nevertheless the wife must not think that that places her in a special position without responsibilities, for just as the church is subject to Christ, she too is to be subject to her husband in everything" (p. 75). Evans overlooks the "for" of v 23, which causally connects the submission of the wife to the headship of the husband. The wife submits herself to her husband because he is her head. The "but" of v 24 follows Christ's being the Savior of the Church, which is the point of contrast.

Evans' interpretation of 1 Tim 2:9-15 resembles that of others who see no distinctions between men and women in the Church. She views it as prohibiting uninformed or false teaching. This approach is based on a misunderstanding of *authentein* as domineering, the existence of false teaching at Ephesus, and the activity of the women in the NT Church. One of the problems with this view is that it does not account for the temporal priority of the man in creation, which is introduced by "for," as one of the reasons for the prohibition in v 12. Evans' response to this objection is that v 13 may merely be an introduction to the argument about Eve's deception (p. 104)—a weak explanation.

Evans reviews all the NT texts relating to women. She concludes that in the NT there is a "remarkably egalitarian picture of marriage" with the male as prior in some unspecified way (p. 132). In the Church, "no function or activity within the Church was specifically or absolutely barred to women," though "senior leaders were almost always males" (p. 132). Though her exegesis is not convincing to this reviewer, Evans does give close attention to the texts and raises questions that will help to sharpen and refine future exegesis.

Susan T. Foh

Table and Tradition: Toward an Ecumenical Understanding of the Eucharist. By Alasdair I. C. Heron. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1983, 206 pp., \$11.95.

Two very different understandings of the sacrament of the Lord's supper divide western Christianity into the Roman Catholic Church and the churches of the Reformation. The former emphasizes what is done, especially by the priest, and sees the whole event as a sacrificial offering to God. The latter underscores what has been done by Christ, which now is remembered and received with gratitude. Despite this radical cleavage in viewpoint in the Church, Heron believes that an ecumenical understanding of the eucharist can be developed. *Table and Tradition* seeks to point in the direction in which such an understanding may lie.

Although the book did not appear until 1983, its contents are based on the 1978 Kerr lectureship at the University of Glasgow. Subsequent revision and the author's move from Edinburgh to Erlangen, where he now holds the chair of Reformed theology, account for the delay in publication. The book is directed primarily to students and ministers in Reformed Churches. In fact, the dialogue between the Reformed and Roman Churches forms the context for the work as a whole.

The book's format reflects the author's approach to the problem. After outlining in the prologue the basic Protestant-Catholic disagreements concerning the sacrament, Heron turns to the NT documents. One third of the book is devoted to his summary exegesis of the various relevant texts. Surprisingly Heron concludes that the "question of the precise connection between Jesus and the Eucharist elements," which is one source of disagreement among the churches, "is not directly posed in the New Testament" (p. 55).

The major part of the book summarizes the development of the various theologies of the Lord's supper. Although some attention is given to the early and medieval eras, the heart

of the book is Heron's discussion of the positions of the three major Reformers (Luther, Zwingli and Calvin).

The exegetical and historical findings form the basis of Heron's own suggestions, which are delineated in the closing chapter. In his estimation neither the realism of Luther nor the subjectivism of Zwingli holds promise for an ecumenical theology of the eucharist. Rather, the author seeks to mine the heritage of Calvin, especially his emphasis on the role of the Holy Spirit in mediating the Lord's presence in the elements.

Yet the book does not advocate merely a return to Calvin. In Heron's estimation not even the Geneva Reformer moved beyond the debate of that era, which mistakenly centered on the relationship between "Christ's past" and the present celebration of the eucharist. This debate missed a central thrust of the NT—namely, that the sacrament is an eschatological celebration. The Lord's presence at the eucharist "is not merely a continuation or extension of what he was 2,000 years ago," as is assumed by all the traditional positions. Instead the presence of the Lord "is his bearing upon our present to make it (i.e., our present) a form and means of *his* presence, opening it (and us) to his future" (p. 153).

Delineation of an ecumenical understanding of the eucharist is impossible in such a short book. Fortunately, Heron does not attempt this task. He seeks only to continue the conversation and to offer insight for further work. This he does well, thereby making an important contribution to this crucial discussion.

Stanley J. Grenz

North American Baptist Seminary, Sioux Falls, SD

In Defense of Theology. By Gordon H. Clark. Mott Media, 1984, 119 pp.

Theology repels three groups of people: uninterested Christians, atheists (including agnostics and pantheists) and a mixed bag of pentecostals, certain fundamentalists and the neo-orthodox anti-theologians. Neo-orthodoxy is anti-theological because it is anti-logical. Three chapters of this book describe and dismiss the three anti-theological attitudes. The heart of the book is chap. 5 on logic. As a "logical defense of logical theology" (p. 73), the argument takes on the unexpected form of a defense of logic by Scripture (pp. 94 ff.). The primacy of faith in relation to reason is strenuously upheld in harmony with unwavering insistence on the rationality of faith. The somewhat technical footnote on formal logic (pp. 101 ff.) draws a few morals from logical necessity: "Any 'faith' that curbs necessary inference is not Christian faith at all. It is irrationalism . . . Because many people avoid theology as well as logic, they are deceived by specious arguments" (p. 104).

The final chapter introduces a fourth group: Christians no less devout than those of the first group but who, even without a course in logic, "realize by their apriori intellectual image that an understanding of revealed information includes what that information logically implies" (p. 107). Theology is possible because man was created in God's image, in rationality. Since a blank mind cannot be the divine image, empiricism is anti-Christian (p. 12). Evolutionistic naturalism by rejecting the rational image entails relativism and skepticism.

This small gem will be ignored by atheists and may infuriate some neo-evangelicals, but it could awaken some Christians to the importance of sound doctrine. Some may be moved to hunt up some of Clark's many other writings, made available by The Trinity Foundation, P.O. Box 169, Jefferson, MD 21755.

William Young

University of Rhode Island, Kingston

Ethics and the Christian. By R. C. Sproul. Wheaton: Tyndale, 1983, 94 pp., \$2.95 paper.

