

BOOK REVIEWS

1, 2, 3 *John*. By Stephen S. Smalley. Waco: Word, 1984, xxxiv + 386 pp., \$18.95.

It happens at every Olympics: An athlete breaks the existing world record but fails to win because another athlete has broken the old record by a slightly greater margin and thus captured the gold medal. What would otherwise have been celebrated as a record-breaking performance becomes instead another second-place finish, largely overlooked and soon forgotten amidst the attention focused on the victor.

This image came to mind while reviewing the latest addition to the Word Biblical Commentary series. Had this volume by Smalley, a well-known British NT scholar who established his reputation as a specialist in the Johannine writings with an earlier volume on the fourth gospel (*John: Evangelist and Interpreter* [Paternoster, 1978]), been published just a few years earlier, one can imagine it being hailed as the substantial commentary on the Johannine epistles. At 420 pages it is considerably larger than any other English-language work published before 1982. Instead it has come out just after the publication of R. E. Brown's magisterial and massive volume on the same documents (*The Epistles of John* [AB 30; Doubleday, 1982]), which at 840 pages overshadows anything else ever written on these epistles in any language. It would be unfortunate, however, if enthusiasm for Brown's commentary should lead one to neglect Smalley's work, for it is an important work in its own right, which maintains the very high standards established by the earlier NT volumes in the Word series.

The format follows the now familiar pattern we have come to expect from this series: comprehensive bibliographies, the author's own translation, textual notes, a section on "Form/Structure/Setting," detailed verse-by-verse comment, and explanation (actually more a comprehensive summary of the preceding comment). All Greek words and phrases are translated, and the volume succeeds in its goal of making itself useful to a very wide range of readers.

A key issue that any commentator must address is the *Sitz im Leben* in which the document being examined was composed. This is particularly the case with any document arising out of the Johannine community, the investigation of which has in recent years become another "storm center" (to borrow W. C. van Unnik's phrase) in NT scholarship. R. E. Brown has been one of the leaders in the effort to reconstruct the history of the community that formed around the beloved disciple (see, in addition to his commentary on the gospel of John [AB 29, 29A; Doubleday, 1966, 1970], *The Community of the Beloved Disciple. The Life, Loves, and Hates of an Individual Church in New Testament Times* [Paulist, 1979]; *The Churches the Apostles Left Behind* [Paulist, 1984]), and his proposals have been solidly based, fresh, provocative and (justifiably) speculative. His commentary on the epistles of John serves as a sort of capstone to his investigative efforts, and he devotes considerable space to an exposition of the circumstances that gave rise to the three letters in question.

In this context Smalley's volume performs a real service. Coming as it does shortly after this period of intense scholarly interest in the Johannine community, it offers a judicious assessment of recent proposals and hypotheses and thus provides the reader a compact overview of the recent debate.

With regard to the historical background, the general contours of the views of Brown and Smalley are similar. Though differing slightly on the dates of the documents (Brown dates the first two letters to c. 100 and 3 John between 100 and 110, while Smalley places

them a decade earlier), they agree as to the general sequence (gospel of John/1–2–3 John). They agree further that the letters are addressed to a divided community and that all the divisions nonetheless stand within the theological tradition embodied in the gospel of John. The split, that is, is intracommunal, not between two different communities. The real division is not between differing traditions but between differing interpretations of what is acknowledged by all parties to be an authoritative tradition.

But where Brown sees two groups within the community (the author's adherents on one side, the "secessionists" on the other), Smalley finds four: (a) "Johannine Christians," committed to the apostolic gospel as received; (b) "heretically inclined members from a Jewish background," who are characterized by a "low" view of Jesus and a "high" view of the law; (c) "heterodox followers from a Hellenistic (and/or pagan) background," characterized by a "high" view of Jesus and a "low" view of the law; and (d) "anti-Christian secessionists" who had begun to break away from the Johannine community. This last group, moreover, are not really "false teachers" (contra I. H. Marshall, *The Epistles of John* [Eerdmans, 1978] 14–16) but "simply followers of a Johannine type of Christianity" who, because of their aberrant Christology and resultant lifestyle, were no longer comfortable within the milieu of the Johannine community and so withdrew from it.

