

BOOK REVIEWS

The Story of Christianity. Two volumes. By Justo L. González. San Francisco: Harper, 1984, 447 and 426 pp., each \$12.95 paper.

Survey books, as a type, can be easily underestimated. Almost by definition they are neither "seminal" nor "pathbreaking" endeavors in the field. Their function is to draw together the basic introductory materials and present them in such a way as to be accurate and "up-to-date" from the instructor's perspective and, from the student's perspective, clear and engaging.

González has written a very fine two-volume survey of the history of Christianity. The author's earlier work has included another noteworthy survey, *The History of Christian Thought* (3 vols., Abingdon, 1970-1975). This latest venture indicates that the author is well able to move from Christian intellectual history to a competent and useful synthesis of the social and institutional side of Christian history.

The first volume is divided into four major sections: The Early Church and The Imperial Church comprise roughly half of the volume, and Medieval Christianity takes up most of the remainder, with a closing shorter but nonetheless unique section on The Beginnings of Colonial Christianity. Volume 2 also has four major parts. The Reformation takes almost a third of the second volume, as does Orthodoxy, Rationalism and Pietism. The last two parts, The Nineteenth Century and The Twentieth Century, fairly evenly split the remaining pages. Each of these parts is preceded by a chronology, is modestly illustrated with black-and-white photos and simple maps, and is followed by a brief list of suggested readings.

The set has several significant strengths that make it a noteworthy choice for classroom use. González maintains a steady but not overbearing Christian interpretive stance. God has been truly at work in the story of Christianity, but it is also a human story, with not only diversity but also contradiction and sin. González is not afraid to make moral judgments in the course of the story, but he does so with proper historical understanding and empathy. Furthermore he reminds the reader that the mixed historical legacy is ours, not just for its own sake but for the present making of history. The amount of attention given to the range of material involved is remarkably balanced. More than the usual attention by such surveys is given to women; Macrina and Catherine of Siena, for example, are more than passing references in the story. The section on the Spanish and Portuguese empires and the chapters on Latin America and missionary expansion in the nineteenth century commendably expand the story beyond the standard European framework. Throughout the volumes, the writing style is exceptionally lucid, and more often than not the people and events and themes are handled engagingly.

Although they do not nullify its strengths, some weaknesses do exist in the set. In the first volume González was apparently unable to choose a consistent approach to organization. The pre-Constantine section is a blend of chronological and thematic treatment, while the fourth century not only receives its own section but is done largely biographically. The remaining sections forego the biographical and revert to a more standard chronological organization. Overall the effect is a bit distracting, even misleading. The fourth century sparkles with personalities—but before and after, it seems, Christianity did not have the same sparkle. In the second volume the personality vignettes appear more frequently but

are woven into the overall chronological progression. The sections on medieval and colonial Christianity at times are too heavily weighted with the institutional, at the expense of more treatment of the religiosity and spirituality of the people and more general social background. Undoubtedly, too, various historians would have criticisms of particular coverage of events, people and periods. However, all such observations and criticisms merely point to the thankless aspects of writing a survey that will never be able to cover everything and please everyone.

González's set is an excellent overall addition to the current choice of college and university level surveys (fewer in number than one might think). It is an affordable paperback set with an easy, uncluttered layout. Its liveliness and clarity make up for most of its organizational weaknesses. Its inclusiveness of women, Asia and Latin America is a major step toward adequately broadening the history of Christianity. *The History of Christianity* merits wide usage.

Douglas Firth Anderson

New College Berkeley, Berkeley, CA

Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament. 1. Josué, Juges, Ruth, Samuel, Rois, Chroniques, Esdras, Néhémie, Esther. By Dominique Barthélemy. *Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis* 50/1. Fribourg: Éditions Universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1982, xxviii + *114 + 666 pp., DM 294.

This is the first of a projected five volumes of the final report of the Hebrew OT text project commissioned by the UBS. For the preliminary report cf. our review in *JETS* 26 (1983) 194–195. The final report does for the Hebrew Bible what B. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, does for the NT: It evaluates significant textual variants, it attaches to the reading chosen a letter (A, B, C, or D) indicating the degree of confidence the committee had in the choice (A is highly probable, D is highly doubtful), and it explains in a note following each decision the committee's rationale for the choice. The first volume evaluates 961 difficulties, and the set will treat a total of five thousand. The project represents more than 14 years of labor by an international and interconfessional team of highly qualified scholars: D. Barthélemy, A. Hulst, N. Lohfink, W. McHardy, H. Rüger and J. A. Sanders. The UBS and Eugene Nida, to whom this volume is dedicated, are to be congratulated for producing this now essential tool for the study of the text of the Hebrew Bible.

Without diminishing our enthusiasm for this encyclopedic work (hereafter *CTAT*), we must nonetheless point out two flaws in the project's design that prevent the work from being even better. The first has to do with how variants for analysis were selected. The committee did not analyze each passage independently to compile a list of variants, nor did they go through the apparatus of *BHK* or *BHS*. Rather, they chose those readings differing from MT that have been adopted by one of the several major modern translations into English, French and German (*RSV*, *NEB*, *JB*, *RL*). Therefore they have depended on the text-critical work of the translators of these versions rather than their own analysis, except in the case of some QL Samuel readings that were unavailable to the translators. This naturally speeded up the work of the committee and would insure that most of the important variants would be included, but it also insures that many significant variants have been completely ignored. For example, in Joshua 1 *BHS* lists more than twenty variants with support in MSS or versions, but *CTAT* treats only one of these. Joshua 2 has more than thirty variants in *BHS*, but *CTAT* again only treats one. Now admittedly many of these variants are trivial or only weakly supported, but some deserve serious consideration. Translators tend to be conservative and cannot be expected to

include every important variant in text or margin. We wish that the committee would add a sixth volume that would go through the apparatus of *BHS* and at least summarily evaluate a large number of other readings.

A second flaw in the project has to do with the stage of the text that was sought. The committee claims to seek not the original text but the earliest attested form of the text (c. third century B.C.). In this way they have reduced the scope of the work by eliminating conjectural emendations from consideration along with the subjective and controversial judgments required to evaluate such proposals. What we as students of the Hebrew Bible actually want, however, is not a later stage of the text but the original. If the original text of an OT book is pre-exilic, then some five hundred years separate the original from the earliest attested source, the LXX. In general we would expect that many if not most of the textual corruptions found their way into the MS tradition in the centuries before the LXX, which means that the earliest "attested" text is likely to be uniformly corrupt in many places. This is why the rule "The more difficult reading is to be retained" cannot be applied to the OT the way it is to the NT, where early, widely distributed, numerous attestations of MSS render conjecture unnecessary. In the OT, where attestation is sometimes lacking for half a millennium, the difficulties in the received text are, in principle, the only means of detecting the earliest corruptions. Therefore to ignore emendations completely is to give a false impression of the nature of the problem of the text of the OT. The committee is rightly reacting against the overly fertile imaginations of several generations of earlier critics, but it seems to me that they have taken the opposite extreme. Whereas omission of emendations may have been the committee's only practical option, one could still wish that they would add yet another volume that would evaluate the inherent probability of those that have been proposed. Cf., however, the committee's defense of its approach on pp. *74-77.

In terms of the evaluations made, the clear majority of the decisions are in favor of the MT reading. This has led to accusations that the committee was biased toward the MT, though they explicitly deny it. What it does mean is that the committee has been very cautious in their decisions, emending the received text only where evidence clearly demands it. I see no reason why evangelicals could not embrace this approach. The discussions of readings are rich in citations, often noting the scholar who originated particular emendations. The result is a storehouse of useful information.

Besides the 562 pages devoted to particular text-critical evaluations, there are author and Biblical indices, 40 pages of bibliography and 62 pages for a history of textual criticism from the beginning to J. D. Michaelis, including its practice in medieval Judaism, Luther, J. Cappel, J. Morin, C. F. Houbigant, Kennicott, de Rossi, T. Hobbes, de La Peyrère, Spinoza, and Richard Simon. This survey would be useful as a separate publication, especially if it were brought up to the present. Finally, some 50 pages cover the history and philosophy of the project.

Aside from the two problems mentioned above, the main drawbacks to this work are its price and (for English speakers) its language. These will continue the usefulness of the amazingly cheap *Preliminary and Interim Report*, which actually addresses more variants than the final report by including a number of the *NEB*'s conjectures that were later omitted. Judgments have changed between the two reports to some extent, and the preliminary report has only an outline discussion of the rationale of the committee. But it can still render good service for those who find the price or the French of the final report daunting. There is also another solution to the language problem, and we may hope the price as well. Sanders, the American on the committee, informs me that an English translation of the first volume is expected in 1987 or so. He also says that the second volume of the final report can be expected by early 1986 and, most interesting of

all, that a new edition of the Hebrew Bible with the committee's apparatus is in the works. Thus in the near future we can expect to be even more indebted to the UBS Hebrew OT text project.

J. M. Sprinkle

Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, OH

Paul's Apocalyptic Gospel. By J. Christiaan Beker. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982, 128 pp., \$6.95 paper.

Can Paul's apocalyptic worldview be retained in modern theology? Beker strongly asserts that it can, at least in a "catalytic" (over against a "biblicistic") sense. This brief paperback, published between the first and second editions of *Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought*, Beker's major contribution to the study of Pauline theology, brings the primary thesis of the larger work to bear upon present Christian thought. It is not every scholar who makes such an admirable effort to bridge the gap between the ethereal realms of modern theological discussion and the life of the Church. Moreover, Beker works seriously and honestly to come to grips with the hard evidence that Paul's gospel is eviscerated if his expectation of an end to history in the return of Christ is removed by hermeneutical surgery.

Beker perceives two major erroneous responses to the apocalyptic element of Scripture on the present scene. The first of these he terms "neo-apocalypticism," from which Hal Lindsey's books, *The Late Great Planet Earth* and *The 1980's: Countdown to Armageddon*, are singled out as prime examples. Although Beker shows virtually no familiarity with the extensive and ongoing debates concerning eschatology within evangelical circles, a number of his complaints against an approach such as Lindsey's have some validity. Beker asserts that this "neo-apocalypticism" is built on a twofold assumption: (1) predictability of future events, based on an infallible Scripture; (2) divine determinism, controlling the events leading to the end. Stated in this way, Beker's charge too easily passes over another implicit and ultimately decisive assumption. The claims of Lindsey's books, and those like them, is based not only on an infallible Scripture and divine control of human history but also on an unerring interpretation that is able to correctly correlate the text with present happenings. Not only the difficult exegetical problems that are inherent to texts such as Daniel, Revelation and the Olivet discourse but also the history of apocalyptic sects and cults who mistakenly determined that Christ would appear in their generation should caution against such an overconfident hermeneutic. Beker is certainly correct in demanding that the materials first be understood within their historical contexts (p. 27). Secondly, according to Beker, Lindsey's writings are "deterministic in the extreme," leaving no room for responsible Christian participation or responsibility in world events. This is not a completely accurate assessment, since Lindsey's *1980's* book calls for action on the part of American Christians (albeit in a politically conservative, nationalistic mode, pp. 131-158). Nevertheless it is fair to say that such an approach might very well lead either to apathy concerning world affairs, unjustifiable support for Israel, or a lifeboat mentality (upon which the section cited above verges).

The second major error Beker attacks is the neglect of apocalyptic in modern theology and in the life of the mainline churches. Here, however, his case stumbles. He is able to point out the weaknesses of the approaches of scholars such as C. H. Dodd and Rudolph Bultmann, and of sociological treatments of Paul's apocalyptic, but he is unable decisively to make his case that Paul's apocalyptic is relevant today. Even if one accepts his argument (which I think is correct) that a future apocalyptic is a necessary part of the gospel, never abandoned by Paul, one has a difficult time demonstrating its relevance given

Beker's exegetical and historical judgments. First, Beker wants to tell us that Paul does not deduce the end from a variety of historical events but from God's promises confirmed in Christ. For Paul the end was basically incalculable (pp. 48–49). Nevertheless Beker tells us that Paul changed his mind about the date of the *parousia* and his participation in it (p. 67). Was the end calculable for Paul or not? Likewise, Beker's prior commitment to the critical consensus that the delay of the *parousia* was a crisis for the early Church wreaks havoc with Beker's contention that apocalyptic is not obsolete. Beker stresses that Christians must concentrate on the "concrete occurrence" rather than on the imminency of God's final victory (pp. 113–117). The question can be fairly put that if Paul mistakenly thought that the *parousia* would occur in his lifetime, by what criterion may the rest of his apocalyptic be preserved? Beker tries to do this by stressing the integral nature of apocalyptic to Paul's gospel. His effort is not sufficient: It is only Beker's *amore Pauli* that allows the Pauline gospel to buoy apocalyptic up, rather than the more logical conclusion that an obsolete apocalyptic pulls Paul's gospel under (or at least requires that his gospel be radically reinterpreted). This is not the place for exegetical arguments, but a good case can be made that Paul seriously contemplated the possibility of the *parousia* in his lifetime, but without a commitment to its necessity. Beker too quickly dismisses 2 Thessalonians 2, which gives at least some indication of delay, as non-Pauline on prior theological commitments. Moreover, he does not give adequate consideration to Cullmann's contention that eschatology is chronologically dethroned as it moves from Judaism to Christianity (p. 75). Beker's work needs further exegetical and historical development to show more precisely how Paul's apocalyptic is related to early Judaism, to the apocalyptic of Jesus, and to early Christian apocalyptic.

Part of Beker's aim is to demonstrate the ethical impact of Paul's apocalyptic hope. He insists that the cosmic dimensions of Paul's hope call Christians to battle against the structures of the present world, but he leaves the practical nature of this battle very ill-defined. Presumably he has in mind political, social and economic concerns, since he asserts that Paul's gospel calls us to "the larger concerns of our interdependent and pluralistic world" (p. 120). He appears to adopt a position of universalistic salvation, although he hesitates to postulate such a position for Paul (pp. 16, 35). In all this one wonders where Paul has been left behind, since Beker fails to produce a careful study of how Paul's apocalyptic concretely expressed itself in his life and thought. Surely one cannot neglect Paul's overwhelming concern for evangelistic mission and insistence on an exclusive gospel. Moreover, Paul seems willing to tolerate the "structure" of slavery in spite of his higher principles (1 Cor 7:20–23). Paul manifestly advocated aid toward those outside the faith (Gal 6:10), but justice must be done to the particular emphases of Pauline ethics. Beker illegitimately moves from his correct observation that Paul's hope includes all of creation to asserting that Christian efforts ought to be focused on concerns outside the particularity of the Christian faith.

Above all, Beker's work rightly underscores the need for the patient teaching of exegetically sound eschatology with appropriate hermeneutical restraint. The sheer popularity of speculative eschatology in evangelical circles demands that pastors cannot neglect to provide careful teaching on this topic. There is a continuing need for evangelicals to produce materials that reflect the highest scholarship and yet remain readable at the lay level. In his insistence that apocalyptic must not be neglected in the Church, Beker has struck the right note.

Mark A. Seifrid

Princeton, NJ

A New Concordance of the Bible. Edited by Abraham Even-Shoshan. Hebrew, with English introduction by John H. Sailhamer. Jerusalem: Kiryat Sepher, 1983, 1242 pp., \$43.00.

The 1981 edition of this concordance was reviewed in *JETS* 26/4 (December 1983), but this 1983 edition has one important additional feature that deserves notice, and more needs to be said concerning the material presented in the concordance.

For the benefit of those of us who are weak or unskilled in Israeli Hebrew (alas, too many of us), and as recommended in the earlier review in *JETS*, a 37-page booklet, "Introduction to *A New Concordance of the Old Testament*" (note the slight difference in the English title reflected by the booklet, along with the paper jacket, in comparison to the English title found on the title page of the book itself and reproduced above), has been prepared by Sailhamer (Baker, 1984). Using in part Even-Shoshan's introductory remarks and supplementing these with his own observations, Sailhamer has produced a valuable "owner's manual" for the use of this concordance by the English reader. There are step-by-step descriptions of what the concordance has to offer and how to make use of it. This introduction is clearly and plainly written and gives examples from the concordance under each heading. A table of abbreviations and signs is also included in the booklet and reproduced on a 4 x 5 card included with the volume. The booklet cannot be purchased separate from this Baker-distributed edition of the concordance.

Concerning the physical features of the concordance, the binding (a real consideration in a reference volume) is good and happily somewhat superior to the binding on Lisowsky. The print in this three-column edition, while not microscopic, is rather small—about half the size of Lisowsky's handwritten script—but at least it is printed (and fully pointed). I cast one vote for larger print in reference works, even if it means multiple volumes and higher prices.

As to the contents, this is certainly no concordance for the Hebrew neophyte. Since the headings, explanations, definitions and abbreviations (not to mention the numbers, in part) are in Israeli Hebrew, at least a couple of years of Hebrew study are probably necessary to make full use of the material presented. OT books are cited under their Hebrew names and in the Hebrew order.