Sproul has made many fine contributions to the Christian Church over the past few years. Those who are already "fans" of his thought will no doubt wish to hear what Sproul

has to say about ethics. Those who are already in agreement with his ethical positions may find some help in buttressing their commitments. Some ethically confused or wavering souls may be strengthened. Scholars and pastors will find this a useful sample of current ethical thinking among many American evangelicals and fundamentalists.

Sproul spends the first half of the book on method and the last half on specific issues. In his method he is concerned to affirm the importance of divine revelation as the basis for an ethics that is absolute. Though he warns against legalism, his primary concerns are antinomianism, situation ethics, and the elevation of normal behavior to normative status ("statistical morality"). He is concerned that his readers learn to distinguish between greater and lesser forms of sin and be able to recognize "adiaphorous" matters that do not fall within the ethical commands of God (and are left to the taste and conviction of the individual). His four issues chosen for discussion are economic materialism, capital punishment, war and abortion. In each case he espouses a traditional, conservative viewpoint.

Like Sproul, I believe Christian ethics must be firmly based on divine revelation ("inerrant Scripture" to boot). Unfortunately, even a brief 94-page book ought to make much clearer than Sproul does why this is so and how the Bible functions in Christian ethics. If Sproul's four "issue" studies are examples of how to discover divine revelation on a given topic, we are in trouble. None of Sproul's studies conveys anything of the richness and power of Biblical revelation. His justifications of wealth, private property and the profit motive, for example, are extremely simplistic and onesided. To allow the Exod 21:22-25 passage to dominate a discussion of abortion is not very helpful. Furthermore, why are these four issues chosen and not others? Are abortion, capital punishment and war more pressing issues than truth-telling, sexuality and political decision-making in most readers' experiences? Will readers of this little book be better prepared to be ethically faithful on the job tomorrow?

A more fundamental problem is the method taught or implied by Sproul's study. First, he is not very precise, accurate or persuasive in what he does say. His definitions of "ethics," "morality," "freedom" and "autonomy," for example, are wrong historically, etymologically and theologically. His discussion of "the continuum of vice and virtue" is unhelpful and certainly does not get at "the main thrust of Jesus' teaching in the Sermon on the Mount" (pp. 17-18). His discussion of "conscience" raises far more questions than it answers.

Second, the task of ethics, as Sproul presents it, is for an individual "moral athlete" to search for ethical principles in his or her concordance and then muster the "moral courage to do the good" (p. 93). But that is only a small part of the ethical teaching of Scripture. Where is the person of Jesus Christ in all this? Where is the community of faith? Where is eschatology? Where is character formation? Biblical ethics cannot be an individualistic, rationalistic, "quandary ethics" of the kind that has dominated the western philosophical tradition for two thousand years. Situation ethics is an enemy of Christian faithfulness. But while fighting so vociferously against this approach, we have allowed other enemies to come in the back door and make themselves at home among evangelicals. Biblical Christian ethics is an infinitely richer brew than that presented by Sproul.

My disappointment in this book is fueled by the respect and admiration (and, thus, high expectations) I have for Sproul. My willingness to prepare this painful review is based partly on the conviction that those who read will be misled, but it is also based on a hope that Sproul will take the time to write the kind of ethics book of which he is certainly capable.

David W. Gill

New College Berkeley

Sociology and the Human Image. By David Lyon. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1983, 224 pp., \$6.95 paper.

Lyon has written a superb book on the relationship of sociology and Christian thought. As a point of integration he considers the "human image" as understood by various sociological thinkers and as revealed in Scripture. He steers a wise and thoughtful course between those who treat human beings as free makers of history and those who reduce the human agent to a mere pawn of various social systems and forces.

Though not a history of sociology, the book contains a wealth of helpful material on the founding fathers of sociology (Comte, Durkheim, Weber, Marx) and on the various movements and schools of sociology over the past century. Lyon is factually accurate and brings a balanced critical judgment to each of these figures. He writes with great familiarity with the sociological world and yet with essential Christian critical perspective. He is expert especially on the legacy of Marx, but I found his comments on Habermas and the influential "critical theory" (Frankfurt school) to be equally helpful. Lyon concludes for a "Christian perspective in sociology" rather than a (possibly sectarian) new "Christian Sociology" *per se*.

Lyon's book, as he says in the introduction, will be most helpful for those who have already read at least some sociology. I would urge sociology professors in Christian colleges to consider this book as assigned reading, and pastors should try to get it into the hands of sociology students in their congregations. All who wish some introduction and wise guidance through the contemporary labyrinth of sociology will profit from this book. It is also a model of the kind of quality integrative thinking and writing Christians must undertake in all fields.

Having thrown all these bouquets toward Lyon, I must confess my disappointment that more space was not given to the work of Jacques Ellul—perhaps the most important Christian sociologist in our generation. This would also have implied that technology and bureaucracy be considered as at least equal in importance with Marxism and feminism as contemporary challenges to sociology. I would also like to see attention directed to the nature of the Church as a "society within a society," to the Biblical cosmology of the "powers" in relation to notions of systems and structures, to the Biblical concept of sociality as rooted in the Trinity, and more discussion of the relation of moral values to a given social group.

None of this is to complain about what Lyon has written, all of which is superb. Rather, it is to suggest further avenues to explore. For this reviewer, at any rate, such exploration will be most fruitful if guided by a first-rate Christian sociologist like David Lyon.

David W. Gill

New College Berkeley

The Great Omission. By Robert McQuilkin. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1984, 103 pp., \$4.95 paper.

Missionary messages usually are heard with more excitement than they are read, but that can not be said of these lectures. With eloquent simplicity and directness the addresses come to grips with basic issues in world evangelization today. Seldom have I come across a more compact Biblical answer to the perplexing question: How come so few Christians go to the unreached multitudes?

Getting at the inner drive of the spirit his first chapter, "Three Loves," sets an insightful tone for the book. He notes that love of self with its attendant desire for reward and fear of loss may prompt some obedience, but it falters before the sacrificial demands of the cross. Love for people, nearer the divine comparison, thrusts one to care more deeply for the lost. Yet love of God himself must constrain the will before Christ's great commission becomes the heartbeat of life.