It will be noticed that Smalley's reconstruction is more complex than Brown's, which is more complex than Marshall's relatively simple (yet sophisticated) analysis of the historical situation behind 1 John. In a sense, Smalley has combined the history of the community as outlined by Brown with the view of A. E. Brooke (*The Johannine Epistles* [Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1912] xxxix ff.): The epistle "is directed against various forms of teaching." Lest the differences between these views be thought of as more academic splitting of hairs, it may be noted that one's reconstruction of the historical situation has a strong influence on how one handles certain key passages including, e.g., the much-discussed reference to the "sin leading to death" in 1 John 5:16–17. Thus Brown and Smalley are quite justified in devoting the space they do to a discussion of the issue.

Despite (or perhaps because of) having read Brown and Smalley back to back, the present reviewer is not yet prepared to adjudicate between them on the issue under examination, not the least reasons being (1) the degree to which the issue of the background and formation of the gospel of John bears on the question and (2) the difficulty in determining whether in some cases exegesis of the text has led to historical reconstruction or historical reconstruction to exegesis. Perhaps in place of a premature judgment the following observation may be offered. If (as they surely are) Brown and Smalley are correct in their general reconstruction of the situation—namely, that the divisions within the larger community involve different interpretations of the same authoritative tradition—then the historical situation behind the Johannine letters is a close parallel to contemporary situations in which divisions within churches are at root differences about how to interpret Scripture. That is, unlike the Pauline churches, in which division was not infrequently due to what Paul termed "another gospel" (i.e., a different source of authority), churches today are often in agreement as to the putative source of authority (Scripture). What produces intrachurch splits are more often differences of opinion as to how to interpret that Scripture. If this parallel of the first and twentieth centuries is a valid one, then a careful study of the pastoral approach of the author of 1 John could prove to be very helpful to contemporary pastors. Here Smalley is quite useful as he carefully notes how 1 John deals with both the Christological errors of the opponents and the ethical errors resulting from the distorted Christologies. There is real sermonic meat in this commentary.

The amount of space devoted to textual questions is gratifying, particularly at a time when the standardization of the two most widely-used texts (Nestle-Aland²⁶ and *UBSGNT*²⁷) could give the misleading impression that all textual questions are basically settled. At the same time it was surprising to observe how similar are the textual pref-

erences of the UBS editors and recent commentators. A comparison of a dozen notable variants in 1 John revealed complete agreement between *UBSGNT*⁸, Marshall and Smalley, while Brown differed at only one point, preferring to read *lyei* ("destroys") in place of *mē homologei* ("does not confess"). This remarkable degree of agreement is due in part, no doubt, to the influence of Metzger's *Textual Commentary*. One suspects as well that it testifies to the existence today of a firm consensus of opinion regarding fundamental assumptions and principles of textual criticism.

The "Comment" sections form the heart of the commentary, and here Smalley's remarks are almost always clear, concise and authoritative. His lexical comments are excellent, and he gives close attention to the significance (or, as important, lack thereof) of shifts in tense or grammatical construction. Moreover, unlike many critical commentaries he pays close attention to the theological aspects of the text. One consequence of this is that there seems to be a great deal of sermonically useful material "close to the surface" of this volume, more so than in any of the other NT volumes in the series.

His treatment of the classical exegetical difficulties is quite good overall. With respect to the debate over the meaning of *hilasmos* ("atoning sacrifice") in 2:2; 4:10, he suggests that the "subjective" (Westcott, Dodd) and "objective" (Hill; surprisingly, Morris is not mentioned here) aspects of the term "need not be regarded as mutually exclusive." The seeming contradiction between 1:8 and 3:6 is nicely handled, as is the discussion of Gaius and Diotrephes in 3 John. The only disappointment was his treatment of the "sin leading to death" in 5:16. Whereas both Brown and Marshall read the verse in light of their understanding of the situation behind 1 John, Smalley does not indicate how his reading of the text relates to his understanding of the historical situation. This is the more surprising in view of the attention he has given the issue in the introductory section. As a result, there is a certain flatness in his treatment of this passage.

Overall, this is an excellent volume. While in some respects it will inevitably suffer in comparison to Brown's larger work, in other respects it comes out ahead. Brown's exhaustive work is at times simply exhausting. While no work of 420 pages is short, nonetheless it frequently comes across as a model of concision in comparison. This relative conciseness, together with its evangelical perspective, reliable exegesis and pastoral concern will strongly commend it to many who read this *Journal*.

Michael Holmes

Bethel College, St. Paul, MN

New Testament Exposition: From Text to Sermon. By Walter L. Liefeld. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984, 180 pp.

"Everybody talkin' 'bout heaven ain't goin' there," says the old spiritual, and the same might well be said of expository preaching. Everybody—well, almost everybody—acknowledges that faithful exposition and application of Scripture is the preacher's ideal. Yet probably only a small percentage of preachers achieve that ideal consistently, if at all. What is the problem? Where do the majority go wrong?