My own personal use of Even-Shoshan's *New Concordance* left me somewhat disappointed. A brief while ago I was studying the compound divine name 'dny yhw in the OT. Using Lisowsky, I found without difficulty 297 occurrences under the heading 'dny. I decided to compare Even-Shoshan's presentation of the same.

First, though words are often presented under the *plene* spelling, 'ādōnāy is listed under the defective spelling (since the word is written *plene* only once in the OT), though 'ādōn, 'ādōnī, etc., are found under the *plene*.

Second, there were groupings for certain combinations involving the compound name, such as 'dny yhw and n'm 'dny yhw, but not 'dny yhw šb'wt or w'dny yhw. Not only so, but at least nine occurrences of 'dny in the OT are apparently not included anywhere in the list: Isa 10:24; 22:14, 15; Ps 69:7 (all four 'dny yhw šb'wt); Jer 2:19; 50:31 (both n'm 'dny yhw šb'wt); 46:10 (twice—both l'dny yhw šb'wt); Amos 9:5 (w'dny yhw hšb'wt). All these references include šb'wt with the divine name, but so does Jer 49:5, and it is included under the heading n'm 'dny yhw. I am at a loss to explain these omissions except as careless oversight. In a reference work this is inexcusable.

Under yhw there is no grouping for the combination 'dny yhw, though there is for yhw šb'wt, yhw 'lhym, plus numerous other combinations. And in the listings I was unable to locate the reference to Gen 15:2, the first OT occurrence of 'dny yhw (it should, I believe, follow entry #296 on p. 441). If these defects are real (and I double- and triple-checked the references noted lest the newness of the tool trip me up in its use), and such defects are typical of the work, then it stands in need of a complete and thoroughgoing revision.

There were other errata that turned up. On p. 173, under *byt*, occurrence #1478 gives Jer 8:17 as the verse reference; it should in fact say Ezek 8:17. On p. 503 an entire column has been corrected with a pasted-in column, covering what the publisher must have felt was a serious defect. I decided against steaming off the correction to see what the problem was. In the English preface opposite p. 1242, "appear" is misspelled "apeor." While some defects and errors are to be expected in such a detailed and complicated undertaking, to have turned up so many in so short a period of use does not speak well of the quality and accuracy of the work on the whole.

With its valuable features, Even-Shoshan's *New Concordance* seems also to be plagued with numerous and often serious inaccuracies, which, until corrected, will seriously hamper its usefulness.

Doug Kutilek

Cincinnati, OH

Confrontations with Prophets. By Hans Walter Wolff. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983, 78 pp.

Wolff, professor emeritus at the University of Heidelberg, has written extensively on OT prophets. This slim new volume presents a readable synthesis of conclusions drawn from his earlier work. Like F. F. Bruce's *Peter, Stephen, James and John*, Wolff's *Confrontations* provides the reader with a specialist's overview of his particular interest.

Wolff attempts to show the relevance of ancient prophets (Amos, Hosea and Micah) in today's society. He also suggests a means of improving Jewish-Christian dialog (with an analysis of Jer 31:31-34) and then examines the difference between true and false prophets in terms of the modern discussion about rearmament and peace.

The author succeeds admirably in his treatment of the three prophets. He points out in chap. 1 some parallels between the irresistible call received by Amos (3:8; 7:10-17) and the Church. Both owe their ministry and mission to this "*verbum irresistibile*" (p. 16). Both await a cataclysmic finale precipitated by an encounter with God. And both have hope for the end times (5:4-5; 9:11-15).

In chap. 2 Wolff casts Hosea's story into modern terms (e.g. Jezreel, Hosea's first son, is renamed "Auschwitz," p. 24). Hosea addresses a decidedly twentieth-century problem, where "modernism and greediness go hand in hand" (p. 26). The prophet's effective word from God results ultimately in accomplishing what was thought impossible: "The obstinate son and the faithless wife experience a wholly new, unconditional and final love" (p. 34; cf. Rom 8:3).

Micah represents the prophets who "tear away the masks and show the true face of the people behind them" (p. 35). His task is like our own: to remove the hypocrisy latent in pride, corruption and greed for the benefit of all others. Micah illustrates the need for true justice, in which God "remains efficaciously present" (p. 48).

These three studies will be of greater value to the pastor than to the student. The later must go to Wolff's commentaries and elsewhere to determine the reasons behind his statements here. But the former will find in *Confrontations* much help for making these minor prophets palatable to parishioners. Wolff's warning—"The person who no longer takes his bearings from the word of the Lord will find it impossible to find his bearings at all" (p. 43)—is an encouragement to use these Biblical books within the Church.

The remaining two chapters are less useful. Chapter 4 points up three "new" aspects in the new covenant of Jer 31:31-34: the way in which God now mediates his directions (p. 54), an understanding of Jesus as the "newest-of-the-new" (p. 56), and the foretaste we have in the Church of the "fulfillment of the new covenant" (p. 57). While these points

are helpful for a Christian interpretation of Jeremiah 31 (particularly its relationship to Luke 22), it is debatable whether Wolff's treatment will enhance the Jewish-Christian dialog. Of his points all but the first are likely to be contested by Jewish exegetes.

In the final chapter Wolff presents criteria for distinguishing between true and false prophets. The true prophet focuses on guilt and its concomitant judgment and shows no trace of self-confidence (p. 70). The false prophet depends on his listeners' favor and fails certain critical and charismatic criteria (pp. 71-72). While Wolff's initial criteria seem more descriptive than prescriptive, his appeal to compare prophets to see "who reminds us more clearly of Jesus Christ" (p. 73) is helpful.

Wolff applies his theoretical discussion to the practical matter of rearmament. Without clear explanation for his reasons, however, he turns from figures (i.e., specific prophets) to ideas. These he labels as true or false prophecy, which then in turn are personified. This false prophecy is "bent on calculating . . . retaliation" and has policies "based on mistrust alone" (p. 75).

As Wolff so clearly shows earlier in the book, the word of God comes to individuals; specific prophets speak "as they were carried along by the Holy Spirit" (2 Pet 1:21). One cannot but notice a shift in the author's emphasis and treatment in this final chapter.

In sum, the first portion of this book is stimulating and helpful. Wolff brings to life three minor prophets and shows the relevance of their ancient message. The second part is more opaque; though containing some interesting material, it simply requires further expansion and checking against the available evidence.

Daniel H. Schmidt

Bethany Chapel, Wheaton, IL

Jesus—Son of Man. A Fresh Examination of the Son of Man Sayings in the Gospels. By B. Lindars. Grand Rapids/London: Eerdmans/SPCK, 1983/1984, 244 pp., \$9.95.

Since the turn of the century the Christological title "Son of Man" has perplexed just about everyone, and even with the morass of literature devoted to the subject there is no sign of any consensus. I enjoyed hearing Lindars present a summary of his present contribution to a conference at Glasgow University in 1980. There the British members of SNTS listened with interest, but once he finished a stormy debate erupted. I suspect that much the same will happen with this book in evangelical circles. It is a difficult book—turgid and plodding in style. And it is tirelessly exhaustive in its analysis of the Son-of-Man tradition. But it represents merely one view, and I doubt whether it will fare any better today than it did in Glasgow five years ago.

Let us sketch the contours of the discussion and place Lindars in context. Excluding parallels, there are over fifty Son-of-Man sayings in the gospels. Unlike other titles for Jesus, this one is limited to the gospels and Acts 7:56. In other words, it had little currency in the early Church (e.g. Paul and Hebrews). In Greek it is an awkward phrase (*ho huios tou anthrōpou*), and this has led to the modern agreement that some sort of Semitic form must lie behind it. So far so good. But if this is a Semitic phrase, what was its original meaning? Here is where the debate rages. The evangelists clearly use it as a title for Jesus, but was this Jesus' intention? Could it even have been used as a title in pre-NT Judaism? Is it a creation of the early Church?

A closer look at the synoptic use of the term shows three categories: (1) There are sayings that refer to the Son of Man in his present activity, such as Mark 2:28 ("the Son of Man is Lord even of the Sabbath"). (2) There are sayings tied to predictions of Jesus' suffering and death (Mark 10:45, "For the Son of Man came . . . to give his life as a ransom for many"). (3) The phrase is used in future—even apocalyptic—contexts like Mark 13:26 ("they will see the Son of Man coming in clouds"). In the search for the

authentic meaning of the term scholars will often accept or reject one category or another depending on their solution to the problem.

What are the options from here? To say that the phrase was used by Jesus in all of these settings, that it had a titular significance, that the title was a self-designation, and that it affirmed Jesus' unique messianic announcement is unpopular today in academic circles. S. Kim has recently made a case for this in *The Son of Man as Son of God* (Eerdmans, 1984), where he urges that Jesus is using the Danielic image from Dan 7:13 to refer to himself as a divine figure. The same is true of R. G. Hamerton-Kelly, *Pre-Existence, Wisdom, and the Son of Man: A Study in the Idea of Pre-Existence in the New Testament* (Cambridge: University Press, 1973). But this goes strictly against the tide. Instead, two broad solutions to the Son-of-Man problem are now current. The aim throughout these is to delve into the oldest Christological traditions and gain a glimpse of the authentic Jesus.

First, some have said that "son of man" is an innocent self-reference, an idiom from Aramaic where the speaker simply employs a circumlocution. Geza Vermes is an ardent spokesman for this view. He accepts the sayings of Jesus in category 1 (above), is doubtful about category 2, and rejects the apocalyptic sayings completely as a "midrash based on Dan. 7:13" by Jesus' "apocalyptically-minded Galilean disciples" (*Jesus the Jew* [Macmillan, 1973] 186).

Second, others have been more willing to accept that "son of man" may be a title of some sort. But what sort is the question. The creative and somewhat disarming solution of R. Bultmann, G. Bornkamm, R. H. Fuller and others was to say that only Jesus' apocalyptic sayings were authentic and that here Jesus viewed the Son of Man as someone distinct from himself. This is an interesting answer, but it forces the interpreter to jettison most of the sayings and accept as authentic only the ones where the distinction is possible (see Luke 12:8).

Others have taken the titular usage seriously but pursued other avenues. Perhaps the title stems from an ancient pagan myth of an "archetypal man" and this was applied to Jesus by the Church (so C. Colpe, F. H. Borsch). But this truly strains the evidence. Morna Hooker's study of Mark in 1967 rightly pointed to Jewish backgrounds and here developed another archetypal figure. For her, all of the sayings in Mark could be authentic and based on a Jewish notion of an "archetypal Adam," a theme found also in Paul (Rom 5:12 ff.; 1 Cor 15:47 ff.) and Philo. This figure is a collective entity representing Israel: Israel will inherit the prosperity promised to Adam—indeed, Israel will become the "true Man." Daniel 7 uses the collective image, and this explains Jesus' appropriation of the title.

The most important issue is whether there are any genuine Jewish antecedents for the use of this title. Here the controversy becomes dramatically inflamed. Dan 7:13 comes right to mind, but is this an individual or collective figure (see the interpretation, 7:15 ff.)? Subsequent Jewish writing shows that an individual messianic figure bearing the title "Son of Man" was known, but the value of these writings is disputed. *1 Enoch* 37–71 and 4 Ezra 13 are clearly modeled on Daniel 7, but their date may be post-Christian. Nevertheless these writings are still important and may point to an ancient tradition antedating the NT.

The significance of this last issue cannot be stressed enough. If Jesus' use of the phrase "Son of Man" was intelligible to any of his hearers, then it must have fit into the linguistic, cultural and/or theological categories of the first century. If a titular use cannot be established in Judaism, then some other explanation must be found.

How does Lindars tackle the problem? He surveys the evidence and promptly (some would say cavalierly) dismisses the possibility that "Son of Man" was a title in our period: "The assumption that the Son of Man could be recognized as a title of an eschatological figure in Jewish thought . . . has now been demolished, and with it the whole theory that there was a commonly accepted concept of the Son of Man along these lines in the

intertestamental period collapses" (p. 8). He does concede, however, that the name is used as a title for Jesus. But this has only come about because Christians identified Jesus as Messiah, adopted the Danielic picture, and in concert with *1 Enoch* employed the "son-of-man" notion in its thinking. Hence the apocalyptic uses of the phrase are distinctly inauthentic. To his mind the titular, messianic use of "son of man" is a modern myth. No such title was common in Jewish messianism, and Jesus could not have employed it as such.

If it cannot be a title, Lindars must return to the earlier views of Vermes: "Son of man" is a general self-reference, a generic idiom without messianic force. But he goes further. The truly idiomatic sayings have a collective feature wherein the speaker refers to himself as one member of a class (e.g. a son of mankind). "The Son of Man is an Aramaic phrase (*bar enasha*), corresponding with the Hebrew *ben adam*, which means a man as a specimen of humanity, or collectively, mankind" (p. 158). Those sayings that reflect this usage "have the highest claim to being authentic" (p. 24). Lindars then combs the gospels carefully and provides us with his assured minimum of authentic sayings: nine son-of-man sayings, all in Mark and Q (Matt 8:20/Luke 9:58; Matt 11:16–19/Luke 7:31–35; Matt 12:32/Luke 12:10; Luke 11:30; Matt 9:6/Mark 2:10–11/Luke 5:24; Matt 10:32–33/Luke 12:8–9 and three passion predictions: one behind Mark's threefold prediction, Mark 10:45, and Mark 14:21/Luke 22:22).

How do we account for the many other Son-of-Man sayings? The Church recalled clearly the idiomatic usage of this phrase by Jesus, but when the sayings were translated into Greek the subtlety of Jesus' generic use was lost. Thus it comes as no surprise that the other titular reference is in Acts 7 with the Hellenist Stephen. The inauthentic sayings are hallmarked by a strict self-reference (a virtual title) and an allusion to Daniel 7. Therefore "nearly half the Son of Man sayings in Mark can be attributed to the evangelist" (p. 86). But this conclusion (while hammered home for pages) is astounding. If the early Church found "son of man" to be a serviceable concept and created these sayings—especially the apocalyptic ones—why do we not find a son-of-man Christology elsewhere in the NT? It is insufficient for Lindars to explain that the use of the saying only in the gospels "is a feature of the presentation of Jesus by means of a biography."

In the balance of the book Lindars studies the development of the Son-of-Man tradition in the work of each evangelist (including John, which contains no authentic sayings). In each case the evangelist has exploited the concept in the development of his Christology.

Three issues seem to be critical in this discussion. First, has Lindars really been fair in his dismissal of the title in Jewish tradition? Granted, the evidence is slim and the dates of *1 Enoch* and of 4 Ezra are late, but could they not represent an older, wider Jewish tradition? On the other hand, conservatives have to deal with the limitations of this scanty evidence: For instance, *1 Enoch* has not even appeared in QL.

Second, it strains credulity to think that a creative Christological tradition was at work in the Church and that this tradition is not extant outside the gospels. There is a marked dissimilarity of Christological interest here that must be addressed.

My third objection is central. Lindars attributes to the Church the creative union of the generic *bar enasha* with the Danielic image. But why must this union have taken place at this secondary stage? James D. G. Dunn has drawn the logical inference: Perhaps this reflects the creative genius of Jesus as his unique messianic announcement (*Christology in the Making* [Westminster, 1980] 86–87). If the synthesis was possible for Mark, why not Jesus? The son-of-man sayings are diverse and the solution to their origins complex. But we can at least say that it is not unlikely that Jesus found in this term a useful—even favorite—title for himself. It had a striking generic use and a sufficiently underdeveloped messianic message that could serve his own desire to define his mission.

Gary M. Burge

The Peaceable Kingdom. By Stanley Hauerwas. South Bend: Notre Dame University, 1983, 179 pp., \$17.95/\$7.95.

The Peaceable Kingdom is not a survey of what various Christian ethicists have thought and written but a "primer," a straightforward account of a Christian ethic as Hauerwas has come to believe it should be stated. Hauerwas calls himself an "evangelical Methodist." He teaches in the department of theology at the University of Notre Dame. His thinking has been influenced by, among others, his Mennonite colleague at Notre Dame, John Howard Yoder, his doctoral mentor at Yale, James Gustafson, the Niebuhr brothers and Aristotle. In recent years Hauerwas has found strong kinship with the work of philosopher Alasdair MacIntyre (*After Virtue*).

Out of this eclectic context, however, Hauerwas has emerged during the past decade with a clear and coherent contribution to the field of Christian ethics. He is the major contemporary proponent of a Christian ethics of character. This interest began with his doctoral dissertation (revised and published as *Character and the Christian Life: A Study in Theological Ethics*, 1975) and has been further elaborated in three volumes of his essays. *The Peaceable Kingdom* is a relatively brief, updated account of Christian ethics from Hauerwas' perspective.