McQuilkin goes on to point out that the salvation of a fallen race is what brings the greatest glory to God. Forthrightly he discusses the lostness of humanity, along with what happens to those persons who have never heard the gospel. Turning to the Church, he gives due attention to the need for prayer and the empowerment of the Holy Spirit. A final chapter deals with the missionary call.

Running through the volume is a plea for believers to obey the voice of God, repent of an apathetic life style, and commit ourselves to become world disciples. Certainly the challenge is needed. I can only hope that it will not go unheeded.

Robert E. Coleman

Deerfield, IL

The Gift of Prophecy in 1 Corinthians. By Wayne A. Grudem. Washington: University Press of America, 1982, 333 pp.

This volume is the author's 1978 Cambridge dissertation under the supervision of C. F. D. Moule. The text, he says, has been altered only to add two brief sections (pp. 43-53, 82-105) and therefore has not taken recent literature into consideration (notably D. Hill, *New Testament Prophecy* [Atlanta: John Knox, 1979]; but cf. his review of Hill in *Themelios* 7 [1982] 25-26). Grudem proposes to define "the type of prophecy represented in 1 Corinthians" (p. 5), a study overlooked but significant. In his four chapters he discusses such by examination of "authority," the psychological state of the prophet; the function, content and form of prophecy; and the qualifications for being a prophet. His book is important for the debate in the United States regarding the charismatic movement and may provide answers for the perplexing problem of prophets in the contemporary Church. The author's style is clear, and he provides readers with helpful syntheses and summaries.

The closest the author comes to driving a central theory is contained in his first chapter. Grudem argues that authority can either be claimed by a prophet or attributed to the prophet by someone else. His major proposal is that one must distinguish "divine authority of actual words" from "divine authority of general content." The former is evidenced in the OT (Deut 18:18-20 *et al.*) and NT (e.g. Matt 10:19-20; Eph 2:20; Revelation), the latter in Jewish extra-Biblical literature (the juxtaposition of cessation and revelatory activity). This last category is then used analogously to clarify some NT phenomena: the authority of general content but not details (1 Cor 14:29, 30, 36, 37-38; 11:5; also Acts 21:4; 1 Thess 5:19-21). (In this discussion Grudem has a valuable comparison of OT prophets to NT apostles and concludes that it is the NT apostle and not the NT prophet who is the NT analogy to OT prophets. This is a helpful contribution and forcefully presented.) Grudem certainly finds a sensitive issue, for it seems that one cannot simply equate Isaiah's prophecies with Acts 21:4—and therefore I find his conclusion attractive but not completely convincing. Were not all prophecies weighed and, after deciding that such was a message from the Lord, was not then obedience demanded? If so, it is not a matter of degree but of kind: Some utterances were from God and others not. (I use "degree" because he sees some authority extending to every word.) But more importantly, I wonder if his usage of a category from extra-Biblical data is warranted. In these documents the assumption is that God has withdrawn the spirit of prophecy, but in 1 Corinthians such is not the case. Thus the rabbis could not claim a direct revelation with divine authority of actual words, and their perceptions were therefore necessarily inferior. The Corinthians (and Paul) could claim revelation (which is how Grudem defines prophecy; cf. pp. 139-144). (I add here that a very real problem for this view [and for the NT data] is the combination of revelation and only an authority of general content. Grudem has certainly pointed to a sticky wicket, and his solution may prove convincing to many.) But it appears unwise to me to use this extra-Biblical category for describing the Corinthian phenomena. It seems therefore that the

author too quickly offers a category and, having not established it as a good analogy—which is needful here—proceeds to utilize such for phenomena in a different arena. In other words, with the conviction that the Spirit was once again active, it seems that the NT data will require a different explanation.

Chapter 2 discusses the psychological state of the prophet. What characterizes prophecy is receipt of a revelation and the public report of that revelation. This revelation comes spontaneously to an individual from God and results in a divine perspective on something. But this experience was not ecstatic because the prophet was not forced to speak against his will, did not lose control, spoke understandably and was aware of his congregation (1 Cor 14:29-33). This argument is presented forcefully, and I can only disagree with some details without details of why: his view that 1 Cor 14:32 means various manifestations of the one Holy Spirit (pp. 120-129); that in 14:6 we have an *a-b-a-b* parallelism (pp. 138-139) (which Grudem assumes is accurate); in his argument that every prophecy has a revelation at its origin Grudem too often assumes his answer (pp. 140-141); and I am not convinced that Paul's experiences (2 Cor 12:1-5) can be so easily dismissed as evidence for ecstatic prophetic experiences (pp. 174-175). But with the conclusions of this chapter most will agree. Some, however, may desire a more complete portrayal of ecstasy in ancient prophetic experiences.

The author's presentations of the functions, contents and forms of prophecy come next. Prophecy functions essentially as edification and signs for the believer. Its contents: The prophet does not claim divine authority of actual words; his message derives from a revelation and edifies the group. Although I was disappointed with a lack of definition, probably not much more can be said here. His treatment of the form of prophetic speech is disappointing and lacks comparison with outside material. Formal characteristics from clear prophetic phenomena outside Corinth could be utilized with profit. He concludes with criticisms of the views of scholars who argue for prophetic sayings of the risen Lord embedded in the gospel tradition.

The author finishes with a carefully-argued chapter on the qualifications of a prophet. Grudem sees prophets as such because they prophesied, not because they were ordained to do such, though some will have done so more frequently and could be called "prophets." He has a suggestive interpretation of 1 Cor 14:33-35: Paul prohibits women from evaluating prophecies but not from prophesying (cf. 11:5). Instead of seeing these verses as a new topic (parallel to v 26) or as a specific example (parallel to vv 27-28, 29-33a) Grudem sees vv 33b-35 as an explication of 14:30b. Although at first somewhat cryptic, the argument is cogent. His book ends with an appendix in which he refutes G. Dautzenberg's understanding of 1 Cor 12:10 (a reprint from *BZ* 22/2 [1978] 253-270). The most recent book on prophecy by D. E. Aune concludes that "Dautzenberg's argument has been demolished by W. Grudem" (*Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983] 407 n. 114)—a fair assessment of his penetrating article.

Though this reviewer is not convinced at every point, the book has value for exegetes of Paul and for those interested in understanding the charismatic movement Biblically.