In the volume under review, Liefeld answers these questions out of his own experiences as a pastor and as a teacher for twenty years at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School. The work is not exhaustive. It runs to 165 pages of text, plus notes, bibliography and indices. But it is basic in the best sense. Its three sections deal with (1) the importance of expository preaching, (2) preparing the text, and (3) applying the text. Its main thrusts—not identical with the sections—are (1) uncovering the "facts" for understanding the passage, (2) discerning the "function" or purpose of the passage and relating it to the needs of the congregation, and (3) deciding on the "form" the sermon should take.

The most commendable feature of Liefeld's study is its balance. It balances the goals of the sermon itself, stressing equally its role in glorifying God and ministering to the needs of listeners. It balances the tasks of exposition (uncovering the text's meaning) and preaching (applying that meaning to the listener).

Most commendable of all for a book by a seminary professor, *New Testament Exposition* is balanced in what it requires of the preacher. Liefeld commends hard work, particularly in the area of a careful text analysis, but he is not averse to saying that much of what particularly young pastors do is unnecessary. "I am convinced that the kind of exegetical instruction many seminary students have received leaves them thinking that exegetical preparation for sermons consists of parsing, diagramming and doing word studies. Consequently, an inordinate amount of time is spent in detailed work, while the relatively more productive study of the passage in terms of its literary structure, flow of thought, and so on, is neglected" (p. 17). He challenges preachers to select those features of the passage that are truly significant and focus on those. Thus does one begin to bridge the frequently unbridged gulf between exegesis and the sermon.

Liefeld gives an interesting description of the approach he commends. "I like to picture myself taking the members of my congregation with me back into biblical times. We stand as invisible observers of the life situation of the text. We identify with the needs and concerns of those who listened to the Lord Jesus, of those who heard the first reading of one of Paul's letters, of those beleaguered Christians who read the Book of Revelation. We think together not only of what they felt, but of why they felt that way. We learn how the ministry of the Lord Jesus and of the apostles or other writers of the New Testament helped them. We talk together about our world and about how we feel. . . . The chasm still exists between the first century and ours, but it is connected, not with a flimsy, treacherous tightrope, but with a massive, solid bridge, the bridge of truth and of the power of Scripture to achieve its goals in every age" (pp. 107-108).

My only reservation about *New Testament Exposition* is one I have in regard to all books of this type. It is that in my judgment good preaching is not learned from books but from example. What are needed are models. Consequently, even where books are concerned the ones that are most helpful are those by men who are themselves preachers and pastors, particularly if they are filled with personal anecdotes and sample sermons. It is still hard to surpass Spurgeon's *Lectures to My Students*, Macartney's *Preaching Without Notes* and Lloyd-Jones' *Preaching and Preachers*.

Still, Liefeld's book does as well in this area as a book can. Its points are illustrated throughout, and there are several extended examples of unfolding important passages. A chapter-long treatment of several ways of handling Rom 6:1-14 concludes the work.

The bibliography is short but useful. It lists eight books on preaching, plus eleven more general works.

James M. Boice

Tenth Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, PA

Unexpected News: Reading the Bible With Third World Eyes. By Robert McAfee Brown. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1984, 168 pp., \$7.95 paper.

One of the signs of our times is the acceptance of pluralism in theology. This acceptance is evidenced by the increased popularity of third-world theologies in western Europe and North America. Brown's *Unexpected News* adds to the growing literature that seeks to explain third-world theological specificities to first-world readers.

Brown is to be commended for having produced a very readable book. He begins with a helpful introduction in which he explains both the book's title and his own purpose for

writing it. As the title suggests, the theme of the book is that the message of the Bible is always a disturbing one. Brown explains: "The world of the Bible is always a 'strange new world,' and for that reason it is always communicating 'unexpected news'" (p. 12).

The purpose of the book is twofold. First, the author calls his readers to enter into dialogue with the Bible. As he puts it, he advocates looking at the Bible with a "secondary naiveté" (p. 15), an approach that seeks to answer the question: "What does the Bible say to us?" Second, the Bible is even more unexpected news today because it is being read through a plurality of grids, cultures and assumptions. That is the reason for the subtitle of the book: "Reading the Bible With Third World Eyes." The book's subtitle reveals Brown's second purpose, which is to make people living in the United States enter into dialogue with Christians from other parts of the world who hear different things from the Bible (pp. 13-14). In summary, Brown's purpose is to encourage Bible study (p. 14) through the rediscovery of the strange news of the Bible with the help of Christians from the third world. In the process, he sets himself as the interpreter of third-world Christianity to American Christians.