There is a twofold polemic in Hauerwas' work. First, he opposes the narrow focus of ethical thought on quandaries, on problems of decision and action when confronted by difficult dilemmas. This, he argues, evades the more fundamental question of the character of the agent. But just decisions and actions cannot be expected without just persons, even if these persons have rules and principles of justice in their hands. Second, he opposes the tendency of ethicists (Christian and otherwise) to search for an "unqualified," ahistorical, universal, objective ethical standpoint. For all ethics (including those of Kant and his many descendants) are in fact "qualified" by particular histories and communities. Denying this community relation leads not to objectivity and universal standards but rather to moral chaos. A just person must be nurtured and sustained by a just community. What is said for justice in the preceding sentences can as well be said for love, hope, truthfulness or other virtues and norms.

Positively, then, Hauerwas addresses himself to the Christian community. Like any other community (Marxist, American, etc.), Christians are a "story-formed" people. Our community (and our ethics) is thus narrative-based. It is the task of ethics to illuminate the practical force of our theological convictions. Those theological convictions are expressed most basically in the form of a story: the Biblical story of God's ways with Israel and in Jesus above all. Christians are people who make that story their own, who form their community and lives in fidelity to this Biblical narrative. As Hauerwas points out, it is no accident that so much of Scripture, including each of the four gospels, is composed of stories, of narratives.

In particular Hauerwas stresses the importance of Jesus. "The life of the man whom God made his representative is ignored or used selectively" in much Christian ethical thought (p. 72). "We learn to be like God by following the teachings of Jesus and thus learning to be his disciples" (p. 75). "Christian ethics is not first of all an ethic of principles, laws, or values, but an ethic that demands we attend to the life of a particular individual—Jesus of Nazareth" (p. 76). Jesus' truthfulness, nonviolence, care for the stranger and, above all, his cross and resurrection are the center of our theology and our ethics.

It is not merely a matter of a casual or accidental participation in our particular Christian story and community. We must "make it our own." Christians must believe that this story is true—in fact, *the* true story—and evidence this faith by forming their lives in accordance with Jesus Christ. But it is also clear, Hauerwas argues, that those who have and speak the truth need no recourse to violence to impose it on others. Violence

is always an indication of an untruth that must be imposed by a force other than its own truth power.

The Church assumes great importance in Hauerwas' ethics. The Christian story is not just a story of Kantian individual rationalists; it is a story of a community of faith and life. The Church is a community of "remembering," of keeping alive those stories and applying them to the present. It is a school of virtue and character for its members. Ethically, at least, the most important thing is for the Church to be itself. It is a mistake for the Church to be preoccupied with plans and strategies to control the world. Being present in the world faithfully is the major task.

Virtue is acquired by habituation, practice, imitation of good models. For Hauerwas the most important ethical question is: "What kind of person am I to be?" When moral quandaries arise, the question is: "How can I act consistently with the kind of person I want to be"—i.e., like Jesus, or like the faithful predecessors in our story. While Aristotle and Aquinas remain the great teachers of the virtues in their ethics, Hauerwas believes that both failed to understand the narrative basis of virtue. They were on the right track, but for historical reasons they failed to illuminate its relation to community and narrative. Further, neither of them was sensitive to the moral tragedy and conflict of life. Hauerwas defines virtue as "the skills to make my life my own and live truthfully without deception of self or manipulation of others."

Of course there is need for a kind of casuistry, a discernment of guidance for specific cases. But, he argues, this should be understood as flowing from the community and the virtues. Rules, prohibitions and the like need to be seen as ways of marking limits and of indicating what sort of actions our character entails. They are not in themselves the heart of the matter, but they are necessary. The Church needs to function as a community of moral discourse. Its members mutually assist one another in resolving specific quandaries in light of their principles, rules and, most basically, their story.

The preceding summary is largely in the terms Hauerwas uses. This summary fails to indicate adequately how deeply and robustly Biblical Hauerwas' work is. He is arguing for the ethical authority of Scripture, the centrality of Jesus Christ, the importance of the Church as a body distinct from the world in crucial ways, and the importance of ongoing discipleship and sanctification of Christian character. Hauerwas' terminology helps to illuminate these factors—though it takes some getting used to for new readers.

Because there are few examples and illustrations in this book I recommend that Hauerwas' previous book, *A Community of Character* (1981), be read after (or before). In this other book Hauerwas gives all of the same themes and ideas mentioned above (two times through these ideas is helpful), but he also includes several essays on marriage, family, sex and abortion. We need to hear more from Hauerwas on specific virtues and specific ethical issues and areas and perhaps more on ethical rules and principles. The Ten Commandments, Proverbs, and Romans 12–13, for example, are located in a broader narrative but also abstracted in some sense. The Commandments are often repeated (just as the Exodus story is repeated). What does this mean for our ethics? How do we apply this didactic material?

Nevertheless, Hauerwas in *The Peaceable Kingdom* and his other works has made a major contribution to ethics, theology and the Christian Church. His method is very Biblical and evangelical and fills some yawning gaps in most of what has passed for evangelical or Christian ethics in recent decades. His applied or detailed studies of the family, marriage, sex and abortion are evidence of the fruitfulness of his method. I have not read anything on these subjects that is anywhere near as creative or Biblical in recent books and articles. Obviously Hauerwas has not said it all, but what he has written is ignored at great loss to all ethicists, especially those wishing to work as Christians.

David W. Gill

New College Berkeley, Berkeley, CA

The New International Dictionary of Biblical Archaeology. Edited by E. M. Blaiklock and R. K. Harrison. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983, 485 pp. plus maps, \$24.95. *The Archaeology of the New Testament*. By E. M. Blaiklock. Revised and updated. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1984, 186 pp., \$6.95 paper.

E. M. Blaiklock, well-known in evangelical archaeological and classical circles, was involved in the writing of both of these books. The smaller of the two works, *The Archaeology of the New Testament*, represents his interest for many years in NT archaeology. This volume does not relate archaeological research to the study of the NT book by book. Rather, the work is a popular treatment of selected archaeological topics that illuminate aspects of the NT: the papyrus evidence for the Roman census (Luke 2); the words of Christ and the parables; the death of Christ; the empty tomb; the fourth gospel; the birth of the Church; the persecutions; the papyri and the epistles; the book of Revelation; the Dead Sea scrolls; the trials of the Jews at the Colosseum and Masada; and the early Church.

Our author first starts with several standard definitions of archaeology (Introduction). Then he elaborates on the development of papyrus as an ancient writing material used in the writing of documents such as the NT and the nonliterary papyri (chap. 1). This theme of papyri runs throughout the book. Blaiklock's treatment of "The Papyrus and the Roman Census" (chap. 2) only deals narrowly with the census itself (unfortunately he only alludes to the historical problems of Quirinius and the census at 8-5 B.C.). There is an interesting description of how Joseph probably fulfilled the demands of the imperial decree as he went to Bethlehem, his home town. In chap. 3 Blaiklock emphasizes the lost sayings of Christ, using for illustrations sayings derived from as far away as Agra, India, as well as from the Reformation scholar Beza, the Gospel of Thomas, and the Oxyrhynchus Papyri. Blaiklock (chap. 4) argues that the parables of Christ really deal with the affairs of the common people. He uses the story of the prodigal son (Luke 15) for illustration, and for background material he discusses the archaeological evidence found in ancient Gerasa (modern Jerash) of the Decapolis and found in first- and second-century papyri. He also uses as an example the parable of the unjust judge (Luke 16), the details of which he illustrates from other nonliterary papyri.

To make vivid the death of Christ (chap. 5) Blaiklock dwells on the meaning the Greeks visiting Jerusalem must have gotten from the saying "except a seed fall into the ground and die" (John 12). He does this by expounding the classical myth of Demeter and Kore—a format, he argues, within which the Greeks would have understood this saying of Jesus. In illustrating the significance of Pilate as the procurator for Palestine and as the Roman officer at the trial of Jesus, Blaiklock depends on the Josephus narratives, the coins of Pilate, the Caesarea inscription, and the modern excavation work done at Caesarea Maritima. To give added meaning to the crucifixion scene, our author describes the archaeological find of a part of an ancient crucified victim found at Giv'at Ha-Mivtar, Israel, and discusses the significance of an ancient graffito and catacomb inscriptions regarding the form of the cross.

He highlights the archaeology of the empty tomb (chap. 6) by describing the Church of the Holy Sepulchre (he is skeptical that it is the site), Gordon's Calvary (which he favors), the Nazareth Decree (which inveighs against violating tombs), the archaeological remains at Emmaus, etc. Blaiklock argues the authenticity of the gospel of John (chap. 7), using the John Rylands Papyrus, the Dura Europos Papyrus fragment, and the archaeological evidence of the Pavement (John 19:13).

To illustrate the birth of the early Church (chap. 8) Blaiklock deals briefly with the archaeological evidence derived from certain cities in Asia Minor, from inscriptions of Phrygia and from cities of Greece (Philippi, Athens and Corinth). Illustrating the persecutions of the Church (chap. 9) our author presents the Palatine Hill graffito ridiculing

Christians, the heathen background of the city of Ephesus and her goddess Diana (Artemis) and Caesar worship. Blaiklock expounds on "The Papyri and the Epistles" (chap. 10) with evidence from nonliterary papyri letters, arguing that this kind of papyri material shows that the Greek of the NT was the vernacular of the day.

To explain the cultural and historical background of the book of Revelation, Blaiklock briefly discusses the archaeology of the island of Patmos and of the seven churches of Asia Minor. Some of the cities he deals with adequately (Ephesus, Pergamum) and some skimpily (Smyrna, Thyatira, Sardis, Philadelphia, Laodicea). He deals with the possible meaning of the number 666 or 616 (Revelation 13), but he does not explain for the layperson that the difference in the two different numbers has to do with variants in the manuscript evidence. He seems to want to identify Ostia, Italy, as the city described in Revelation 18.

Our author gives a short treatment of the historical background of the Dead Sea scrolls (chap. 12) and stresses the difference between the Qumran community and Christ. He says that "the Scrolls merely sharpened vision and understanding" of the NT (p. 145). He gives some illustrations from the Isaiah scroll, which brings clarification to the Biblical text (pp. 150–152). In "Archaeology and the Tale of the Jews" (chap. 13) our author describes how the Jews had a part in the construction of the Colosseum and how they resisted the Romans at Masada. The Roman catacombs and their inscriptions furnish Blaiklock with illustrations illuminating the life and thought of the early Church (chap. 14). He argues that Christianity overcame the insidious influence of Mithraism, the early Roman religious cult.

Dealing popularly with certain archaeological themes and the NT, Blaiklock evidences that his appeal in the book is to laymen. This treatise does not purport to deal with the deeper issues of scholarship. The bibliography is limited and somewhat dated. The book is fairly well illustrated with photographs.

The *New International Dictionary of Biblical Archaeology* claims, according to the jacket, to be a work to help students, professors of archaeology, pastors and interested laypersons—quite a wide range. It is a work of a different nature than Blaiklock's treatment on NT archaeology. The *Dictionary* is more detailed and technical and treats alphabetically a wide range of archaeological and historical subjects authored by twenty scholars whose names are published at the beginning of the book.

The dictionary was in publication process for some ten years, so that although the articles written early in the period were updated in the early 1980s much of the research seems to have been based on material available up to about 1975. However, among the bibliographical references there are items dated as late as 1979 (see the article "Archaeology Since 1948") or as late as 1981 (e.g. "Galilee," "Tell Mardikh [Ebla]," "Epigraphy, General," "Dan"), or even 1982 (e.g. "Urartu"). Unfortunately the article on "Bab Edh-Dhra" only deals with research up through 1973 (there is a brief reference to Rast and Schaub's survey work and the bibliographical references only go through 1968); there has been ongoing excavation at the site and reporting on it up to the present. For some subjects discussed, such as "cloth, clothing," etc., the date of the research material (1960) is not so crucial. (It is to be noted, however, that there is much important research being done today in these technical cultural areas.)

As noted above, the format of the book is alphabetical from "Aaron's Tomb" through "Ziusudra," over 800 articles in all. There are several colored maps in the back of the book and a few in black and white with an index to the full-color maps. There are frequent helpful black-and-white photographs throughout the book, with a group of sixteen full-color photographs in the middle of the volume.

The bibliographical references given in individual articles on the whole are quite plentiful, and there is a rather full listing of abbreviations of important reference points:

(1) general abbreviations to common terms (e.g. EB = Early Bronze Age, etc.); (2) modern

translations and paraphrases; (3) books of the Bible, the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha; (4) names of the Dead Sea scrolls and related texts; (5) organizations and institutions (e.g. AIA = Australian Institute of Archaeology; it is strange that there is no mention of the prestigious Archaeological Institute of America); and (6) periodicals, reference works, and classical sources (five pages of these). Transliterations of Hebrew, Aramaic, Arabic, Ugaritic and Greek letters are also given. This preliminary section concludes with "A Select Annotated List of Current Archaeological Periodicals in English" (including general Biblical archaeology, periodicals from specific countries or areas, Dead Sea scrolls, the NT and the classical world [one might have expected a section on the OT]), and a "Chronological Chart of Archaeological and Historical Periods." The latter follows the general dates assigned by Near East-Palestinian archaeologists but only goes down through the Roman period (37 B.C.—A.D. 325).

The dictionary deals with a variety of subjects, such as cities (e.g. Gerasa, Megiddo, Nineveh, Pergamum, Sidon, Tyre), geographical regions (e.g. Galilee, Phoenicia), peoples (e.g. Ammon, Philistines), persons (e.g. Darius, Esarhaddon, Solomon, Tutankhamen), general topics (e.g. Aaron's tomb, games, Episcopos, marriage, Muratorian Fragment, musical instruments, Sanhedrin, sarcophagus), and literature (e.g. Dead Sea scrolls, Gospel of Thomas, Nag Hammadi papyri). Technical scientific topics, such as archaeometry, coins, dating (C14, etc.), dendrochronology, epigraphy, stratigraphy-typology, etc., are also included.

A good many of the articles are short, but frequently bibliographical references give the reader other literature and sources with which to expand one's knowledge. Some topics are rather extensively treated, such as Jericho, Jerusalem (NT and OT), Samaria, etc., but others, deserving of greater coverage, are quite short (Judea, Edom, Petra, etc.). Mesopotamian and other Middle East sites, topics and persons, such as Pasargadae, Bactria, Cyrus, Darius, etc., are treated extensively (in contrast, the Persepolis article is tantalizingly short). One might have expected the same extensive treatment of the important classical and Biblical sites of Athens and Rome (Corinth is a little better covered). The problem of the exodus is not really tackled (only briefly touched on in the discussion of the Israel Stele), but there is an extensive discussion of the problem of the three walls of Jerusalem (Jerusalem, New Testament).

If one wants to read a rather light and selective treatment showing how archaeology in general and papyri in particular relate to selected parts of the NT, then he will want to read *The Archaeology of the New Testament*. But if one is a student, teacher, pastor, or layperson desiring more in-depth treatment of many archaeological and historical topics relating to the OT and NT, he will want to have as a standard archaeological reference tool *The New International Dictionary of Biblical Archaeology* to obtain basic materials needed for background study of the Bible. Since this volume is obviously dated (copyright date, 1983) to the materials uncovered and studied up to the early 1980s, one should also have available a periodical or two like *The Biblical Archaeologist*, *The Biblical Archaeology Review*, *The Near East Archaeological Society Bulletin*, etc., to keep oneself abreast of current developments. One could hope that this *Dictionary* in time will be revised to include additional information gathered from ongoing excavations.

W. Harold Mare

Covenant Theological Seminary, St. Louis, MO

A Contemporary Wesleyan Theology: Biblical, Systematic, and Practical. 2 volumes. Charles W. Carter, general editor. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983, 1178 pp., \$39.95.

This work intends to fill a forty-year void in America for a current Biblical, systematic

and practical Wesleyan theology. Twenty-three theologians from seven prominent Wesleyan denominations are involved in trying to accomplish the task of replacing H. Orton Wiley's *Christian Theology*.

I believe this product will be used by the various projected audiences—college, seminary and church—with profit. There is certainly sufficient spiritual candor to interest those not formally trained in theology, while seminarians will benefit from poring over the pages and some college classes will find this to be essential reading.

Evidence that a particular Wesleyan viewpoint prevails in the work is seen in the suggested label "progressively evangelical." Thus liberal Wesleyans and Holiness Classical Pentecostals—the latter sufficiently under the influence of Wesleyan thought that Melvin E. Deiter can refer to the entire Pentecostal movement as a logical outcome of Wesley's theology—will, for different reasons, find the work to at times espouse theologies at variance with their own traditions.

Liberal Wesleyans and Classical Pentecostals receive useful consideration in many articles. Indeed a fair amount of space is given to interacting with Pentecostals, and they will benefit from many of the things said to them. However, the most extensive treatment of a Pentecostal distinctive (i.e., psychological analysis of tongues-speech) demonstrates a lack of awareness of current Pentecostal scholarship as found, for example, in the Society for Pentecostal Studies.