Scot McKnight

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

The Troubled Triumphant Church. By Paige Patterson. Nashville: Nelson, 1983, 326 pp., \$7.95 paper.

Patterson has perceived correctly that 1 Corinthians speaks often to the current setting for the Church. As he encourages, the modern Church should learn from the experiences of the Church in first-century Corinth. Valuable lessons in ethical and moral problems that affect the family, the Church and the business world are available.

The overall effect of this work would have been strengthened if more attention had been given to the introductory matters. The eight-page introduction does not give enough space

to help a student understand the setting for the church at Corinth. More attention to the introduction would have made it possible for the author to have made more direct applications to the present-day Church.

Although the attempt to make Greek understandable to those who do not know the language is admirable, the author's attempts are often misleading. On p. 30 Patterson has stated that "examination of the English word 'apostle' and this Greek verb *apostello* establishes the common origin of the two." Surely this is an effort to explain that "apostle" is derived from the Greek noun *apostolos*, which shares a common root with the Greek verb. The treatment of *logos* on p. 31 is equally weak.

On two occasions Patterson raises a question concerning the lack of mention of ecclesiastical positions (pp. 85, 100). Apparently he had already decided the answer to his question, because he does not look at the evidence concerning the presence or absence of such positions in this church or the timing of the appearance of such positions in the Pauline churches. Patterson assumes the presence of bishops, pastors, elders and deacons at Corinth. This is contrary to Paul's methodology for the appointing of offices, such as elders, on his first missionary journey. This journey is covered in Acts 13-14 where Luke states that Paul appointed elders in the churches on his second visit to those churches and not on the first. Furthermore Paul's letter to the Philippians does mention their bishops and deacons. If one accepts that Philippians was written during Paul's Roman imprisonment, this would follow the methodology mentioned above. But for the first Corinthian letter Paul had not made any other visit than that on the occasion of his second missionary journey. This pattern would seem to have been followed through Paul's first two journeys. Yet on his third journey it seems that he appointed elders at Ephesus after an extended stay with that church on his first actual mission visit. Patterson may wish to assume the presence of such offices in the church at Corinth, but the possible answers should have been investigated for the benefit of his readers. It should be noted that prophets, such as those mentioned in 1 Corinthians, do appear in congregations after Paul's first visits.

Assumption of desired theological positions apparently is the norm for Patterson's writing style. On p. 90 Patterson discusses Paul's admonition to deliver a sinner to Satan (1 Cor 5:5). He states that one appropriate conclusion on this matter contains an assumption by Paul: "Paul seems to have been assuming here the possibility that the man's incestuous actions indicated that he might actually never have been saved at all." This is an assumption based on the theological presuppositions held by Patterson. If this assumption is correct and gives Paul's understanding that the sinner was never saved, according to Paul, was the sinner in the church? In 5:12-13 Paul instructs the Corinthians to judge those who are in the church and leave the others to God. In that Paul commanded the Corinthians to judge this sinner, was the man in the church or not? If he was in the church, does the church contain individuals who are not saved? Patterson never addresses such questions as these. He may be able to answer them very capably, but he did not.

The same type of assumption also appears in the discussions of 6:11; 7:11. On p. 103 Patterson states that "washed" in connection with the salvation of the Christians at Corinth has nothing to do with water baptism. And on p. 117, where he discusses the dissolution of a marriage of two Christians, he states that Paul and Jesus do not allow a Christian to remarry even after a divorce because of an unfaithful mate. In both of these cases the position is stated but not demonstrated. If all of his assumptions are correct, he does them a disservice by not giving the evidence.

This book was written with a particular theological audience in mind and may speak to them.

Charles B. Stephenson

Lubbock Christian College, Lubbock, TX

The Message of Philippians: Jesus Our Joy. By Alec Motyer. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1984, 234 pp., \$6.95.

Motyer is the OT editor for the series of which this book is a part: *The Bible Speaks for Today* (J. R. W. Stott is the NT editor). This commentary brings the total commentaries produced on the NT to nine. The series attempts to walk the middle line between "reference" commentaries and "sermon" commentaries, which "do not take Scripture seriously enough" (general preface).

Motyer has divided his work into brief chapters, each dealing with an average of four verses. Each chapter first presents the *RSV* text and then follows with a well-outlined commentary on the text (c. two pages per verse). Included are one map and a five-page appendix on where and when Paul wrote Philippians. He concurs with the traditional location (Rome) and time (Paul's first imprisonment, early 60s).

Motyer's style is lucid, picturesque, readable and (in the main) devoid of verbiage. He exhibits a keen awareness of the structure of Philippians and an adept ability to trace the argument of a pericope. From one so interested in oral exposition it is noteworthy that he is careful not to impose an artificial arrangement on the text—one that Paul would not have recognized. The reader will find, in fact, that Motyer's outline is readily adaptable for homiletical purposes.

Many Scripture references are relegated to footnotes (not endnotes, for which I am very grateful), thus contributing to the removal of "visual clutter."

Motyer detects three predominant themes in Philippians: (1) the unity of all believers (pp. 18-19); (2) the spiritual warfare that the Church is involved in (pp. 19 ff.); and (3) the expected return of the Lord Jesus Christ (pp. 21 ff.), the one who ties all three strands together.

Though Motyer is hesitant to fill in details that are lacking (see pp. 12, 14, 20, 37-38, 110), he graphically recreates (with an artistic flair) the milieu of (especially) historical passages. One is anxious to see what will happen next—and the best part is that his suggestions are credible.

Passages are afforded fairly equal treatment, but especially noteworthy are his comments on 2:5-11, 12-18; 4:10-20. Other highlights are best left in his words. On doctrinal arrogance he aptly points out (p. 32): "To Paul, Christian unity was highly prized and belonged not on the edge of Christian truth but near to its very centre. This should be our attitude too. Where Scripture is plain in its meaning, ought we not to love all those who consent to that meaning, and ought we not to express our love by leaping over all barriers so as to worship together, to partake in the Lord's ordinances together and work for the gospel together? And where Scripture is unclear, or where Christians who revere Scripture reach different conclusions, is it right to unchurch those who have been saved by the same blood and seek to order their lives by the same God-inspired book? Dare we be so sure of our own wisdom, so confident in our own understanding, that we desert the authority of the Bible in favour of the authority of our own interpretation of it?" And on separation he advocates that (p. 31) "the heart of the matter is this: the saint's separation is not a reaction against but a response to; not a mere determination to be different from the world but a whole-hearted determination to be like God by obeying his word."