Brown uses two expressions in the introduction that necessitate comment: "third world" and "secondary naiveté." Since I am a citizen of one of those third-world nations, the expression immediately caught my attention in the title and throughout the book. American readers who are unfamiliar with the term "third world" will be grateful to the author for providing a succinct history and definition of it (p. 13).

Some of us, however, are always uneasy with the overgeneralization implied in the use of "third world" to designate nations of Africa, Asia and Latin America. To his credit Brown recognizes that the term is unsatisfactory, and he apologizes for using it (p. 13). Yet he defines third-world Christians as "Christians living in Asia, Africa, Latin America, or impoverished areas of the United States who are generally poor and powerless" (p. 13). Such an assumption is rather questionable, especially when the author focuses on Latin American Christians as his dialogue partners throughout the book. He explains his choice of Latin America for reasons of space but adds that "similar partners could be found in Asia and Africa as well" (p. 14). Once again readers are given the impression that Latin American Christianity is the best representative of third-world Christianity. Granted, it is better known to American readers. But the implication of Brown's choice is erroneous: Third-world Christianity is not one unique kind of which Latin American Christianity is a sample. One needs only read the internal debate within the Ecumenical Association of Third World Theologians, especially in *Irruption of the Third World*, to be convinced.

Brown prefers secondary naiveté. According to him, what he characterizes as primary naiveté "accepts everything in Scripture at face value and digs in its heels when portions of the Bible threaten to be eroded by the acids of modernity" (p. 15). This is the usual caricature of the so-called fundamentalist and evangelical view of Scripture. Surely Brown must recognize that, ultimately, reading Scripture and being attentive to its message is neither a matter of primary naiveté nor of secondary naiveté. It is one of trust in the truthfulness of God and his messengers who are now called, in our theological vocabulary, the authors of Scripture.

In spite of the two areas mentioned above, I found *Unexpected News* an interesting and thought-provoking book. It is obviously written with the aim of jolting American Christians out of their complacency, and it achieves that remarkably well. Each of the ten chapters of the book begins with an aspect of the current world situation. Then a Biblical passage (or selection of passages) is printed in the text with comments from the author and perspectives from Latin America. Third, the author provides other Bible passages relating to the same concerns. In a fourth section of each chapter Brown raises questions for group discussion.

It is impossible, in such a brief review, to do justice to all the chapters. They would

all need to be examined individually. It is interesting that each chapter's subtitle focuses on change as it deals with a specific Biblical passage. The author selected four passages from the OT and six from the NT. I will briefly review two chapters—one dealing with an OT selection, the other with a NT selection.

Chapter 2, entitled "Exodus: God Takes Sides," deals with selections of passages from the book of Exodus. Here Brown reiterates the familiar idea that Exodus proves that God has taken the side of the poor and the powerless. He is a political and partisan God. Brown states: "God always sides with the oppressed" (p. 41). Also, says he, the hardening of Pharaoh's heart shows that "God *does not enlighten the powerful but empowers the powerless*" (p. 43; italics his). No one doubts that Exodus "speaks" a message of liberation, but Brown and liberation theologians certainly overstate their case.

The theme of God's preference for the poor is also treated in passages selected from the NT. An instance of that is chap. 6, entitled "Jesus at Nazareth: Good News to the Poor." It deals with the familiar passage in Luke 4:16–30. The author finds a striking similarity between Luke 4 and the exodus story: "If the exodus is the paradigm story for the Hebrew Scriptures, the episode in the synagogue in Nazareth is the paradigm story for the Christian Scriptures" (p. 90). For Brown the episode of Jesus in Nazareth means that Jesus wants to change structures because of his preference for the poor (cf. p. 96). Again, no one denies that structures can perpetuate evil. But to reduce the entire Christian message to "Changing Structures" (the subtitle for this chapter) is to fail to heed the whole message of Jesus and his apostles.

If on the whole Brown reiterates familiar rhetoric from liberation theologians, his intention is to bring us (the readers) to face Scripture in new ways. If even a handful of people would redirect their commitment to God, Christ and his Church because of the book, the author will have rendered a valuable service to some post-Christian Americans. The book has the potential to do just that.

Tite Tiénou

Alliance Theological Seminary, Nyack, NY

A Concise Dictionary of Theological Terms with an English-Afrikaans and an Afrikaans-English List. By Ferdinand Deist. Pretoria: Van Schaik, 1984, 302 pp., R17.75 paper.