There has been something of a deluge of systematic theologies recently released in English. Yet the valuable contributions of Wainwright, the Hansons, Braaten and Jenson, Moody, Erickson, Weber, H. Berkhof and Bloesch do not remove the need for this useful statement by the selected conservative Wesleyan scholars. Many, like the Pentecostals, will find their posture a dialectical one but not conclude that the work has by that kind of reading been exhausted. These articles have much to commend themselves to audiences that range in formal theological ability and theological commitments. Further, the specific self-description of the work as "topical, biblical, exegetical, expositional, contextual, dynamic, positive, relevant, and nonpolemical" seems earned and further justifies the existence of these two volumes. Traditions with various theological emphases will doubtless suggest weaknesses in particular areas, but my greatest mystery was the absence of a distinct treatment of the doctrine of election. It is understandable that some areas of classical interest have not been included, but this doctrine continues to impact significantly on many traditions and it seems that an opportunity was missed to make an important contribution to this part of the discussion.

The format of almost every article is sufficiently organized so that readers will be able to identify quickly the topics of interest to them. Many of the articles end with summaries and then discussion questions, some of which seemed redundant. Having made some observations about matters that generally characterize the twenty-four articles, it is now appropriate to note some particulars of each article.

The opening article by G. W. Stafford offers an abbreviated account of select issues generated in recent theology. This is followed by two rather specific articles, one by R. S. Taylor and the other by T. L. Smith, that attempt to provide an explanation of and defense for the ongoing use of a conservative, reconstructed Wesleyan theology. This is especially set in contrast to theologies by liberals, Spirit movements and Calvinists.

The first article on theology proper deals with an area of first priority in systematic theology. A. Truesdale's "kerygmatic" explanation of theism includes most items essential to the topic. This is followed by a treatment of cosmology by E. E. Carpenter, who takes a moderate stance on many post-Enlightenment questions (including science, historical and literary criticism) brought to bear on the subject while maintaining the priority of the religious in interpreting the data.

The study of humankind by the general editor calls attention to the various distinctives of humans as *Homo sapiens* with emphasis on sin. He offers an explanation for the

origin of evil but not the reason for such a phenomenon. R. Earle distinguishes between general revelation and special revelation. The centerpiece of special revelation, the Scriptures, are said to be plenary inspired and dynamically inspired—rather than verbally inspired—with the result that truth is conveyed without error.

C. R. Wilson articulates a unique God-man Christology that is held to be vitally connected to soteriology. The doctrine of the Trinity is less clearly taught in the OT than in the NT, according to J. K. Grider, who then defends a threefold plurality of God that does not compromise the unity of God.

The pneumatology described by M. S. Agnew centers on the affirmation that baptism with the Holy Spirit (which has several names in the Bible) is a distinct, subsequent experience that primarily involves ethical concerns. R. L. Shelton describes important elements that constitute salvation and salvation applied. The last article in vol. 1 is appropriately about entire sanctification. Wesley is interpreted by W. T. Dayton to have spoken without complete clarity of a holiness—which can be called perfection—that involves an instantaneous, subsequent work of the Holy Spirit and results in an improvable perfect love that does not deny the fallibility of humanity.

Volume 2 opens with a broad-based study of ecclesiology by D. L. Smith. C. W. Carter and E. N. Hunt, Jr., defend evangelism as the divine mandate over against the moratorium proposed by those who turn missions into the liberation from political, social, economic and/or religious bondage(s). This is followed by R. D. Thompson's study, which suggests that social involvement—ranging from personal morals to societal realities—is a God-given responsibility for Christians.

W. G. McCown reviews selected principles of Biblical interpretation and encourages consideration of the *analogia fidei* and the lack of multiple meanings of various texts while giving particular credence to the Christ principle and the inductive method. Preaching, according to D. E. Demaray, is for any time, anywhere and anybody and should not be lost by a failure to observe important practical guidelines. Demaray opens by saying that Wesleyan preaching is as diversified as the varying descriptions of an elephant by the fabled blind men, and he later comments that the Wesleyan characteristic of using picture-stories is compatible with the "right-brain" triggering of the "left-brain" cognitive powers. D. M. Henderson suggests that while Christian education may employ various teaching methods the center of such learning should be the local church, the Christian home and approved Christian organizations. He argues that part of his case is strengthened by the fact that the Wesleyan revival was not born in a Holy Club or at Aldersgate Street but in a "godly home where the proper balance of fatherly and motherly training prevailed."

A wedding of particular psychological and theological insights is the object of J. M. Ridgway's work. Ridgway has an interesting study of psychopathology that is seen as supporting the Wesleyan distinction of infirmities from sins and a disappointing reduction of contemporary glossolalia, xenolalia and akolalia to either unfortunate psychological factors or satanic stimuli. C. W. Carter's fourth written contribution to the series clearly defends traditional Wesleyan ethics, which are shown to be in considerable tension with those views espoused by the likes of J. Fletcher and J. A. T. Robinson.

T. L. Smith, R. S. Nicholson, Sr., and T. C. Mitchell each contribute to a better understanding of the theologies, particularly the pneumatologies, found in the hymnology of the original Wesleys. An engaging study of good and evil angels is provided by W. E. Caldwell. While admitting that many questions (e.g. organization, guardian angels, fall of Satan) cannot be answered with certainty, Caldwell finds much in Scripture that not only speaks to the reality of angels but also of their works. The final article, written by W. R. Thompson, affirms many fundamental aspects of the Biblical record of last things (e.g. intermediate state not soul sleep, a return of the Lord that leads to an eternal decree)

but is unwilling to speculate needlessly or commit to uncertain theologies including various millennial theologies.

The second volume concludes with a helpful index prepared by J. F. Scott. This is matched by qualitative documentation and bibliography coupled with helpful content endnotes found with each article. Additionally, some articles include a glossary of terms.

No reader will be able to suggest that most of these writers are generally unaware of modern theology—left or right or Cartesian or non-Cartesian—or of older views extending back to the apostolic fathers. The reader will find Scripture as the projected principal authority. Wesley is repeatedly mentioned as *homo unius libri*. Attention is given to other matters including particular interpretations of the original Wesleys, the Wesleyan tradition (especially Wiley), and modern conservative Wesleyan scholarship. Sometimes a defensive posture is taken toward Wesley and the Wesleyan tradition. At other times Wesleyan thought is reconstructed. And finally there are times at which a different path is taken. The reader for various reasons will not be equally satisfied with each article but will always benefit from time spent with the material.

Harold Hunter

Oral Roberts University School of Theology, Tulsa, OK

Keep in Step with the Spirit. By J. I. Packer. Revell, 1984, 301 pp., \$11.95.

There are many good books on the market and a number of excellent ones. But there are a few that, by virtue of their exegetical richness, penetrating insight and spiritual depth, stand as landmarks in their generation. Packer has given us a new landmark. *Keep in Step with the Spirit* is the theological enterprise as it was meant to be. It is pneumatology in its finest hour.

Chapter 1 demonstrates that the Spirit's ministry centers not in such things as performance (e.g. the exercise of gifts) but in mediating the personal presence and ministry of the Lord Jesus. Chapter 2 surveys pneumatology from this perspective, from the personality and deity of the Spirit to the use of spiritual gifts (where Packer defines and discusses "gifts in terms of Christ the head of the body," p. 82). Chapters 3–6, the meat of the book, analyze Wesleyan perfectionism, classic Keswick teaching and contemporary charismatic spirituality (chaps. 5–6) and restate the Augustinian view of life in the Spirit as a "more deeply biblical" alternative. Chapter 7 offers some thoughts about the Spirit reviving the body of Christ. The entire book is characterized by clear thinking, an irenic spirit, and a call to holiness "at the deepest level of scholarship, pastoral insight, and personal experiment" (p. 102).

Perhaps Packer's most significant contribution in the book is his analysis of the charismatic movement, a "largely positive evolution" (p. 219), he feels. After reviewing charismatic distinctives and diversity he offers an annotated credit and debit balance sheet (chap. 5). He finds twelve positive aspects of the charismatic renewal that merit "unambiguous approval" and ten defects or dangers to which charismatics are particularly subject. It is in chap. 6 that his full-blown critique emerges. After penetrating analysis (pp. 200–219) he concludes that "it cannot be convincingly concluded from any of this evidence that the archetypal New Testament realities have now, after long abeyance, been given back to the church just as they were" (p. 218). He then offers his "alternative theology" (pp. 219–228) to explain what it is that charismatics do experience: an intensifying sense of their acceptance and fellowship with God.

Packer's evaluation, then, of charismatic spirituality is: Charismatics are wrong in regard to their distinctives but have many things to teach noncharismatics, so let us not throw the baby out with the bathwater. God is in the charismatic movement (p. 185),

though when examined by the Biblical criterion for revival it falls short: "Revival conditions are not with us at present. . . . We remain pygmy saints" (p. 248).

Some (including the reviewer) will conclude that Packer's irenic spirit overpowers his assessment of the charismatic movement at points. At times he seems to give too much (as when he concludes that any divisive, disruptive, or disunifying effects of the charismatic movement are purely incidental, p. 179). But despite this demurrer the reviewer feels that Packer is on target: Our feelings toward those who differ with us on these issues should be more cordial.

Packer's volume stands above all as a fervent call to holiness and Spirit-led revival. He has given us a magisterial treatment of holiness that instructs our generation with keen insight but that also calls us to holiness of life and compels us to worship our great God. This is sustained excellence. May it become the standard work on the Spirit for many years to come!

Van Campbell

Calvary Evangelical Free Church, Indiana, PA

Commentary on Numbers. By Philip J. Budd. Waco: Word, 1984.

One of the earliest volumes to be published in the new Word Biblical Commentary series is Budd's treatment of the book of Numbers. Word is the sponsor and publisher of this new series, and it would therefore be expected that the contributors would be distinctively evangelical in their approach. Word has in the past shown a consistent preference for books representing an evangelical viewpoint. The editorial preface prepared by the general editors, G. Barker and D. A. Hubbard, would lead the public to believe that the commentators of this series would be recognizably conservative or even orthodox in their handling of matters of higher criticism. The preface comments: "The broad stance of our contributors can rightly be called evangelical, and this term is to be understood in its positive, historic sense of a commitment to scripture as divine revelation, and to the truth and power of the Christian gospel."

After a commendation such as this it would naturally be expected that Budd would espouse the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch at least to the extent that Christ and the apostles did according to the NT record. In Matt 19:8 Jesus says: "Moses for the hardness of your heart suffered you to put away your wives"—in reference to Deut 24:3. In John 5:46-47 he is quoted as saying: "For if you believed Moses, you would believe me. But if you do not believe his writings, how shall you believe my words?" Again, in John 7:19 Christ declared: "Did not Moses give you the Law? And yet none of you does the Law." In the light of these and many other allusions to the Pentateuch as the divinely-inspired work of the historic Moses (such as Matt 22:32; Mark 12:26, where Jesus treats as verbally inspired the words of Jehovah in Exod 3:15, which Jesus specifies as "the book of Moses") it is highly instructive to read our commentator's appraisal of the origin of the Pentateuch in general and Numbers in particular.

On p. xxvi of his "Introduction" he makes his position unequivocally clear: "Our investigations have proceeded on the assumption that the book of Numbers is a complex accumulation of tradition, and not a simple factual account of Israel's journey from Sinai to the border of the land. This assumption is rooted in the findings of literary and historical criticism, and has been shown to be justified at every stage of the inquiry. The question must necessarily be raised as to what value if any the book has to the historian of the second millennium. In general the prospects are not very promising."

On this basis it is quite clear that Budd would hardly accept as historical the account in Numbers 21 of the miraculous healing from venomous serpent bites of all those victims

who looked in faith toward the bronze serpent set up by Moses in obedience to the command of God. It is equally clear from Christ's reference to this episode as a type of his coming crucifixion (John 3:14) that he personally understood that event to be historical.

One thing is certain, so far as the history of Pentateuchal higher criticism is concerned. This new commentary opens up virtually no new ground. The same rationalistic sorting out of traditions, assumed from the start to be centuries later than the time of Moses and notably discrepant and inconsistent with one another, is practiced by Budd as was employed by K. H. Graf, A. Kuenen and J. Wellhausen in the 1860s and 1870s. Little has changed in the interval of a century or more, and what we have here is little more than a trite and hackneyed rehash that any student of Wellhausian higher criticism could crank out without entertaining a single new insight from the advances made by modern archaeology. The correctives to the assumed inaccuracy of the Pentateuchal record so eloquently and convincingly voiced by W. F. Albright seem to be completely ignored. Albright commented, as the foremost Biblical archaeologist in America back in 1941: "Archeological and inscriptional data have established the historicity of innumerable passages and statements of the Old Testament. . . . Wellhausen still ranks in our eyes as the greatest biblical scholar of the nineteenth century. But his standpoint is antiquated and his picture of the early evolution of Israel is sadly distorted" ("Japheth in the Tents of Shem," *American Scholar* 42, p. 181). In *The Archeology of Palestine* (Pelican, 1949, p. 225) he concludes: "It is, accordingly, sheer hypercriticism to deny the substantially Mosaic character of the Pentateuchal tradition." Albright could hardly be classed as an evangelical by conviction, and he still spoke in terms of the JEDP documentary theory in his discussion of the Torah. Therefore it can only be regarded as favorable testimony from an adverse witness—the most valuable kind of testimony in a court of law—for him to concede the essential Mosaic origin of the Pentateuchal traditions.

If the commentary on Numbers is a fair sample of the other volumes that are shortly to be published, it will soon become apparent that they are evangelical in name only.

Gleason L. Archer

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

1 and 2 Kings. By G. H. Jones. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984, 2 vols., lii + 666 pp., \$7.95 per volume.

This recent addition to The New Century Bible commentary series is a worthy contribution to a series that is marked by its high scholastic standards. The level of Jones' mastery of the area of study relative to *Kings* is immediately apparent not only from the publishing of an excellent bibliography covering both the usual background studies and commentaries and also a wide-ranging list of pertinent articles and special studies (pp. xiv–lii) but from his continuous interaction with these sources throughout the commentary. Jones' careful research has enabled him to handle well the relevant problems of critical concern so that his section on introduction (pp. 1–85) is more than sufficient to inform the reader of the state of current scholarly opinion. Too often the dictates of space as circumscribed by the needs of publication render introductions to a commentary almost useless or relegate them to being little more than short studies that are largely isolated from the remarks of the following comments. It is to the credit of the publisher that such is not the case here so that Jones' basic approach to the crucial matters of text, chronology, the identity and contributions of the Deuteronomistic school, and the theology of *Kings* are well represented in the body of his comments. For instance, the so-called Miscellanies of

the LXX mentioned in the introduction are discussed in detail at their proper places in the commentary (cf. p. 2 with pp. 117, 119, 173, 248–249, 349).

As for the textual tradition of Kings, Jones assumes a cautious middle ground between the views of Shenkel and Gooding with regard to the antiquity and reliability of the Greek tradition. Each Greek variation from the MT must be carefully evaluated in the light of all the evidence, including the hermeneutical tendencies of the textual traditions in which it is found. As for matters of chronology, since Jones assigns a high value to the Greek traditions he believes that “it is now clear that the chronology of Kings cannot be reconstructed by reference to MT alone” (p. 21). Further, the numerical discrepancies between the Greek textual tradition and MT at crucial points (together with his lack of concern for full harmonization of details) allows him to dismiss elaborate systems of co-gencies, especially as proposed by Thiele. Instead, following the principle of the shift in employment of an antedating system for the reckoning of regnal years in the early period of the era of the divided kingdoms to a postdating system at some later point, Jones adopts largely the chronology of K. T. Anderson that works critically with the chronological notices of the MT but allows recourse to LXX at crucial points as necessary. However, it must be pointed out that this process is not always entirely satisfactory. For example, in adopting the Lucianic chronology that juxtaposes the accession of Jehoram of Israel with the second year of Jehoram of Judah (pp. 23–24, 28) while holding to the superiority of the MT reading at 2 Kgs 3:1, which relates Jehoram’s accession to the reign of Jehoshaphat of Judah, he is forced to allow a contradiction to stand with 2 Kgs 1:17 (which favors his chronology) and to attribute each tradition to differing independent sources that themselves were not totally accurate.

The heart of Jones’ work is taken up with his application of the principles of Deuteronomistic theory to the text of Kings. Jones adopts the position that Kings is the product of the continuing activity of the Deuteronomistic school, a literary group that betrays its connections with at least priestly, prophetic and wisdom circles. The raw material for these writers apparently came from an abundant source material that was made up of many small units as well as larger strands. Accordingly Jones’ theory of literary compilation is basically an application of the old fragmentary hypothesis to the concept of Deuteronomism. The major thrust of Jones’ commentary therefore becomes literary analysis as he scrutinizes the major blocks of source material to isolate their component parts, particularly the distinctive contributions of the Deuteronomists. Thus he finds in the traditional succession narrative (2 Samuel 9–20; 1 Kings 1–2) a pro-Solomonic narrative that emerged from an author in the court circle. The basic two-part account in Kings (chaps. 1, 2) is of course permeated by the author’s own annotations and comments. The “Book of the Acts of Solomon” (chaps. 3–11) originated from court annals and/or temple archives but is punctuated by narratives of political interest, descriptive stories of Solomon’s wisdom, and secondary additions and Deuteronomistic annotations. Throughout this section Jones attempts to present in piecemeal fashion the processes by which the fragmentary source material was compiled into the canonical literary building blocks. While Jones finds genuine historical information here, he also clearly decides for the presence of much legendary material and some theologizing remarks.