In my opinion the purpose of the series *The Bible Speaks for Today* has been well met in this volume. Motyer's work is readable to anyone who is interested (with or without a knowledge of Greek), yet it is suitable for substantive research as well. It should be noted, however, that the book's forte is explaining the text. Look elsewhere for detailed bibliography or technical discussion of fine points. *The Message of Philippians* does just that for the reader: It gives the message of Philippians.

One final word: InterVarsity Press is to be commended for a very reasonably priced volume.

David Baker

Winona Lake, IN

James: The Apostle of Faith. By David P. Scaer. St. Louis: Concordia, 1983, 158 pp., \$9.95 paper.

Seldom have I discovered a book with which I agree so heartily, yet disagree with so vigorously.

First, my agreements. Scaer has subtitled this book *A Primary Christological Epistle for the Persecuted Church*. I appreciate his interest in showing that James is not devoid of theology, and specifically of Christology. Although the epistle does not explicitly refer to Christ's death or resurrection, as the critics of Jacobean authorship often point out, yet a number of its statements assume the fact of these great Christological events.

I agree that this is the earliest NT book, having been written not too long after the dispersion of the Jerusalem church recorded in Acts 8:1; 11:19. James therefore provides "a window into the life of the earliest church between Jesus and Paul" (from P. L. Maier's foreword to the book). Consequently it may be reflected in later books of the NT, such as Matthew and 1 Peter.

I also agree that the epistle of James draws more heavily on the sermon on the mount than many recognize. This is not to say that it draws on the Matthean record, for Matthew had apparently not yet been written when James wrote. Nor does it employ specific phrases or clauses from the sermon; instead, it draws on its thought content. Thus the sermon on the mount may well provide the earliest commentary on the epistle of James.

Now, my disagreements. I do not agree that a reasonable case can be made for Scaer's view that the epistle of James was addressed primarily to pastors. Neither Matt 12:50 nor Acts 15:23 (both of which the author uses to support his view) shows that the designation "brethren" (1:2) refers to pastors. For instance, although in Matt 12:49 Jesus points out his disciples as his brothers, yet in 12:50 he clearly says that all who do God's will are his brothers, certainly including lay members as well as clergy.

My second and most serious disagreement is with the kind of hermeneutic that persistently characterizes the book. On page after page Scaer violates the interpretive principle of the unity of the meaning of Scripture. For example, it is said that the man who asks for and receives wisdom may be James himself (1:5); the man who doubts and is like the wave of the sea may be Peter fearfully walking on the water (1:6); the blessed man who perseveres under trial (1:12) is Peter, the only person Christ calls blessed (Matt 16:17), or he may be Christ who continues to suffer in his people (Scaer says "a double sense is intended" here); the dishonored poor man of 2:6 could well be Jesus; following Reicke, "the whole body" that is bridled in 3:2 is the church that is controlled by gospel preaching.

Furthermore, driven by an overarching desire to prove James to be a primary Christological epistle, Scaer finds Christology in the humiliation-exaltation theme of 1:9-10. The good gift of 1:16 describes God's gift of Christ for atonement rather than referring to many divinely bestowed gifts.

To be sure, the book is marked by creativity and imagination, but creativity overdone may well destroy a valid hermeneutic.

Donald W. Burdick

Denver Conservative Baptist Seminary

James, 1, 2 Peter, Jude. By Paul A. Cedar. The Communicator's Commentary, Vol. 11; Waco: Word, 1984, 262 pp.

This is one of numerous, recently-appearing volumes from the new commentary series edited by L. J. Ogilvie. The editor's preface describes as the purpose of the series to provide NT commentaries that combine scholarship, personal application, illustrations, and outlines of passages in a manner that will appeal to teachers and preachers in the Church. The hope is that these commentaries will help impress the reader that God communicates through Scripture today. The authors have been chosen for their communication skills, which are

undergirded by solid scholarship. The view of the Bible is thoroughly evangelical. The text chosen is that of the *New King James Bible*.

Cedar is the senior pastor of Lake Avenue Congregational Church in Pasadena, CA, described on the book jacket as the largest Congregational church in the world. He describes his plan of exposition in the introductions to each of the four books he covers as inductive, calling upon the Holy Spirit to help each reader understand the original meaning and to apply it in his life. Apparently this is what he means by "inductive." In practice, it also appears to mean that no information is brought to bear upon the text except for relevant Biblical passages and occasional listing of the meanings of Greek words.

There are many strengths to this commentary, as long as one is not expecting it to be a critical commentary. One of these is catchy phraseology, as when in commenting on Jas 1:5 Cedar calls wisdom learned through painful experience "hot stove" experiences. Another is numerous, excellent illustrations—some drawn from his years in the ministry, others from current events and poetry. Many of the best are personal, involving such things as a fishing trip with his son (Jas 1:13), his wife's bridal shower (1 Pet 3:7), a summer construction job (4:14), his first track meet in high school (2 Pet 1:11), and his participation in moving his home town in South Dakota because of a new dam (Jude 19). Cedar effectively introduces the subject of Negro slavery and persecuted Ugandan Christians into his exposition of 1 Pet 1:7-8. The story he tells of the battered Christian boy who eventually brings about the conversion of his father in regard to 1:20 is appropriately moving.

Cedar also demonstrates a good knowledge of the Bible and manages to apply to the passage at hand numerous other Biblical passages that provide helpful insight. One of these is when he involves Matt 6:24 in his exposition of being "double-minded" (Jas 1:8; 4:8). Another is when he brings Job 42:12 to bear upon Jas 1:13.

Another strong feature of this commentary is how passages are carefully outlined in a way that is perfect for aiding the expository preacher. One-to-ten-verse portions of the text are handled at a time by means of a brief introduction followed by two-to-four-point discussions.