Deist, from the department of OT studies at the University of South Africa, concludes the preface to the first edition of his dictionary with the following expectation: "And so I give this dictionary into the hands of its users. I trust that students and serious readers alike will find it well worth their while." This is no wishful thinking because the need for such a dictionary among Biblical scholars and theologians is one of utmost urgency. We can only thank Deist for taking the first steps, at least in South Africa, in compiling a dictionary for the Biblical scholar. Several dictionaries are available that explain the terminology of systematic theology of the various churches, but there is a desperate need for a concise dictionary that will guide the student of the OT and NT. This was one of the author's main reasons for compiling a concise dictionary. The second factor that played a significant role in the origin of this book is the fact that much of our theological terminology is coined in terms derived from ancient languages such as Greek, Hebrew and Latin. Not all theological students have sufficient knowledge to understand these basic terms. This book wants to fill this lacuna by helping students to master the terminology of the Biblical sciences. A third factor is the interdisciplinary character of the Biblical sciences. Fields such as philosophy, sociology, linguistics and literary criticism are making enormous inputs and contributing to new insights in OT and NT studies. Thus the Biblical scholar is confronted with a completely new register of "loan terms"

from these areas. This book is an attempt to help students to master the major terms of the related sciences. Fourth, many dictionaries of this kind usually reflect the dogmatic views of a particular denomination. For Deist this ideological viewpoint has two major disadvantages: "The terms dealt with are not representative, and the definitions given tend to be evaluative." His aim is "a deliberate attempt . . . to put forward neutral definitions only—to define the various views (whether 'heretical' or 'orthodox') as accurately and so concisely as possible." Two lexicographical aspects need further clarification. Ideally, it is possible to give neutral definitions. The term "definition," however, is in itself not neutral, because one of the main components of definition is the principle of selection and perspective. What are the criteria for entering a word or a nominal compound or a phrase? Lexicographers differ in their criteria for selection. The most common criterion is relative frequency. Usually relative frequency is subdivided into primary and secondary meaning. On the other hand, it is linguistically problematic to follow such a subdivision because one can hardly speak of a dominant or primary meaning. The notion of primary meaning is a reduction of the various meanings of the word with all its manifold and interlocking relationships to a unidimensional series. This reductionist tendency is in a sense typical from an historical perspective. This problem can be limited if the lexicographer works from a synchronic perspective. An historical dictionary's aim is to present the words that have formed the vocabulary of a certain field of study from the times of the earliest records down to the present day. A synchronic dictionary's aim is to concentrate on the meaning of a word in a specific time, usually the contemporary language use (*parole*). This can be accomplished by the use of statistical methods or comparable tabulations of contemporary terms and phrases. Deist acknowledged that he had used the thesauruses of the OT and NT data retrieval projects of the Institute for Theological Research at the University of South Africa. Although it is very difficult to maintain a clear distinction between the two perspectives, Deist's dictionary is to a large extent written from a synchronic perspective. If it is true that a synchronic dictionary is also a reflection of contemporary language use, then the user of this dictionary gets a good view of currently-used theological, philosophical, linguistic and literary terms in the field of Biblical studies. However, Deist is acutely aware of the shortcomings of his definitions. For a literary critic the definition of literary genre, for instance, would be insufficient. Deist defined it as "a category of works of literature that are broadly similar in composition, e.g. epic literature, dramatic literature, lyric literature." Genre is one of the most debated questions in literary theory today. One thing is certain: The use of traditional categories, like epic, dramatic and lyric, is outdated. The definition of genre is not only based on textual levels but also on the level of the different recipients or readers of the specific text. If it is still possible to speak of different genres it must be against the background of its respective communicative functions in a specific interpretive community. This is why literary critics and text linguists prefer to use the term "text type." The same can be said about Deist's definition of "metonymy" and "metaphor." Is this only a rhetorical device? Is it not more adequate to say that metonymy is a literary-semantic category? At the end of the day we can only agree that the most perceptive beholder can see only what is already in his eye.

One of the main questions in lexicography is "Who will be the user of this dictionary?" A dictionary like this can be useful and desirable to several kinds of people: students, translators, laymen, linguists, theologians, etc. Deist hopes that at least two categories will benefit from this dictionary: university students of theology, and serious readers of the Bible who seek to deepen their understanding of the Bible. However, if it is correct to say that the vocabulary of a dictionary determines the readers or users we can say that this dictionary is a benefit for a much broader spectrum of readers—for instance, students in philosophy, linguistics, literary science and history.