The basic histories of the monarchy (1 Kings 12–2 Kings 17; 2 Kings 18–25) are viewed as largely dependent on the “Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Israel” and the “Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah.” These were popular unofficial histories from which the Deuteronomistic historian drew his material in creating and composing his own historical framework and narrative of Israel’s monarchic period. Obviously, the bare annalistic reports of the chronicles have been greatly augmented by various narratives and Deuteronomistic fictionalized additions and theologizing observations. Again and again seemingly straightforward historical accounts are dissected into minute literary fragments that leave Jones’ readers dazzled by his attempts to unravel the complex

layers of the compilation (e.g. 1 Kings 18, pp. 309–326; 2 Kgs 13:1–13, pp. 496–501). Perhaps this is best illustrated in Jones' treatment of 2 Kings 18–20 (pp. 556–595).

Jones also gives full attention to the prophetic narratives that contain not only the extended Elijah (1 Kings 17–19, 21, 2 Kings 1) and Elisha (2 Kings 2–10:36; 13:14–21) cycles (both of which were produced within the circle of Elisha's disciples) but also independent narratives concerning several minor prophets that are placed at strategic points throughout the two books of Kings. Each of these is minutely examined form-critically so as to determine the boundaries and literary genres of the smaller units utilized in forming the various larger building blocks into a continuous narrative. All of this was punctuated and/or reworked by the Deuteronomist. In sum, although Jones sees the hand of the Deuteronomist in selecting and adapting his sources as he composes his theological narrative concerning Israel's monarchic history he nonetheless believes that the end product is largely reliable, bearing often the reporting of genuine historical traditions.

Even a casual glance at Jones' two-volume commentary on Kings would be sufficient to convince its reader that this is certainly a major work. The bibliography alone is worth the price of the book. Moreover, as remarked previously, Jones has interacted superbly with his sources so that in a very real way his commentary is itself a state-of-the-art text. But this great strength perhaps becomes at once the commentary's weakness and raises several points of criticism.

(1) Jones is consistently predictable. Having analyzed the various scholarly opinions on a given issue, he will usually take an irenic position that strikes a balance between extremes (e.g. the identity of the Deuteronomists, pp. 44–46). Jones himself seldom breaks new ground.

(2) Jones' wholesale commitment to the concept of Deuteronomism makes his interpretations predictable. Despite the fact of uncertainty as to the history of the compilation of Kings, the nature and extent of the proposed redactions, and the actual identity of the Deuteronomists, Jones has followed the lead of current critical scholarship in asserting that Kings is one of the major literary products of a "deuteronomic school." Accordingly, any matter relative to cultic orthodoxy (particularly as centered in the temple), divine retribution for nonorthodox activity, and prophetic fulfillment of God's words can be assigned *a priori* to the theologizing tendencies of the Deuteronomists. Jones' hermeneutical posture predictably preconditions his comments at any given point where typically "deuteronomistic material" can be assumed. Jones gives no indication of having seriously considered the incisive objections to Deuteronomistic theory by such evangelical scholars as R. K. Harrison (*Introduction to the Old Testament*, pp. 721–732), W. C. Kaiser, Jr. (*Toward an Old Testament Theology*, pp. 63–66), and K. A. Kitchen ("Ancient Orient, 'Deuteronomism,' and the Old Testament," in *New Perspectives on the Old Testament* [ed. J. B. Payne], pp. 1–24). Indeed, one will look almost in vain throughout the commentary for any interaction with a specifically evangelical viewpoint. Jones' own hermeneutical/theological position could scarcely be viewed as evangelical, for the position taken consistently in this book runs at distinct crosscurrents with the position of the ETS in matters of Biblical inerrancy, revelation and inspiration.

(3) It comes as no surprise, then, that anything supernatural or miraculous is immediately discounted as literary fiction or consigned to the realm of legend. Accordingly, although the great prophets Elijah and Elisha were historical persons, their exploits are viewed as greatly exaggerated and the accounts of their deeds are classified largely as "prophetic wonder legends" (p. 303; cf. pp. 381, 401, etc.).

(4) On a purely technical level, Jones' chronological scheme simply avoids the many problems of conflicting Biblical data. Full harmonization of details is characteristically sacrificed to the supposed preservation of variant traditions. As indicated above, Jones' treatment of the relationship of 2 Kgs 1:17; 3:1; 8:16 is less than satisfactory. Nor does

his disallowance of co-regencies enable him to deal adequately with the complex details relative to the correlation of the dates for the reigns of Baasha of the northern kingdom and Abijah and Asa of the southern kingdom, or the era of Menahem, Pekahiah, Pekah and Hoshea of Israel and Azariah and Jotham of Judah, or the extremely difficult chronological problems relative to the reigns of Jotham, Ahaz and Hezekiah of Judah. While one may always disagree as to small points of lexical or historical perspective, it must be said fairly that Jones does well in these areas. However, the commentary could have been strengthened by fuller attention to syntactical matters. This reviewer has noted literally dozens of places where matters of Hebrew syntax have either been ignored or not given their full weight. Perhaps the series' commitment to the *RSV* has predisposed the case for Jones. As well, the commentary would demonstrate better continuity if more extended discussions of the developing historical context in which the narratives of Kings are set would have been given. The book tends to move from one historical event/context to another in a rather disconnected fashion.

(5) This last observation bears likewise on the next general criticism. The book does not read smoothly. One never senses the great movement of God among his covenant people in the context of the developing scenes of the real world. Doubtless due to Jones' commitment to a fragmentary hypothesis blended with Deuteronomistic theory, the reader is always presented with bits and pieces of discussion. Although one learns a good deal of particular information and comes to understand Jones' evaluation of the status of current research in a given context, that context's relationship to the theme and developing flow of thought of Kings is too easily lost sight of in the detailed investigations of literary analysis.

(6) An evangelical will look in vain in this commentary for spiritual help or practical application to the Christian life. Although one can be pleased with the fact that the publisher has allowed the author adequate space to develop his comments fully so that Jones' commentary is a genuinely scholarly piece of work, pure scholarship that is dissociated from spiritual perspective too easily yields a work that is at best academically antiseptic and spiritually sterile.

In conclusion, Jones' commentary on Kings provides a valuable sourcebook for various scholarly positions on the problems that have perplexed the readers of Kings, and Jones' own interaction both with the scholars and those problems makes the book a state-of-the-research type of commentary. However, while the book should find a welcome place on the scholar's bookshelf, it will probably not enjoy a warm reception in the evangelical community at large.

Richard D. Patterson

Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther. By D. J. A. Clines. New Century Bible Commentary; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984, xx + 342 pp., \$7.95.

Clines has produced a concise, scholarly and current commentary on the postexilic books of Ezra, Nehemiah and Esther. The commentary is divided into five sections: (1) an introduction treating Ezra-Nehemiah (31 pp.); (2) comments verse by verse on Ezra (101 pp.); (3) comments on Nehemiah (114 pp.); (4) an introduction to Esther (21 pp.); and (5) comments on Esther (60 pp.).

Ezra-Nehemiah, which Clines believes is closely connected with Chronicles in language, style and interests and which begins by quoting the last two verses of 2 Chronicles, is first discussed in relation to extracanonical literature. A table (pp. 3-4) establishes the relationship of Ezra with other books using the name of Ezra.

Five sources are suggested for the material of Ezra-Nehemiah: (1) the Nehemiah

memoirs (including two lists of names—the wall-builders list [Nehemiah 3] and the homecomers list [Nehemiah 7]); (2) the Ezra memoirs (including the firman of Artaxerxes [Ezra 7], the list of those who returned with Ezra [Ezra 8], and the list of those who had made mixed marriages [Ezra 10]); (3) the “Aramaic chronicle” (Ezra 4:7–6:18); (4) five lists from temple archives (Nehemiah 11–12); and (5) the Nehemiah pledge (Nehemiah 10).

The author of Chronicles is the primary author of the Ezra-Nehemiah narrative in more or less its present form, and his work was completed within a few decades of the historical events of Ezra and Nehemiah. Clines argues for the priority of Ezra, with a probable date of his coming to Jerusalem in 458 B.C. The author’s primary concern “is to assert the *legitimacy of his own community*, the Judean state of the fourth century BC, as the sole heir of the true theocratic Israel.” The northern kingdom had taken itself out of this “theocratic community,” and only those individual members who had joined Judah could share in the blessings. God’s promises were made to the Davidic dynasty, and only those who remained loyal to that dynasty were part of the true Israel. “In the books of Ezra and Nehemiah the Chronicler is at pains to stress the continuity between the pre-exilic Judean state and the community of returned exiles.”

The verse-by-verse commentary is well done. The remarks are concise and relevant. Hundreds of references are given in support of the comments or as suggestions for additional reading. A wide range of scholars and works is cited. A few examples will illustrate the type of material found. Clines uses the term “phratry” to translate the Hebrew *mišpāhā*, which is too large a unit (10,000 members or more) to be called a “family” or “clan” (p. 48); the technical term *nētīnīm* receives a good treatment (p. 56); the problems of Zerubbabel are discussed (pp. 64–65); and a caution is given about the use of the term “Samaritan” (p. 73). Examples of good insight and application are seen in his comments such as those on opposition to the work of God (pp. 82–83), the time of Ezra’s return (p. 107), Nehemiah’s reaction to opposition (p. 165) and Nehemiah’s economic policies (p. 172).

The introduction to Esther discusses the contents of the book in the Hebrew Bible in relation to the Additions, the canonicity of the book, its historicity, its function, its relationship to the festival of Purim, literary influences on the book, its theology, and the date of composition.

The verse-by-verse commentary of Esther compares well with that of Ezra-Nehemiah. A thorough knowledge of the problems and the literature on the subject is evident. One minor error is the citing of Jeremiah instead of Jeconiah (Jehoiachin) (p. 287). A flaw this present writer noticed throughout the book, which had nothing to do with content, was the strange division of words at the ends of lines. These are listed with page numbers: ultima-tely (2), investig-ation (6), rearrang-ement (12), indep-ence (28), enti-rely (28), dang-erously (29), transc-ental (31), worsh-ipped (37), orthogra-phically (40), celebr-ation (67), and many others.

This commentary can be highly recommended for students and teachers, for laymen and clergy. The style is clear and easy to follow, yet the information provided allows for extended reading and considerable depth of study. The author’s attitude toward other scholars and their positions is fair and professional. He does not claim to have solved all the problems, but he does draw conclusions when the evidence is sufficient. His attitude is well expressed by his statement: “No clear conclusion emerges from this survey of the evidence, but there can be little doubt that the evidence should be thoroughly reviewed before any decision by a reader is reached” (p. 261). The book is well worth its price.

Roy E. Hayden

Oral Roberts University, Tulsa, OK

Esther: An Introduction and Commentary. By Joyce G. Baldwin. Leicester and Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1984, 126 pp., \$6.95.

As the one book of the OT that contains no reference to God, the book of Esther has long puzzled both Jewish and Christian scholars (e.g. Luther and Calvin wrote no commentaries on Esther). The reference in Esth 4:14 to help from "another quarter" may be the one veiled reference to deity.

Baldwin has placed us in her debt with her commentary on Esther as her third contribution to the Tyndale Old Testament Commentary series edited by D. G. Wiseman. Like her other volumes this is a gem. There is a wealth of data and a depth of exposition compressed within a small compass.

The author comments on the coincidence that in an earlier one-volume commentary as the only woman contributor she had been assigned books on the heroines Ruth and Esther. As the former dean of women at Trinity College in Bristol she brings the special insight of a feminine point of view to the text. For example, on 1:17 she comments: "The argument of Memucan may have commended itself to the men present, but it took little account of female psychology. Women do not as a rule support one another as readily as men in taking concerted action" (pp. 61-62). Commenting on the institution of the harem she observes: "The prestige of living in the royal palace was small compensation for the king's neglect, though girls with a passion for luxury could no doubt indulge it to the full" (p. 68). On Esther's relation to Ahasuerus she notes: "Other people often have easier access to her husband than a wife, who has sometimes to reckon with volatile feelings and reactions, in so sensitive a relationship" (p. 79).

On matters of introduction the author maintains the essential historicity of the narrative, though conceding that some features "continue to seem improbable" (p. 24). As to the date of composition she opts for the latter half of the fifth or the early fourth century B.C.

As to the lack of reference to God in the text she suggests: "The difficulty is that 'divine right' puts a matter beyond argument and sets every other right out of consideration. Perhaps this is why the author of Esther kept his story on the human plane, aware of divine destiny, but not making grand claims" (p. 41).

On occasion she uses colorful prose: "It is necessary for us to put ourselves in the place of Mordecai, who by his pig-headed pride or loyalty to principle brought disaster not merely on himself but on his whole race" (p. 76). She fully empathizes with the heroine: "It is very moving to see the extent to which this young girl, who has everything money can buy, identifies herself with her own kith and kin, and is prepared to risk everything in an attempt to prevent the disaster that threatens them" (p. 95).

Quite appropriate and helpful are her practical suggestions on the value of fasting for Christians today (pp. 84-85), her added note on the difficult theme of vengeance (pp. 100-102), and her citations of historical parallels to the fate of the Jews (pp. 104, 116). Of great interest for Protestant readers unfamiliar with the Apocrypha are the Additions to Esther, which are included in an appendix.

Though the author is well informed and cites numerous works in her footnotes and list of abbreviations, a separate bibliography is lacking. One misses any reference to C. A. Moore, *Daniel, Esther and Jeremiah: The Additions* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1977).

Edwin M. Yamauchi

Miami University, Oxford, OH

The Message of the Psalms. By Walter Brueggemann. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984, 206 pp., n.p.

The Augsburg Old Testament Studies series, which includes this volume, is "designed for students of the Bible, especially for pastors and teachers of the community of faith" (p.7). Although emphasis is placed on the contemporary relevance of the Psalms, laypeople might find it rough going.

Brueggemann clearly shows how form criticism can help us in understanding the Psalms. In fact, it can complement a more traditional and devotional approach. The literary forms or genres reflect the "seasons in the life of faith" (p. 10)—that is, "there is a close correspondence between *the anatomy of the lament psalm . . . and the anatomy of the soul*" (pp. 18–19). Some may wish to criticize Brueggemann for imposing his own psychological and theological understanding on the Psalms, but I found it refreshing to hear someone going beyond the cultic exigencies that psalms reflect to the faith that they express.

He interprets the Psalms according to a threefold scheme, the stages of which he illustrates with Psalm 30. "Psalms of orientation" (Ps 30:6–7a) include songs of creation, of torah, of wisdom, of retribution, and occasions of well-being. Among the "psalms of disorientation" (30:7b–10) he groups personal and communal laments, prophetic psalms, the seven "penitential" psalms, and three wisdom psalms reflecting on the inequities of life (49; 73; 90). "Psalms of new orientation" (30:11–12) include personal and communal thanksgiving songs, enthronement psalms (on p. 140 "the song of Miriam" should read "the song of Moses"), psalms of confidence, and hymns.

Brueggemann admits that his threefold scheme is "heuristic" but believes that it helps us "see things we might not have seen otherwise" (pp. 9–10). Although I think each of his categories has shortcomings, this scheme is the only one this reviewer is aware of that goes beyond an analysis of the genres that compose the Psalter to a synthesis of how they relate to each other and form a whole. (C. Westermann started us in this direction by showing us how lament leads to praise.) The whole he constructs is not a literary or cultic one but one that reflects the patterns of religious experience represented in the Psalter. The whole of the life of faith, from praise to lament and back again, is traced in the psalm categories.

A major benefit of Brueggemann's pattern is that it brings into sharp relief the essential role the psalms of disorientation play in the discovery of new life. "Orientation-Disorientation-New Orientation" also brings to light significant analogies between the Psalms and the death and resurrection of Jesus (see pp. 10–12, 20–22).

The criticisms that follow are simply meant to qualify some of the many fine suggestions of the book. Although Brueggemann, in the introduction, believes his categories reflect "*seasons in the life of faith*" (italics mine), he ironically approaches the psalms of orientation as though they give a complete picture of how a segment of Israelite society viewed the world, or at least how they wished others to view the world. Because these psalms present "a satisfied and assured assertion of orderliness," Brueggemann believes they probably came "from the economically secure and the politically significant" (p. 26). Since Psalm 145, which he takes to be the most representative of these psalms, contains "no slippage, tension, or incongruity," he infers that it reflects "the experience and interests of the 'well-off.'" A principle of form criticism, however, is that while interpreting the contents of a psalm we must respect its overall intent, which we infer from features such as its literary form. (Neglect of this principle can also be found on p. 164.) Granted, Psalm 145 is overwhelmingly positive. But that is because it is designed to praise God's wonderful deeds. In the few instances where reference is made to the condition of humankind the implication is, in fact, of people in need. People "fall" and "are bowed down" (v 14), and the righteous "cry" (v 19). As I see it Psalm 145, as a hymn, speaks of a

divinely maintained order that overarches present troubles. It is not trying to report on life as we see it but to speak beyond the life that could overwhelm our faith to the God who intervenes to sustain that faith. The psalms of orientation are therefore not static but holistic.