The weaknesses of this commentary unfortunately seem inevitable in commentaries of this type, despite the noble aims of the series. It suffers from tendencies (1) to offer oversimplified solutions to passages of notorious difficulty, (2) to represent interpretations that betray ignorance of scholarly discussion, (3) to lose sight of the context of the passage at hand in the plethora of Biblical and other illustrations, and (4) to deal with the Greek in ways that would kindle the wrath of James Barr.

The first and second problems are evident, with regard to James alone, in the way Cedar handles Jas 3:6; 4:2, but especially 1:21 when he equates the "implanted word" with the Holy Spirit. His exegetical naivete is also betrayed when he says that Jas 5:12 "is quoting directly from Jesus in His Sermon on the Mount." If the bibliography at the end of the volume is what Cedar used to inform himself in his exposition, these kinds of problems are understandable since there is but one modern critical Greek commentary represented (J. N. D. Kelly on Peter and Jude).

The third problem is especially evident in Cedar's handling of Jas 1:25 when he is trying to determine what the "perfect law of liberty" is. He goes to Matt 5:17; Mark 12:29-31; John 8:32, but he never mentions the obvious importance of Jas 2:8, 12 to this question.

The fourth problem can be seen from the very beginning of the volume when in Jas 1:9 he uses the meaning of the "root word" *aucheō* to represent *kauchaomai*.

Other criticisms of this volume include the repetition to the point of meaninglessness of "How to . . .," "What . . . is all about," and "Keep on . . ." in the general outlines respectively for James, 1 Peter, and 2 Peter, and the monotony of beginning the introductions with "recently" (James), "a few days ago" (1 Peter), "several years ago" (2 Peter), and "recently" (Jude) followed by an illustration. An editorial slip on p. 32 during his exposition of James in which Cedar refers to his exposition of 1 Peter in the past tense should also be noted.

All good intentions of the series to be scholarly aside, then, this commentary cannot be recommended as a critical commentary. It is, in fact, a devotional commentary and on that basis can be highly recommended. Most *JETS* readers will appreciate the conservative positions taken on introductory issues. Cedar is a good communicator and has many potentially inspiring comments to make that will bear fruit in the reader if, as Cedar hopes, he is open to the Spirit.

William R. Baker

Hammond, IN

A Translator's Guide to the Revelation to John. By Robert G. Bratcher. London/New York/Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1984, 204 pp., \$2.40 paper.

This is one of a series of books that the United Bible Societies is putting out as a kind of elementary version of their Translator's Handbook series. The *Guide* uses the *TEV* but also prints out fully the text of the *RSV*. Everything is in English, text-critical notes offer Bratcher's conclusions but usually provide no rationale, and scores of decisions are defended by some such phrase as "most commentators agree" or "commentators generally agree."

The introductory essay, "Translating the Revelation to John," wisely insists that "the translator should in no way try to explain or interpret what the symbols mean: this task is for the teacher, the preacher, the writer of commentaries. The translator's duty is to translate clearly and precisely every one of the figures and symbols used in this book." Yet although there is wise caution in such a statement, there is also naivete; for how does a translator translate "clearly and precisely every one of the figures and symbols used in this book" without making some difficult decisions about what they mean? On 5:5, for instance, the translator is encouraged to render "the root of David" by something like "the famous descendant of David," because the Biblical title "reflects the language of Isaiah 11.1,10," and "in very few languages will 'root' or 'shoot' make much sense in a title like this." But then is one not interpreting "what the symbols mean"?

In general the execution is better than the theory, and for this we may be grateful. What does strike me about this Translator's Guide series, however, is how remarkably elementary many of the comments are. They are very often the sort of thing that should have been covered by any student who has done a couple of years of seminary Greek. That such elementary comments have to be included is vaguely troubling: Does this reflect the low level of Greek instruction, or the inadequate training, of many of our translators?

D. A. Carson

The Supremacy of Jesus. By Stephen Neill. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1984, 174 pp., \$5.95 paper.

This volume is from "The Jesus Library," a new series edited by Michael Green that attempts to re-explore the Jesus story in light of contemporary scholarship. Other books in the series include *The Hard Sayings of Jesus* by F. F. Bruce, *The Teaching of Jesus* by N. Anderson, and *The Example of Jesus* by M. Griffiths.

Neill's title accurately summarizes the content of his book. He seeks to show that Jesus is in a class by himself among the religious and philosophical leaders who have lived throughout history. Neill attempts to answer those who ask, "What is your Christ more than any other Christ, that human beings are challenged to put their trust in him to the exclusion of any other Christ or Saviour?" (p. 9). He answers the question by demonstrating the supremacy of Jesus over all contenders, including Gautama the Buddha and the prophet Muhammad.

Neill's credentials for writing such a book are noteworthy. His earlier writings include *Christian Faith and Other Faiths* and *Colonialism and Christian Missions*, both of which relate to the present subject matter. He is currently writing a three-volume history of the Church in India, where he was a missionary and bishop for a number of years. He is now an assistant bishop in Oxford and lectures at Wycliffe College.

Neill's approach in his new book is unusual. He sets forth the uniqueness of Christ by examining some of the many (more than fifty) titles used of Christ in the NT. The question this leads to is: "What manner of man must he have been to whom all these titles have been given?" (p. 16). Of course Neill recognizes that some of these titles—prophet, teacher, etc.—have been used of other great leaders of human thought and religious experience. This suggests to him that some comparisons between Christ and other religious leaders may be legitimate. "But," writes Neill, "the coalescence of so many titles on this one historic figure raises the question whether we may not here be in contact with something which is unique, and affords some grounds for the contention of Christians that their beloved is more than another beloved" (p. 17).

Chapters of interest to Bible students are those dealing with Christ as a teacher, as a prophet, as the Son of God and as the Savior. Space forbids a survey of each of these, but the conclusion in each is the same: Christ is, by virtue of such titles, supreme over all religious leaders. There is none like him.

Neill's chapter entitled "A True Prophet: or More than a Prophet?" is worthy of mention. Many readers may find this chapter to be quite thought-provoking. Neill first notes that Jews and Christians are most familiar with the prophets mentioned in the OT. But Neill also recognizes the legitimacy of a genuine prophetic office in other faiths: "It is not necessary to suppose that so divine a gift flowed only through one single stream; we should, perhaps, be ready to recognize that other peoples also have had their prophetic figures, and that the authority that flowed through them, though perhaps not comparable with that which was manifest in the Israelite prophets, was at least in its own measure genuine" (p. 72). Neill attempts to substantiate this view by citing the prophetic roles of Zarathustra (prophet to the Iranians) and Muhammad (prophet to the Arabs).

Though evangelicals will undoubtedly wince at such statements (occurring only in this chapter), they can still agree with Neill that Christ himself was much more than a prophet. Christ was God incarnate who, after being crucified, was raised from the dead. Furthermore, Christ is King of kings and Lord of lords. "No words like these," says Neill, "have ever been written about the other prophets who have come to our notice" (pp. 81-82). After examining the Pali Canon of Buddhism he further asserts that "there is no suggestion that the Buddha will continue to be present with his followers after his death; the *dhamma*, the teaching, will take his place and will be their guide" (p. 82). Similarly in regard to Muhammad, Neill writes: "No one has ever supposed that he survived the accident of physical death . . . no one in the Islamic world has ever dreamed of according to him divine honours—he would have been the first to reject any such suggestion as blasphemy" (p. 82). In a capsule, the Buddha and Muhammad claimed to be prophets with a way to God; Christ claimed to be God himself.

In defending the uniqueness of Christ Neill does not want to take anything away from any other faiths. He recognizes goodness, loveliness, and even a measure of truth in these other faiths. He believes that each has something of value to offer. Yet, as he is quick to add, God has revealed himself fully and decisively in Jesus Christ and in him alone. All other religious leaders pale into insignificance in the presence of the incarnate Christ.

Ron Rhodes

Dallas Theological Seminary

The Birth of the New Testament. By C. F. D. Moule. Third edition, completely revised; San Francisco: Harper, 1982, xii + 382 pp., \$9.50 paper.

Since the first edition was published in 1962, Moule's *Birth of the New Testament* has stimulated students and scholars with its refreshing and even entertaining format and style. While including many of the matters typically discussed in a NT introduction, *Birth* makes them seem almost interesting by mentioning them in a lively narration of the processes that led to the production of the NT as we have it. By utilizing such a format Moule hopes to help "the reader enter imaginatively into the circumstances in which the New Testament was brought to birth" (p. 275). The first edition was slightly revised in a 1966 printing. Now, however, Moule has thoroughly redone the volume. The chapter headings are the same, and the content is often reproduced verbatim. But Moule interacts with much of the new material that has appeared since 1966 and includes, accordingly, some valuable new discussions.

In its general tone and approach *Birth* remains surprisingly faithful to its earlier editions. Thankfully—for Moule has long been appreciated for his careful, balanced and sane judgments about a host of critical matters. This caution and careful evaluation of various new and innovative approaches to the NT characterized to a fault the earlier editions of *Birth* and remains unchanged in the latest editions. But it is not only in style that the third edition is a true heir of its predecessors. In comparing this edition to the 1966 one, I could find no major change on a substantive issue. Thus for instance Moule continues to take a quite conservative stance toward the historicity of the gospels, dates most NT books (including all three synoptic gospels, Hebrews, 1 Peter and the entire Pauline corpus except the pastorals) before A.D. 70, sees early Christian worship as the setting for some early theological development (typically, however, he is cautious about identifying early "hymns") and stresses uniformity over diversity in the documents ("The marvel is . . . that the basic Christian convictions persist with such remarkable consistency").

Moule's interaction with recent scholarly discussion generally substantiates this basic conservatism. He is skeptical about the applicability of the category "midrash" to the gospels (p. 95), he strengthens his rejection of the hypothesis that the Jewish trial of Jesus in the gospels is a fabrication (with regard to Brandon's theory—p. 72 n. 2), and he dismisses as too simple the straightforward developmental scheme based on the alleged "delay of the parousia" (pp. 141-146). While significantly increasing the amount of space he devotes to Jewish methods of exegesis, Moule nevertheless concludes that the NT use of Scripture stands as a uniquely "three-dimensional," historical approach.

Naturally I do not agree with Moule's conclusions everywhere. But it would be fruitless as well as inappropriate to enumerate many of these. One of special concern, however, is Moule's assertion that "the Christian church was much too confident of the living presence of the Spirit of prophecy to attempt to abide by a rigid authoritarianism in its attitude to the traditions" and that "the test of authenticity was adherence not to the original words [of Jesus], but to the truth of the message as a whole" (pp. 117-118). These statements are not well substantiated, and there is much even in Moule's own approach that would run counter to them.

As Moule admits, *Birth* is neither a NT introduction nor a NT theology—and it certainly is no substitute for either. But for a refreshing and stimulating combination of the two, there is nothing that comes close to this perennial standard. By discussing those factors that gave rise to the NT, Moule gives us a better sense of the origin and function of the NT documents than most introductions are capable of doing. And by discussing theology in conjunction with this development, Moule illustrates the tie between circumstances and theology better than a theology can do. *Birth* is therefore highly recommended as companion reading to these more traditional kinds of textbooks.

No review of *Birth of the New Testament* would be complete without due recognition of its highly readable and often witty style. I conclude with one example: "It is one of the

merits of 'form criticism' that it has forced us to strain our eyes—though the illumination is usually inadequate—to see these antecedent stages in the formation of Christian writing" (p. 69).

Douglas Moo

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

The New Testament: An Introduction. Proclamation and Parenthesis, Myth and History. By Norman Perrin and Dennis C. Duling. Second edition. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1982, xx + 516 pp.