Brueggemann's label of "disorientation" is inappropriate for most of the psalms that he includes in this category. The psalmist who says "Why have you forsaken me?" undoubtedly expresses disorientation, but the lament psalmist who asserts "Behold, God is my helper; the Lord is the sustainer of my soul" (54:4) has a clear orientation. He is in distress and he does cry for help, but he is certain of the One he turns to. (Of the approximately sixty-five lament psalms, roughly twenty reflect such disorientation.) In spite of this criticism I found this chapter, along with the introduction, particularly stimulating. We are shown a bold faith in these psalms.

I also wonder about the label "new orientation" for his final category. I grant that psalmists respond to Yahweh's deliverance with great joy. But on what grounds can we say that their subsequent orientation differs from what it was prior to the distress? In Psalm 30, for example, it appears that Yahweh answers precisely as the psalmist requested of him. The deliverance has certainly confirmed and heightened the psalmist's belief that Yahweh hears when called upon, but I would not call that a new (implying different) orientation.

A problem that Brueggemann has with this scheme, as he admits, is the difficulty of discerning in some cases whether a psalm represents an old or a new orientation (p. 125). His dilemma is most apparent in his treatment of the hymns (p. 158).

One of the greatest values of the book is in Brueggemann's application of sociology to the Psalter and in his attendant critique of modern culture. (Note his similar treatment in *The Prophetic Imagination*.) At times Brueggemann overstates his case (see e.g. p. 134) and uses unnecessary jargon. He also has his own bias. Although he thinks the frequently-asked question about the identity of the "enemy" should be handled with "imaginative freedom" (p. 192 n. 79), his actual interpretations leave little doubt that most psalms represent class struggle. Other possibilities, such as righteous neighbors and betraying friends, receive little mention. The absence of any treatment of royal psalms and songs of Zion should also be noted.

Brueggemann's emphasis on social aspects may rub some the wrong way, but it would be our loss if we ignored this dimension of the Psalms, which is part of their warp and woof. It becomes clear that those to whom we are indebted for many psalms are those who were oppressed. Brueggemann helps us to take off our "pietistic" spectacles to see that interwoven with the spiritual fabric of the Psalms are economic and sociological threads. We are thus made aware of our own cultural biases and prejudices and how they deafen us to concerns important to the psalmists.

In spite of the above criticism, *The Message of the Psalms* can (and should) be read with great profit. Brueggemann's exposition carries drama, which is unusual among books on the Bible. Yet one senses that, for the most part, it is not a drama of his own making—he has simply read the Psalms. And this is what he helps us to do. Familiar passages are not allowed to remain so, because fresh insights on old sayings are given to us. And less familiar (and thus unusually uncomfortable) passages are also given a voice. Brueggemann has done us a great service by awakening us to neglected dimensions of the Psalms.

Craig C. Broyles

Isaiah 40–55: Servant Theology. By George A. F. Knight. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984, ix + 204 pp., \$9.95 paper.

It is difficult to overestimate the importance of Isaiah 40–55 for an understanding of OT theology, and the influence of these sixteen chapters upon subsequent canonical writings is likewise substantial. Knight's effort is a verse-by-verse attempt not only to follow the Biblical writer's own development of the many theological themes that permeate the text but also to suggest some origins and successive developments of these theological motifs and to point the reader toward present-day application. In this endeavor to address what the text meant and what it means, Knight's commentary clearly operates within the province of Biblical theology.

It is to his credit that Knight regards these chapters as a single theological treatise composed by one author, but in so doing he provides only some help in detailing the various *Gattungen* used in the formative process. With his emphasis on the theology inherent in the text, there is a paucity of comments concerning the shaping of the final text. This insufficient attention to the structure and movement of the book fails to aid the reader in perceiving how the work coheres. For instance, it is refreshing to note the author's insistence that the so-called Servant songs be interpreted within their context and not isolated. Since B. Duhm in 1892 the tendency has been to view those pericopes as foreign to their respective contexts. Knight holds that there are no sufficient grounds for so doing, and happily he is not alone in this position (see for instance the works of J. Muilenburg [1956], C. R. North [1964], J. D. Smart [1965], H. M. Orlinsky [1967], N. H. Snaith [1967], T. D. M. Mettinger [1978, 1984], and Y. Gitay [1981]). But in his comments he gives very little space to how those sections actually fit in the movement of their contexts.

Conservative readers who maintain a pre-exilic, single-author view of the book of Isaiah will find Knight's dating disappointing, though probably not surprising. Firmly rooted in the dominant opinion among scholars that Isaiah 40–55 (Deutero-Isaiah) was composed during the exile, Knight's working framework is pervasive. A more detailed treatment concerning date, authorship and other introductory issues could have been presented systematically at the outset. Instead, such matters are left for the reader to discover as the commentary proceeds. All matters of historical detail—including the intention of the prophet's words, the Scriptures available to him (e.g. Jeremiah and Ezekiel), and the reaction of the audience—are forthrightly assumed as exilic throughout the commentary. Regardless of one's dating of the book, however, Knight's attempt to understand how the exilic community of faith treated these Scriptures should provide the reader with a useful and very needed perspective.

The book's subtitle, "Servant Theology," indicates rather clearly what the author perceives to be the central theme of Isaiah 40–55. Knight's exegesis leads him to conclude that the Servant of the Lord can only be Israel—that is, "the whole people of God as it is represented by the *remnant*" (p. 130). Israel's mission as the Servant is directed not only toward itself but to the rest of God's people and to the nations as well. The nature of this Servant, says Knight at Isa 53:5, simultaneously comprises "that of a very human Israel, and that of God *in* Israel" (p. 171). Readers will find Knight's views provocative where he discusses how the Servant is a corporate representation rather than a single individual (pp. 130–131), that the Servant is both divine and human (pp. 165–166), and that the vicarious suffering involved God's voluntary participation, which was neither substitutionary nor penal (p. 173).

A detraction of the book, to this reviewer, is the constant reference to Israel as a feminine entity. Whether this tack is due to an overemphasis of the "wife" motif (see e.g. pp. 9, 10, 140–141) or to the English convention of regarding nations as feminine, it misleads the reader from the original meaning of the text—a pitfall that Knight other-

wise seeks to avoid. For Knight, "Zion" and "Jerusalem" are often interchangeable terms with "Israel" (pp. 15, 126, 161-162, etc.), which in itself betrays his blurring of their identities. Furthermore all three are regarded by him as feminine, despite the overwhelming use of the masculine gender in Hebrew when referring to "Israel." In doing Biblical theology these terms should conform to the usage of the Biblical writer and be interpreted from the broader sociolinguistic context of the culture. With very few exceptions in the Hebrew Bible the term "Israel" is considered either masculine plural, when the entire people are meant individually, or masculine singular, when the collective social unit consisting of descendants of their eponymous father Israel/Jacob is meant. It may also of course designate a political entity, such as the northern kingdom, but there too its gender is masculine. Since Knight's feminization of Israel is typical among students of the Bible, a serious reexamination of these factors would seem to be in order. (For a recent though spotty attempt see J. J. Schmitt, "The Gender of Ancient Israel," *JSOT* 26 [1983] 115-125.)

The present work is actually a slightly-revised edition of Knight's *Deutero-Isaiah: A Theological Commentary on Isaiah 40-55*, published in 1965. Despite the publisher's claim that this is a completely revised and updated version of the original, a side-by-side comparison of the two indicates that the revision is less than one might expect. Indeed, the lucid text has received additional polish from the author's hand here and there, but there appear to be no significant changes in interpretations. Changes consist largely in excisions: the elimination of Knight's own translation of the Hebrew text, of section divisions explaining relationships of verses, and of an index to important topics. It is unfortunate that these helpful features were dropped in our edition, but presumably this was due to the format requirements of the commentary series of which it is now part. A concluding chapter that synthesizes the major theological themes here, along with a Scripture index, would have enhanced Knight's work significantly. Typographical errors are minimal; several that were noted include "chose" for "choose" (p. 30), "outcone" for "outcome" (p. 41) and "Cyprus and Israel" instead of "Cyrus and Israel" (p. 47).

This commentary is specifically oriented toward those who are not specialists in OT studies, and the nonspecialist seriously interested in understanding this part of Scripture will find a succinct, sometimes technical, yet thoroughly readable discussion of each verse. Those involved in preaching should find this book especially rewarding, for it is rich in spiritual principles tied directly to the text. The scholar seeking a thorough treatment of various interpretations, however, will be disappointed to find these pages lacking in footnotes and open interaction with those holding variant views. Though often too brief to treat technical matters adequately for the needs of the scholar, the author's frequent attention to the Hebrew text, his emphasis on the meanings of theologically important Hebrew words, and his cross-references to relevant doctrinal and literary themes elsewhere in the Bible may nevertheless make this volume a worthwhile investment.

Kenneth W. Shoemaker

Berkeley, CA

Daniel with an Introduction to Apocalyptic Literature. By John J. Collins. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984, 120 pp., \$14.95.

This is vol. 20 in a series currently being produced under the title "The Forms of the Old Testament Literature." The series is intended to present a form-critical analysis of every book and each unit of the OT (Hebrew Bible) according to a standard methodology, in an attempt to bring consistency to the terminology for the genres and formulas of

Biblical literature. Though a commentary format is adopted, the purpose of the series is confined to answering particular questions connected with the literary forms presented in the text. To that end the structure of the book as a whole and of individual elements within it is given prominence, and this leads on to its genre, setting and intention. The *Daniel* volume starts with an introduction to the major genres found within apocalyptic literature of the Bible, Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha and ancient Near Eastern apocalyptic writing, thus putting the book of Daniel in a wide literary context.

The nineteen-page "Introduction to Apocalyptic Literature" is particularly to be welcomed. Twenty books and articles are listed in the initial bibliography, and four further bibliographies are included. This gives some idea of the coverage of the subject, the complexity of which is pointed out in the opening section. After a brief review of the problems and recent attempts at systematic analysis, Collins adopts the definition he quotes from *Semeia* 14 (p. 9), based on a combination of form and content as opposed to setting and function, and subdivides the genre into apocalypses that have within them an otherworldly journey and those that include an overview of history. These two categories then provide the main headings for a study of basic apocalyptic genres, the first and longer of which, the "historical" apocalypses, includes the book of Daniel. In each section the media of revelation are first defined and discussed, after which the characteristic forms of the genre are pointed out. *Ex eventu* prophecy, the prediction of events that have already taken place (let him that readeth understand), is said to be an old phenomenon in the Bible: "An early example can be found in Gen. 15:13-16." This is simply asserted without explanation. In apocalyptic such prophecy takes the form of the periodization of history, as in Daniel 9, and regnal prophecy, as in Daniel 11. In either case they end in eschatological predictions.

Under the heading "Setting and Intention" the question of dates and historical contexts is dealt with. The author sees it as complicated, if not concealed entirely, by the devices of pseudonymity and of an artificial setting. Collins accepts that there are many different antecedents to apocalyptic, but the developed genre he dates to the Hellenistic age. He contends that it is the product of learned sages rather than of a literary movement, their intention being to provide a worldview that would be a source of consolation in the face of distress. The article ends with a short section on related genres.

This is a masterly summary of a complicated subject, a well-documented guide through a veritable maze.

When all this is applied to Daniel, or rather when Daniel is set against this apocalyptic background, many of the same characteristics of Collins' approach reappear. Each section is accompanied by a full bibliography. The style is direct, the argument logical, the expression concise. The rigid scheme set down by the editors makes for an orderly, almost scientific, in-depth study of the form and genre of Daniel. After a discussion of the anomalies of the book, such as two languages, extracanonical traditions, and the debate between those who take a conservative view and those who support modern critical ideas, a very straightforward account of the structure of the book is put forward and expounded. Indeed, one might be forgiven for wondering whether form-critical study had contributed anything to this overview of the book. The whole book, and not merely the visions, is classified as apocalyptic. But, while the intention of the author is to exhort and console faithful Jews in the face of persecution, there is a difference of method in the two halves of the text. While the stories give examples of fidelity rewarded, the revelations require belief in a supernatural world in which the resolution of human problems must be sought. The fictitious setting in the exile helps to put the present crisis (second century B.C.) in perspective, and the *ex eventu* prophecy suggests that all is foretold and thus predetermined. "The suppression of historical particularity in this case opens the way to universal applicability."

The remaining eighty pages are devoted to a study of the individual units and end

with a sixteen-page glossary, which would provide a useful reference book on the subject of literary forms generally, as these are classified in form-critical study. In order to give some idea of the way individual units are studied, let me take the story of Nebuchadnezzar's dream (chap. 2) as an example. First the structure is set out and in this case occupies nearly three pages, such is the detail into which the chapter is divided. The outline is then assessed and secondary elements identified. As in the case of the other tales in chaps. 1-6 the genre is said to be a court legend. It is set in the royal court, is concerned with the wonderful, and aims at edification. A number of subsidiary forms within the story (dream report, dream interpretation, political oracle, doxology) are identified. The fictional setting is the royal court, perhaps originally in the reign of Nabonidus, who together with his son Belshazzar may have been represented by the iron and clay of the fourth kingdom. In the book as we have it the four kingdoms can be identified as Babylon, Media, Persia, Greece. "While Daniel 2 uses the plot structure of a folktale, its *intention* is not to entertain but to convey a religious and in part political message." A bibliography concludes the section.

In the second half of the book chaps. 7 and 8 are designated symbolic dream visions, but they include subgenres such as the throne vision (7:9-10), the epiphany of a heavenly figure, the "one like a son of man," and an *ex eventu* prophecy (7:23-25). Chapter 9 is predominantly an angelic discourse, while 10:1-12:4 is a complete "historical" apocalypse in the form of an epiphany with an angelic discourse. The prophecy of resurrection at the end of the book is "a climactic revelation," which sheds new light on all that has gone before. "What is at issue is not just a new political administration or even the restoration of the temple, but a new order where the faithful community shares the power of the heavenly holy ones and the wise teachers shine with them in eternal life."

To sum up, we see that the aims of the series are strictly fulfilled in this volume. The author provides scholars and students of the Hebrew Scriptures with a clear presentation of the way form-critical methods may be applied to the book of Daniel and therefore with an opportunity to assess the value of the special insights thus gained. Much will depend on one's assessment of the author's presuppositions and whether one regards them as valid. Is it self-evident, for example, that pseudonymity, fictional settings, and *ex eventu* prophecy characterize Daniel? This reviewer for one has argued otherwise. Much of the characterization of genres is therefore hypothetical and needs to be treated as such. Provided that form criticism is regarded as one approach to the text and not as the last word upon it, this study has a useful contribution to make to an understanding of the book of Daniel.

Joyce Baldwin

Difficult Passages in the Gospels. By Robert H. Stein. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1984, 126 pp., \$6.95 paper.

The latest book by Robert Stein, professor of NT at Bethel Theological Seminary, was originally a collection of articles written for the *Standard*, a denominational periodical of the Baptist General Conference.

The purpose of this book is to demonstrate the possibility of resolving difficulties encountered in (1) parallel passages in the gospels, (2) teachings of Jesus, (3) actions of Jesus, and (4) predictions of Jesus. The author does not attempt to "solve" every problem in these four areas. Many readers will probably not have to think long before recalling a "hard passage" not discussed in this book. But Stein selects representative problems in order to set forth a methodology in dealing with them (p. 14). Where evidence is inconclusive, he admits inability to formulate a satisfactory solution and allows the

problem to stand (e.g. the notorious harmonization riddle raised by the genealogies in Matthew 1 and Luke 3).

Under "Difficult Parallel Passages in the Gospels" Stein first discusses difficult parallel passages in the synoptics and then in the synoptics and John. Synoptic topics include: the voice from heaven at Jesus' baptism (Matt 3:17; Mark 1:11; Luke 3:22); "Blessed are the poor" (Matt 5:3; Luke 6:20); the healing of the centurion's servant (Matt 8:5-13; Luke 7:1-10); the raising of Jairus' daughter (Matt 9:18-19, 23-25; Mark 5:21-24, 35-43; Luke 8:40-42, 49-56); the healing of the paralytic (Matt 9:1-8; Mark 2:1-2; Luke 5:17-26); the genealogies of Jesus (Matt 1:1-16; Luke 3:23-38); the Lord's supper (Matt 26:26-29; Mark 14:22-25; Luke 22:15-20); and the audience of the parable of the lost sheep (Matt 18:12-14; Luke 15:1-7). John the Baptist and Elijah (Matt 17:10-13; Mark 9:11-13; John 1:19-22), the relationship of the Lord's supper to the Jewish Passover (Matt 26:17-18; Mark 14:12-14; Luke 22:7-11; John 18:28), and the hour of crucifixion (Mark 15:25; John 19:14-15) are treated under "Difficult Passages in the Synoptic Gospels and John."

Eleven "Difficult Teachings of Jesus" are examined: "Do not swear at all" (Matt 5:34-37); "And forgive us our debts as we also have forgiven our debtors" (6:12); "And lead us not into temptation" (6:13); "If you forgive the sins of any" (John 20:23); Jesus' teachings on prayer (Mark 11:22-24; Matt 7:7-8); the parable of the unjust steward (Luke 16:1-8); "Let him who has no sword . . . buy one" (22:36); "You are Peter, and on this rock I will build my church" (Matt 16:18); the parable of the rich man and Lazarus (Luke 16:19-31); "No one has ascended into heaven but he who descended" (John 3:13); and "But of that day . . . no one knows . . . [not even] the Son" (Mark 13:32).

Three "Difficult Actions of Jesus" receive the author's scrutiny: Jesus' cursing of the fig tree (Mark 11:12-14); Jesus and the Syrophenician woman (7:24-30); and Jesus and Mary Magdalene after the resurrection (John 20:17).

A brief conclusion follows the discussion of three "Difficulties in the Predictions of Jesus": Jesus' being three days and three nights in the heart of the earth (Matt 12:38-40); seeing the angels ascending and descending upon the Son of Man (John 1:51); and the Son of Man coming during the lifetime of the disciples (Matt 10:23).

Obviously, a book of this size cannot provide a thorough discussion of these passages. Stein refers constantly to the prior work of Augustine and Calvin in the chapter endnotes. Otherwise there is little or no reference to the extensive literature that exists not only on the aforementioned lists of difficulties but on the gospels themselves. There is no bibliography at the end of the book. In the reviewer's opinion, a list of further reading would have increased the value of this work. The approach is popular and nontechnical.

The reviewer would recommend this volume to a layman who needs some answers to gospel difficulties without getting into academic discussion, and to the fledgling student of the gospels who needs a tour of the territory before plunging into weighty tomes dealing with the "difficult passages in the gospels."

Carl B. Hoch, Jr.

Grand Rapids Baptist Seminary, Grand Rapids, MI

The Person of Christ: A Biblical and Historical Analysis of the Incarnation. By David F. Wells. Westchester: Crossway, 1984, 205 pp., \$7.95.

Although evangelicals are quick to point out that the person of Jesus Christ is foundational to their faith, they are not as quick in the production of scholarly and competent treatments of that doctrine that both engage the Christological speculations of the liberal community and edify the Church. Wells has provided us with a book that succeeds ad-

mirably in both tasks. Not only does he interact with and thoroughly expose the liberal reconstruction of Jesus; he also expounds the Biblical portrait of the Savior in such a way that one leaves the book with a profound sense of his majesty and a deeper and more abiding appreciation for the depths of grace revealed in his incarnation.

The book is divided into three parts: Biblical foundations, historical development, and modern interpretation. The range of material in each section exceeds what we have come to expect in traditional evangelical treatments of the person of Jesus (which are usually more popular than scholarly). Wells has written more than a Christology. His analysis of the various themes relative to this foundational doctrine includes careful treatment of the cultural, historical, personal and theological factors that contribute to the context of each issue under consideration. That is, Wells is concerned not simply with what a certain theologian has said of Jesus but why. Although there are only 179 pages of text (with another 25 pages of substantive endnotes, alone worth the price of the book), Wells succeeds in covering a multitude of subjects. I will mention several of the more important of these.

Wells begins with four assumptions that he believes are essential to doing NT Christology. First, if the Scriptures were given to the Church by God for its edification, then surely the Christology contained therein will not be so entangled in the problems of literary origins that only a handful of scholars will be able to make sense of it. Second, the principles of historical research make it plausible to assume that the NT record "is innocent in respect to the accuracy of its portrayal of Jesus until proven guilty" (p. 14). Third, it may be assumed—contrary to many form and redaction critics—that the gospel writers did indeed have an interest in producing biographies. This is not to say that they wrote biographies with the precision or intent of contemporary authors. It is to say that they took a keen interest in the human figure of Jesus about whom they wrote. And fourth, one must recognize both unity and diversity in the NT portrayal of Jesus. Wells resorts neither to the far-fetched harmonizations of certain fundamentalists nor to the excessive isolation of alleged disparate Christologies such as we see in the work of J. Dunn. It is a fundamental mistake, says Wells, "either to deny the differences in the interests of preserving the New Testament's unity or to dissolve the unity in the interests of respecting each author's distinctive view of Christ. The New Testament's unity and diversity are not contradictory elements; they are complementary" (p. 15).

On the much disputed subject of redaction criticism, Wells concedes that the gospel authors were creative—but within certain bounds. Their creativity is not the kind "which fabricates events or sayings and inserts them into the story in order to make a theological point" (p. 16).

Wells argues that the advent of the kingdom in the person of Jesus is "the *sine qua non* for a full and proper understanding of Christology" (p. 26). In order to elucidate the difficult issue of how Jesus conceived of himself Wells draws a distinction between the "self-consciousness" of Jesus and his "self-understanding." The former, inasmuch as it pertains to inner awareness, is psychological in nature. The latter has to do with the value we place on ourselves and the meaning we draw from our lives. "In terms of the historical Jesus," therefore, "we can say without equivocation that the Synoptic authors almost completely exclude from view his self-consciousness. Since they hardly discuss his self-consciousness at all, it is fallacious to declare, as Dunn does, that Jesus was not conscious of being divine" (p. 36). On the other hand, "Jesus' self-understanding, the interpretation he placed on his actions and the meaning he gave to his life, can be discerned without venturing down this slippery path of what exactly his self-consciousness was like" (pp. 36–37). In terms, then, of what Jesus either explicitly said about himself or implicitly claimed by deed and miracle, his self-understanding most certainly entailed the realization that with and in himself the kingdom of God had come. And if Jesus saw himself as the one in whom the powers of the *eschaton* had broken into history,

"then such a perception is a Christological claim which would be fraudulent and deceptive if Jesus was ignorant of his Godness" (p. 38).

Several other issues of importance are addressed at length by Wells. Here I will note only his conclusions. Whereas he affirms the sinlessness of Jesus (p. 42), he vigorously resists any tendency to minimize the reality of Jesus' humanity in the interests of his deity. He denies that Johannine Christology is a move from the "low, adoptionistic" model of the synoptics to a "high, incarnational" approach. What we see in John is rather the process whereby he "explicates what had been assumed but not stated in the Synoptics" (p. 47). *Monogenēs* should be rendered "unique" (p. 49), the subordination of Jesus to the Father is "functional" and not "ontological," and what Jesus rectified on the cross was not some "irrational whim in the mind of the Father, but the objective guilt under which we had fallen as sinners, as well as the control exercised over us through our sinfulness by the malignant forces of evil" (p. 61). As for Phil 2:6, *morphē* means "the essence or essential characteristics of a thing" (p. 64), the consequence of which, in part, is that "Paul moves easily into complete linguistic identification of Christ with Yahweh" (p. 64). Wells concludes his survey of the Biblical foundations of the doctrine by examining the Christological titles of Word, Son of God (which originated with Jesus himself [p. 70]), Suffering Servant, Lord ("to speak of Christ as Lord . . . is to identify him ontologically with Yahweh" [p. 77]), and Son of Man.

Wells surveys the history of Christological thought in three chapters. He discusses such issues as the meaning of orthodoxy and heresy as well as the parameters of legitimate "development" in Christian doctrine. His analysis of the nonbiblical (which is not to say unbiblical) and philosophical language used to explore and define Christological and trinitarian doctrine is especially helpful. He not only explains but critically assesses the Christological schemes in the classical period, principally the Alexandrine (or, as Wells prefers, the "word-flesh" Christology that was invariably "high" in the sense that it always protected Nicene orthodoxy) and Antiochene (or, again, the "word-man" Christology that stressed the humanity of Jesus). There are also brief but lucid explanations of developments in eastern orthodoxy, scholasticism (with emphasis on Anselm, Abelard and Aquinas), and the Reformers (Luther and Calvin).

Wells classifies post-Enlightenment Christological schemes as reflecting either discontinuity or continuity between the being of God and the created order. "Theologies which are built on discontinuity accent the differences between the natural and the supernatural and, in one way or another, present their Christology as the invasion of the divine into that domain which is natural and created. These are almost invariably 'high' Christologies, which may even employ the older 'Word-flesh' language and which yield not one iota on the divinity of Christ" (p. 131). Christologies that stress continuity "generally depict Jesus as the perfection of an existing religious consciousness that is common to all or most people. These Christologies usually fall into the 'Word-man' pattern, but one in which significant Chalcedonian elements are lost. They are Christologies which are constructed from 'below.' They usually begin with whatever can be known of the historical Jesus, and the divine is conceived within the limits of what is human. This, of course, often results in what is divine being equated with and thereby defined as extraordinary insight or profound moral consciousness. There is little or no substantial and personal union between the human and divine, but rather an infusion of the latter is seen to have taken place in the former, so that an atmosphere or aura is created within the human Jesus such that it can be said God dwelled in him" (p. 131). The remainder of this chapter takes up kenoticism (of which Wells, although acknowledging certain positive features, is quite critical), the "lives of Jesus" movement, and the emergence of liberal Protestantism.

The modern period is dealt with via an analysis of three representative thinkers: K. Barth (whose Christology was "unashamedly Chalcedonian" and who was not, contrary

to what some have suggested, "Sabellian" [p. 155]), N. Pittenger (whose process approach to Christology "is simply a statement about the means and objectives of the inspiration of the human Jesus. Jesus was a God-inspired man who differed from other people in the degree of his God-inspiredness" [p. 164]), and E. Schillebeeckx (whose Christology, says Wells, apart from being utterly ambiguous, is flawed primarily by two factors: a misguided view of Biblical revelation, and a deficient understanding of the effect sin has wrought in human nature).

Just as Wells began with four assumptions in the light of which Christological study should be inaugurated, he concludes with four principles on the basis of which the Church should construct its future Christological endeavors. First, "the conceptual framework in which Christ must be understood is that of the eschatological 'age to come'" (pp. 171-172), which is to say that Christology must be understood in terms of the advent of the kingdom in Jesus. It was he "in whom this 'age to come' was realized, through whom it is redemptively present in the church, and by whom it will be made cosmically effective at its consummation" (p. 172). Related to this is Wells' assertion that it is "not possible to construct such a figure from 'below,' to create him out of the fabric of human experience. . . . Christologies constructed from 'below' produce only a larger-than-life religious figure, the perfection of what many others already experience. The common assumption of these Christologies is that diligent theological workers can build a tower the point of which will pierce heaven itself, if only they sweat and toil over it long enough. They will not succeed. Their towers, their Christologies from 'below,' are never more than pictures of the ideal religious person, pictures which all too often merely personify their fabricators" (p. 172).

The second of Wells' principles is that "the person and work of Christ must constantly be linked, each interpreting the other. What Jesus *did* was possible because of who he *was*. Who he was cannot be divorced from or confused with what he did" (p. 175). Third, "the Christ whom we meet, in whom and because of whom we find forgiveness, is personally identical with the Galilean whom the Gospels describe. The content of the Christ is defined by the historical Jesus, because the person of the one is identical with the person of the other. Christ is not other than or different from Jesus" (p. 175). Fourth and finally, "it seems inescapable that some form of the enhypostatic union must be employed if justice is to be done to the full range of New Testament teaching" (p. 177). By "enhypostatic" Wells does not mean that Christ's human nature was impersonal "but that, though fully human, it reached its personal completion in the divine Word because of the action of God in effecting a union with it. As such, it is 'in-personal'" (p. 177).

I personally find little in this book with which to disagree. Therefore my only substantive criticism is not with what Wells has written but with what he has omitted. Given his capacity for penetrating insight and lucidity of expression I only wish that he had analyzed additional modern Christologies, those of Pannenberg and Dunn in particular. Otherwise Wells has provided us with an excellent introduction to the foundational doctrine of Christianity, and his work is certainly destined to become an evangelical standard.

C. Samuel Storms

Believers Chapel, Dallas, TX

The Pauline Letters. By Leander E. Keck and Victor Paul Furnish. Nashville: Abingdon, 1984, 160 pp., \$8.95.

Keck and Furnish team up to give us another valuable work in the *Interpreting Biblical Texts* series. In keeping with the objectives of the series, interpretation methods

and styles receive more attention than specific content of the Pauline letters. Paul and the subsequent Pauline school are examined as paradigms of hermeneutical excellence. (Romans, 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, 1 Thessalonians and Philemon are held as "unquestionably authentic"; Ephesians, Colossians, 2 Thessalonians, and the pastoral epistles are treated as deuterio-Pauline.) For the authors the Pauline corpus demonstrates ongoing interpretation within the early Church, presenting an expanded Paul (because it includes deuterio-Pauline letters) as well as an abbreviated Paul (because it does not contain everything Paul wrote; see 1 Cor 5:9) and an edited Paul (interpretation has taken place in the editing of composite letters, and even the ordering—as with all NT books—indicates interpretive activity; pp. 51–53).

Not all will be comfortable with the fact that Paul seems to be seen more as interpreter than as theologian, not a creator of Christian theology but a master of interpretation. Christologically, for example, Paul is seen as the "most penetrating interpreter of the church's emerging Christology" (p. 81). He is not so much a contributor to this emerging theology as one who interprets, adapts and applies what is emerging. Paul is to be studied not to ascertain his theology but to learn by observing the master interpreter's style and method as he works with existing/emerging theology (p. 64). Chapter 4 presents examples of Paul as interpreter of the Christ-event, interpreter of ethical traditions, interpreter of the experience of the Spirit, and interpreter of Scripture. The authors see Paul weaving all four themes together in 1 Corinthians 15.

One must next turn to the deuterio-Pauline letters (which "doubtless originated in circles where the Pauline tradition was especially honored," p. 58) to see that after his death the interpreter became the one interpreted. The authors maintain that these letters were attempts to adapt, interpret and even supplement Paul's teaching to later times and circumstances (circumstances that Paul probably never anticipated), thus bringing the apostolic tradition into touch with current needs and situations (p. 59). The last chapter gives examples from each of these six letters of how the Pauline tradition was interpreted.

The book is very cogently written. It insists that because the Pauline letters are situation-specific (p. 20) effort must be made to determine, via historical-critical methods, "what it meant" before proceeding to "what it means" (p. 37). A helpful distinction between explanation, understanding and interpretation is made (pp. 31 ff.). Each represents a difference in stage as well as approach. Explanation, for example, takes the modern reader into antiquity and tries to make it intelligible. Interpretation moves in the opposite direction, bringing the distant and ancient world forward into that of the reader (p. 38). These and many other valuable hermeneutical insights and guidelines make the work a must for the student of Biblical interpretation.

Donald R. Lloyd

Horicon Church of Christ, Truman, MN

Paul's Literary Style: A Stylistic and Historical Comparison of II Corinthians 11:16–12:13, Romans 8:9–39, and Philippians 3:2–4:13. By Aida Besancon Spencer. ETS Monograph. Jackson: ETS, 1984, xii + 338 pp., \$13.95 paper.

This photo-reprint of the author's doctoral dissertation attempts to justify the application of stylistics tests to the NT and to assess the results in comparison with her reconstruction of the NT's socio-religious milieu.

Chapter 1 introduces Spencer's approach, emphasizes that stylistics attempts to quantify the analysis of literary style, and quickly surveys important scholarly literature on her passage. After establishing the relation between stylistics and linguistics, chap. 2

defines stylistics, or "the science of style" (p. 33), as a comparative, supplemental, objective, reader-oriented and contextually-dependent investigation. Spencer then defines ten stylistics operations to perform on three Pauline passages. Chapter 3 provides a traditional discussion of the historical contexts of 2 Corinthians, Romans and Philippians. In chap. 4, the heart of the book, Spencer applies the findings of her ten operations in support of chap. 3. The book closes with a brief conclusion, a bibliography (unfortunately missing several important works in stylistics, linguistics and Greek grammar), two appendices (one with the data of the stylistics operations, the other with inadequate definitions of pertinent rhetorical terms), an incomplete subject index and a Scripture index.

Written in simple, unadorned prose (not without clunkers) by an author with greater qualification for this work than most, this book contains far too much material for thorough analysis here. Spencer concludes: "The major variable working on Paul's style is his audiences" (p. 210). Recognition of the importance of audience is the general conclusion of most stylistics studies, and with it I have no particular quarrel. My major reservation is with the precision of Spencer's method.

Spencer seems to hold two major assumptions. The first is that stylistic phenomena can be quantified. This may be true, but not without further assessment. Spencer's ten stylistics operations define both formal and functional criteria. We may be able to isolate morphemes, but the determination of functional data is really quite different. And then we must weigh the results. Is operation one, with four major and sixteen minor tests (including ellipsis, verbal irony and metaphor on the same level), equal in importance with operation nine, which counts verbs and establishes their ratios? A stylistics study only functions properly with a clear method for establishing the importance of examples and with a clear statistical formula to regulate the relative significance of each operation. Spencer seems to provide neither.