The first edition of this standard college and seminary textbook was written by Perrin and published in 1974. Perrin's death in 1976 rendered necessary the use of a second author for the second edition. Duling was a student of Perrin's and is thus able to maintain in the second edition the general slant on NT introduction that characterized the earlier work. This slant can best be described as "middle-of-the-road radical." In both its general understanding of the nature of NT religion and in its specific conclusions on a host of critical matters this volume stands somewhat to the left of Kümmel's standard introduction. Thus, as the subtitle indicates, the authors take as an important clue to the correct interpretation of the NT the interplay between history and myth. The documents of the NT, in a variety of ways, mix history and myth, and it is this feature that makes the NT unique and intriguing. To be sure, the authors do not finally conclude specifically what type of myth (Strauss/Bultmann, Eliade, Ricoeur) characterizes the NT, but they are sure that its presence renders ultimately unimportant the issue of historicity for Christian faith. They can thus demolish the historical foundation of Christian faith while at the same time assuring their readers that it does not finally matter all that much. The pernicious impact of such a line of thought on college students need hardly be stressed.

The volume is long (over 450 pages of text—and the pages are tightly packed) and reasonably comprehensive, as befits a textbook. The book opens with a survey of backgrounds, moves on to an introductory chapter (in which the author's particular approach to the NT is delineated), describes the documents of the NT in accordance with a developmental scheme that begins with apocalyptic Christianity, and then proceeds to Paul, the deutero-Pauline school (2 Thessalonians, Colossians, Ephesians, Hebrews), the synoptic gospels and Acts, the gospel and letters of John, "institutional" Christianity (James, 1 and 2 Peter, Jude, and pastorals), and concludes with "the presupposition of the New Testament: Jesus." Each chapter includes a discussion of the milieu and formative factors giving rise to the literature, an attempt to relate each book to that situation, and a brief "exegetical survey" of each book. Bibliographies conclude the chapters, and the appendixes take up the issues of canon and text and also survey English translations and background discoveries and texts.

To critique this introduction adequately would require extensive discussion of the rather massive presuppositions on which almost every sentence of the volume rests. To be fair to the authors, they do go some way toward spelling out these presuppositions, but they do so in a way that suggests that any other set is rather old-fashioned, anti-intellectual and generally woolly-headed. Furthermore an introduction should strive to at least alert students to alternative views and some bibliography where these views may be pursued. This the authors persistently fail to do. This is not to say that alternative views are never introduced, but these alternatives are almost always chosen from within a narrow range selected from the most recent German and American critical scholarship. To take some examples: The delay of the *parousia* is assumed to be a basic factor in the development of the NT (contrary opinions ably stated by the by-no-means fundamentalist C. F. D. Moule and others are not mentioned); the hypothesis of a theological development proceeding from the Palestinian Jewish Church through the Hellenistic Jewish mission to Gentile Christianity to Paul is presented with little justification (Marshall's article is never men-

tioned); a theology of "Q" is developed with little indication of the scholarly ferment over its very existence; it is "quite impossible" that James, the brother of the Lord, could be the author of the epistle bearing his name, since the letter is very late—but the reasons why it must be late are not spelled out. These onesided viewpoints are accompanied by a failure to include in the bibliographies careful, scholarly works that would present valid alternatives: Ridderbos on Paul, Martin on Mark, Marshall on Luke, Bruce on Paul, and a host of others are never mentioned. To all of this the authors would undoubtedly reply that their understanding of the very nature of the NT rules many such alternatives out of court. But it must be asked whether specific data and arguments should not be considered and allowed to count against the overall thesis. These data are not presented by the authors to their readers—and their failure to alert their readers to even the existence of these factors at point after point does a disservice to the purpose of an introduction. Contrast, for example, the careful consideration of a wide range of possibilities in D. Guthrie's *Introduction*. Who are the truly "narrow-minded"?

Douglas Moo

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

Pauline Christianity. By John Ziesler. New York: Oxford University, 1983, 157 pp., \$9.95 paper.

The Oxford Bible Series is aimed toward a general readership and is designed to provide an acquaintance with the background and major themes of the Bible. In each book a handful of specific passages is also studied in depth as examples of particular points. Ziesler concentrates on the distinctive tenets of Pauline Christianity as it supposedly existed in the first century. His work, like other books in the series, arises from a nonevangelical, historical-critical milieu.

The first two chapters briefly discuss Paul's religious heritage along the lines of enquiry developed by Bultmann. Ziesler has serious reservations about the influence of the mystery religions, gnosticism and so-called "Hellenistic Judaism" on Paul. Paul, he claims, was a Palestinian Jew who regarded Christianity as the expression of the true Israel. He also does not appear to have known much Jesus-tradition.

Chapter 3 moves into the main thesis of the book: that Christology is the center of Paul's thinking. Paul, Ziesler tells us, was called by the risen Lord to be the apostle to the Gentiles. He regarded Jesus as the Christ (the fulfillment of the new age), as Wisdom (the crucial event in God's plan), as Lord (not in the sense of Jehovah God) and as the Son of God (a messenger of God's will, not necessarily pre-existent). Phil 2:6-11 demonstrates not Jesus' deity but his human role as the second Adam.

Chapter 4, entitled "Christ and his People," deals with the idea of the Church as the new people of God existing in the age of eschatological fulfillment. According to Ziesler the idea of the Body of Christ came from the Jewish notion of "corporate personality."

Chapter 5, "Old Life and New," handles the major motifs and word-groups of Pauline soteriology. Ziesler asserts that justification by faith is indeed the key to understanding Pauline theology.

Chapter 6 deals with "Christ and the Law." Paul's attacks on the law were designed to prevent it from becoming a rival with Christ in the lives of Christians. Ziesler concludes that Paul in no way regarded it as a standard of conduct for Christian believers. He then moves on to discuss Pauline ethics.

The final chapter, "Pauline Christianity in the New Testament and Beyond," deals with the disputed Pauline epistles and Acts. He concludes that while all of these display some Pauline elements, Acts and the pastorals in particular reveal a poor grasp of Pauline thought and are to be compared with the Christian literature of the second century.

There are a few commendable items in this book. Ziesler has avoided technical language where possible. Difficult terms are explained rather nicely (e.g. "apocalyptic" in chap. 2

and the soteriological words in chap. 5). Chapters 5 and 6 might be of some benefit for a layperson.

In general, however, this work is not suitable reading for evangelicals, particularly for laypeople. Because Ziesler wished to avoid laborious discussions, many issues regarding background and authorship are lightly touched upon, and hidden presuppositions abound.

Gary Steven Shogren

Kings College, Aberdeen, Scotland