Spencer's second major assumption is that we know what is normal Greek word order. It seems insufficient to argue that "normal Greek word-order is similar to the normal English word-order," citing A. T. Robertson (he does not actually say this where cited) and Demetrius' unclear assessment that "in general the natural order [?] of words should be followed" (p. 39). Spencer surely recognizes that this intuitive estimation is not established according to the stringent method she herself calls for, fails to incorporate crucial contextual criteria, and neglects to consider that Greek and English are quite different. An inflected language, Greek has a flexible word order—but it also has postpositive and prepositive particles, sentences without subject words, words that tend to appear at or near the beginning of sentences, and sentences without verbs. Spencer may be right that Hellenistic Greek and English word order are similar, but this alone does not provide a suitable basis for Greek stylistics.

In performing her stylistics operations Spencer has gone to much work. But it seems that her tests, formulated for English texts, are not always applicable to Greek. For example, it is dubious in my mind that ellipsis of "to be" occurs in Greek nominal clauses, although we must provide the verb in translation. And I question calling 2 Cor 11:30–31; Rom 8:6, 9ab; Phil 3:7 periodic sentences because the word order is inverted (cf. Luke 1:1–4; Heb 1:1–4). Although the middle voice is becoming less important in Hellenistic Greek, Spencer only distinguishes active and passive verbal functions and displays these in a chart with formal items as well. To call the Greek attributive genitive following a noun a phrasal modifier while noting that the preceding attributive modifier stresses the unity of a concept seems to me a classification according to English translation. And Spencer's claim to categorize adverbs according to form results in *to auto* and *loipon* listed as adverbs of manner.

Spencer's treatment of the clause itself seems troublesome. She defines a clause as "a group of words containing a subject and a verb" (what of Greek clauses that do not realize a subject at clause level?) while recognizing that the genitive absolute, imperatival in-

finitive and articular infinitive (what of the participle?) "are considered clauses" (p. 237). Is this in contradiction to her statement that "only a finite verb is capable of serving as a predicate" (p. 63)? Even then, quick comparison of the Nestle-Aland²⁶ and *UBSGNT*²⁸ texts shows that punctuation remains in dispute at at least six points in these passages.

Spencer's use of propositional reduction to "become aware of the thoughts and stylistic options of a writer" (p. 51) seems questionable. Rom 8:31b loses greatly by being "reduced" to "No one is more powerful than God, who supports us" (p. 262) as do Phil 4:4 with "Be happy always" (p. 264) and 2 Cor 12:9b with "When I speak of my hardships and worry as achievements, Christ enters my presence and gives me fortitude" (p. 261). In her classification of abstract versus concrete nouns Spencer specifically excludes "verbals" (p. 270), meaning presumably participles and infinitives functioning substantively. More problematic are a distinction that categorizes "God," "Spirit" and "Satan" as abstract nouns since they "are titles which imply certain qualities" (p. 270) and an assertion that in Rom 8:9-39 the only concrete noun is "Jesus," in a passage with "sin," "Christ," "children," "brothers," etc. The percentage of imperatives to total finite verb forms cannot give an accurate estimation of commands and prohibitions, with a hortatory subjunctive in Phil 3:15 and an infinitive used as a command in 3:16. And the use of the article seems formulated in contrast with an indefinite article as in English rather than with no article as in Greek.

Since Spencer provides no formula to govern use of her operations, the results are applied in various ways. A couple of examples must suffice. Spencer maintains that Romans is abstract and complex despite her findings that Philippians is more complex than Romans on the basis of verbal-nominal ratio and the test of word size, in which Romans has the fewest number of three-or-more-syllable words: "The abstractness and complexity in Romans are not due to longer words. Instead, the use of shorter words in Romans helps create the effect that Paul carefully explains his thoughts. Paul does not let his complexity rest in lengthier words than he usually uses" (p. 181). Spencer agrees that the use of personal pronouns in Philippians reflects an author who is a "Sweet Talker" (p. 186), though how this comports with the sense of "urgency, indicated by the great number of imperatives" (p. 189), is not clear to me. And of 2 Corinthians Spencer claims on the same page both that "by employing such a high percentage of simple and compound sentences, Paul helps create an impartial, objective, cautious effect" and that "the simple structure creates an effect of rush and intensity" (p. 191).

Least this review seem overly negative, let me say that I found Spencer's book to be stimulating and challenging. In her summary she calls for further studies using her method. She is right that stylistics can prove highly interesting, especially in questions of authorship, and could be used in discussion of Semitic influence on the language of the NT (Spencer does not overplay the often-posed contrast between Hebrew and Greek thought), although I doubt very seriously whether the method she proposes can be used apart from some radical retuning.

Stanley E. Porter

Sheffield, England

The Epistles of Paul to the Thessalonians. Tyndale New Testament Commentaries. Revised edition. By Leon Morris. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984, 152 pp., \$4.95.

Morris has revised his Tyndale commentary on the Thessalonian epistles originally published in 1956. The original aim of the series, to provide exegetical instruction for the general reader of the Bible, has been maintained in the revision. Although the revision is substantially the same as the 1956 commentary it has been improved through

interaction with the advance of scholarship reflected in more recent works on these epistles (i.e. B. Rigaux, *Les Epitres aux Thessaloniens*, 1956; C. Masson, *Les Deux Epitres de Saint Paul aux Thessaloniens*, 1957; A. L. Moore, *1 and 2 Thessalonians*, 1969; D. E. H. Whiteley, *Thessalonians*, 1969; E. Best, *Epistles to the Thessalonians*, 1977; R. Thomas, "Thessalonians," *The Expositor's Bible*, 1978; F. F. Bruce, *1 and 2 Thessalonians*, 1982; not included were J. F. Walvoord, *The Thessalonian Epistles*, 1974; I. H. Marshall, *1 and 2 Thessalonians*, 1983—the volumes by Best and Marshall are excellent examples of interaction with critical studies). Morris' new commentary is based on the *NIV* (the earlier edition was on the *KJV*), but he makes liberal use of the Greek text in a nontechnical fashion, writing in the tradition of Milligan's word studies.

Morris accepts the Pauline authorship of these epistles, their traditional order, and their being written from Corinth around A.D. 50. In 1 Thessalonians Paul deals with issues contained in an oral report made by Silas and Timothy, and 2 Thessalonians was written shortly thereafter, primarily dealing with issues not resolved by the first epistle—i.e., the *parousia* and idleness. 1 Thessalonians reflects the importance of the *parousia* for new converts and provides the assurance that they will be delivered right "out of" the eschatological wrath that will come on evil in the end time (1:10). Morris also finds here (2:1–16) one of the finest descriptions of the Christian ministry in the NT. In 2:14–16 Morris understands Paul to refer, with the aorist "has come" (2:16), to the future eschatological wrath of God that will come on his nation, and in 4:13–18 clarification was made for some who understood Paul to say that all believers would see the *parousia*, with Paul's authority ("by the word of the Lord" in 4:15) being a quotation of a saying of Jesus. Morris correctly makes the point that this section is the fullest description of the *parousia* in the NT and warns against undue dogmatism regarding what will happen, because Paul's only point is that the Lord will come. In 5:1–3 he does not limit the Church to chap. 4 with chap. 5 describing events after the rapture (Walvoord, pp. 82–83), but he finds in chap. 5 some believers going on to think about what their own position would be and when the end would occur. Paul reassures them that the day of the Lord will become the day in which Christians live, whereas some Thessalonians were overenthusiastic tactlessly (5:12–14). Morris rightly rejects the argument of a trichotomous view of man (Thomas) in 5:23 because Paul's prayer is that the whole man be kept sound at the *parousia* of Christ.

As Morris comments on 2 Thessalonians, he understands the day of the Lord (2:2) as a complex of many events and that the sufferings of the Thessalonians prompted the belief that the day had begun. The man of lawlessness (2:3) will claim divine honors by setting himself up in the temple in Jerusalem, and his appearing is held back by the restraining force of a well-ordered state (2:6–7). As Morris interprets the situation of the idlers (3:6–13) he moves beyond the idea that speculation about the nearness of the second advent convinced some that work was useless (mentioned in his first edition) to also entertain the possibility that the reason arose from the Greeks' dislike of manual work.

In his work Morris provides a helpful volume for the general reader and evidence of a judicious interpreter with concern for the spiritual needs of the Church. Yet at certain points modifications are in order. Morris, for instance, associates thanksgiving primarily with 1 Thess 1:2–3, whereas P. Schubert identified the "thanksgiving section" (a form-critical designation reflecting the Greek letter tradition) with 1 Thess 1:2–3:18 (cf. 2:13–16; 3:9–13) and most, more correctly, with 1 Thess 1:2–10 (cf. H. Boers, "The Form-Critical Study of Paul's Letters: 1 Thessalonians as a Case Study," *NTS* 22 [1976] 140–158). Morris understands the "word of the Lord" statement (4:15) to refer to a saying of Jesus. But a precise saying is difficult to locate, the formula is unlike those in 1 Cor 7:10–11; 9:14, and the content of the "word" better reflects a church situation than the situation of Jesus. Thus this word of the Lord is better explained as a revelation of the

raised Lord conveyed through a Christian prophet—a mystery revealed by the Lord; cf. 1 Cor 15:51 (Bruce, pp. 98–99). Further, Morris' interpretation that the man of lawlessness would take up his seat in a future temple in Jerusalem could be understood as not a prophecy of the rebuilding of the Jerusalem temple in the end time (Thomas, p. 322) but as a metaphorical use of language from Ezek 28:2 (cf. Dan 11:31 on the action of Antiochus IV) to describe the divine claim of this future agent of evil (Marshall, pp. 190–192). Finally, Morris' description of the idlers (2 Thess 3:6–13) as either eschatologically or culturally inspired should be more simply explained as coming from their Hellenistic cultural environment (cf. R. Hock, *The Social Context of Paul's Ministry*, pp. 42–47).

Even with some areas where modifications could be made, the volume is a beneficial commentary for the general reader.

Ronald Russell

The Wandering People of God: An Investigation of the Letter to the Hebrews. By Ernst Käsemann. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984, 255 pp., n.p.

The present volume is a recent translation of a work originally produced almost fifty years ago by this redoubtable *Neutestamentler*. Given the less than desirable conditions under which he put it together—holidays, imprisonment, late nights after daily pastoral ministry—it represents quite an accomplishment.

As the subtitle indicates, the book offers not verse-by-verse commentary but rather a delineation of major themes in this most intriguing epistle. For Käsemann the letter's principal motif, introduced in 3:7–4:13 and unfolded in the closing section from 10:19 on, is that which he adopts for the title and accent of his own treatment as a whole.

There is ample evidence of underlying exegetical research as Käsemann adeptly demonstrates the posture of Christians according to Hebrews: They are together recipients and bearers of a divine revelation that summons them to pursuit of a goal that lies at the end of a way of persevering faith. In elucidating this point of view he addresses a number of related issues, such as (1) the concrete situation of the community (tempted not to revert to Judaism but, like each generation of believers, to give up persisting in faith's demanding route heavenward); (2) the meaning of *epangelia*; (3) the meaning of *pistis* and *hamartia*; (4) the people of God as a cultic fellowship; (5) the old and new people of God; (6) the divine *martyria* as the continuity of salvation history.

The overall analysis up to this point (fifty pages worth) makes for very profitable reading. Some of the specifics ought to be contested, some of the affirmations should be challenged as overstatement. Nevertheless it needs to be appreciated that subsequent scholarship has been much in Käsemann's debt for the initial insights he has provided into this important pilgrimage perspective.

Käsemann seeks next the religio-historical background of the motif, noting a formal correspondence to it in Philo. The overlap between the two in mode of expression implies at least a residue of shared content deriving from a common underlying tradition. The gnostic myth of the redeemed Redeemer is found to provide just such a mutual source with its analogous idea of the heavenly journey, particularly well documented in the Mandaeen literature.

Thus when Käsemann moves on (for the next eighty-five pages) to deal with the second major motif—namely, that of the Son and the sons—it is in view of the gnostic conception of *syngeneia*, which uses the terminology of sonship and brotherhood in its description of redemptive relationships. As with Phil 2:5–11; Col 1:15–18; 1 Tim 3:16, so the entire Christological scheme in Hebrews from pre-existence to Jesus' exalted primacy as Son and *Prōtotos* of the sons is accounted for as dependent on the Hellenistic *eikōn* reflection

and its continuation in the descent-ascent travel stages of the gnostic *Urmensch* (= primal man, the heavenly *Anthrōpos* and Redeemer).

The inquiry into the Son-sons relationship in the section 2:5–3:6 takes up such worthy matters as (1) the denotation of “son of man” in 2:5–9; (2) Christ as *archēgos*; (3) the meaning of *teleioun*; (4) brother and children; (5) the apostle and his house; and, at last, (6) the meaning of Jesus’ death for his own. Käsemann’s contention through all of this is again that Hebrews’ development of these themes is so far removed from strict exegesis of the OT as to be understood and explained only through deliberate use of the myth (he speaks just that unequivocally e.g. on pp. 124, 126, 132, 144, 149, 150, 151, 157, 164; cf. p. 174 and earlier pp. 68, 74, 76). Its traditions, he postulates, gained entry and were assimilated through the community’s confessional liturgy. Since the already full-fledged myth dominated the consciousness of the Hellenistic world, Hebrews’ Christology was intentionally fashioned to utilize that scheme as much as possible in making the gospel meaningful to that extended new audience. The appropriation, however, was not naive and wholesale but critical, with the myth’s unsuitable naturalism (including the pre-existence and immortality of all souls, the dualism of spirit and matter, and the metaphysical identity of Redeemer and redeemed) deliberately not adopted. Hebrews employed only what gnostic notions it could in order to establish Christ as the end (= *telos*, fulfillment) of the myth just as Paul presented him as the goal of the law. Since the purpose of this strategy was parenetic (to stimulate discipleship) rather than theological, we are not to receive this whole presentation as doctrinal statement, such formulation being reserved for 7:1–10:18.

The concluding chapter of nearly sixty pages addresses the third major theme, that of high priest. Käsemann’s stance is unchanged (his assertions e.g. on pp. 183, 186, 208, 209, 211, 217, 225, 230, 231 are of the same tone as those cited above). In the fashion of gnosticism the section 5:11–6:12 readies the readers as pneumatics for the unveiling of esoteric secrets in chap. 7. Only a fusion of Jewish messianic expectation with the *Anthrōpos* myth provides an intelligible backdrop for the concept of the heavenly high priest who atones for the people’s sins by offering himself. Moreover the unresolved tension between Jesus’ sacrifice on the cross and his conferment as high priest afterward at exaltation is explicable only with the realization that Hebrews did not entirely succeed in its attempted synthesis of differing Christian and gnostic redemptive concerns: atonement for sins and the conquest of matter respectively. The latter interest alone clarifies the role of Jesus’ flesh as the *katapetasma*, a material obstruction to heaven through which his bodily death served to penetrate. The final summary properly stresses how Christ’s high-priestly ministry supplies the necessary encouragement for the wandering people of God.

Käsemann is to be commended for boldly grappling with perceived tensions and questions in Hebrews and for frankly addressing some obvious objections to his own novel solutions. But scholarship (e.g. M. Hengel) has since shown that Hellenism was not at all such a distinct new territory, the crossing into which necessitated for the gospel a major appropriation of entirely new ideas. Moreover the work of gnostic specialists like R. McL. Wilson and ETS’s own E. Yamauchi (among others) underscores how untenable, notwithstanding Käsemann’s protestations, is the premise of a uniform full-blown Redeemer myth pervading the religious mind of the first century and readily available for Hebrews’ author to draw upon. The conceptual distance is as great as the chronological. Especially in regard to the self-sacrificing high priest, what Käsemann calls “a splendid parallel” will strike others as farfetched (see pp. 212–216). It is for such reasons (and not because they lacked German) that commentators such as F. F. Bruce and P. E. Hughes have disregarded Käsemann’s preponderantly gnostic slant. Noteworthy critics in the course of their own treatments include O. Michel, *Der Brief an die Hebräer* (13th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1975); P. G. Müller, *CHRISTOS ARCHEGOS*

(Bern: Herbert Lang, 1973); D. Peterson, *Hebrews and Perfection* (SNTSMS 47; Cambridge: University Press, 1982).

This reviewer welcomed the emphasis, though not without its difficulties, on the significance of Jesus' enthronement for declaration of both his Sonship and high priesthood. Regrettable was the short shrift given the context of OT quotations and the covenant theme. It may be granted that a bridge between the OT and Hebrews needs to be identified. But most unfortunate in this regard is Käsemann's outright exclusion from consideration of the career in word and act of the historical Jesus (see e.g. p. 178).

More specific criticisms require a longer review. The translators have given us pure Käsemann; he has not done nearly so well in giving us Hebrews.

Timothy L. Dyck

Surrey, BC