The overall purpose of this dictionary is to be a study aid to students and serious

readers of the Bible and to help the user in his/her effort to understand the terminology used in Biblical studies. Deist calls this a "ready reference" function. The main focus of the dictionary is therefore on the fields of OT and NT studies, systematic theology, and related fields like philosophy, literary theory and linguistics.

Against this background it is understandable that Deist emphasized the conciseness of this dictionary. He says that "completeness has taken a back seat to conciseness." The regulative idea is rather to enable the user to understand the term in context when he/she comes across a new or problematic term. The underlying semantic principle is thus that this is not a dictionary of meanings but only of possibilities of meaning. Every term gets its own explicit semantic value in a specific context. If this is correct, conciseness need not be a disadvantage for the user because, in the words of well-known stylist W. Strunk: "Vigorous writing is concise. A sentence should contain no unnecessary words, a paragraph no unnecessary sentences, for the same reason that a drawing should have no unnecessary lines and a machine no unnecessary parts. This requires not that the writer make all his sentences short, or that he avoid all detail and treat his subjects only in outline, but that every word tell." In this regard a very real problem in theological language and language in general is that there are to a large extent different terms for more or less the same meanings or concepts. To reduce this problem to a minimum, Deist gave the user enough semantic information on the value of the different terms, with no unnecessary parts attached to it, to actualize the specific meaning of the term in a specific context. Actually, this is what every dictionary ought to be: a lexicon of possible meanings in use. That is why a dictionary, being a semantic description, should aim not at "absolute" definitions but at definitions that delimit the meaning of a term from that of terms with similar, or more or less similar, meanings.

Another problem needs to be mentioned. A considerable number of words from everyday language had been elevated to technical terms with a narrower or wider semantic range than in ordinary parlance (cf. apologetic, rhetoric, liberal, law, community, synoptic, election, etc.). One way of solving this problem is a semantic pattern of arrangement where words are united by bonds of meaning. However, a consistently semantic ramification is difficult to achieve, because only relatively few isolated semantic fields fall into a neatly delineated schema. In view of the overall aim of this dictionary—namely, conciseness—this would mean a complete and extensive book-length list of complementary words. Deist preferred to emphasize the specific technical meaning by putting the word in a specific context. By doing this he has created a small "world of words." Although this approach can only be adequate in large descriptions of words, he has succeeded in emphasizing the specific technical meaning.

In general, there are two possible modes of presentation: syntagmatic and paradigmatic. The major disadvantage of the so-called "dictionary order" form is the alphabetical dispersion of the body of concepts, making it very difficult to control the taxonomic coherence that is supposed to undergird it. Alphabetical order has been called a "tyranny" that makes dictionaries less useful than they might be if compiled in some casual arbitrary way. One of the main problems of an alphabetical order is a lack of coherency.

Deist has tried to maintain an equilibrium between the alphabetical dispersion and the taxonomic organization that undergirds it by a system of cross-references. He tried to solve the problem of incoherency (a major problem of the alphabetical order) by a complementary system of asterisks to indicate, within each column, the terms defined elsewhere in the dictionary. By using this method he succeeded in the interdefinition of terms. However, the danger is that such an endeavor can create a certain pleonastic character. Although we agree to the semantic function of such an endeavor, it sometimes makes the use and operation very laborious and even frustrating (cf. Am Ha-Arets with seven asterisks, Historical Criticism with six asterisks, Derived Structure with five asterisks). The purpose of the English-Afrikaans and Afrikaans-English lists of terms is

twofold: as a help for translators, and as a help for Afrikaans readers to locate the appropriate English equivalents.

Deist has given the Biblical scholar and serious reader of the Bible a very handy tool in the understanding of theological science. One can only hope that this dictionary will be the place where progress in Biblical studies might be recorded—i.e., that the provisional inventory of concepts that it forms be viewed as open to new and better formulations. This can be achieved if Biblical studies, and theology in general, is not seen as a science for one elite, initiated group of researchers. Doing theology is teamwork. If members of related fields of study like philosophy, sociology, linguistics, literary science, etc., will accept the open invitation to suggest improvements on the definitions, this dictionary can be the first few words toward a fruitful interdisciplinary discourse.

J. Bohnen

Stellenbosch, South Africa

Christian Dogmatics. Edited by Carl E. Braaten and Robert W. Jenson. Two volumes. Fortress, 1984, 591 + 639 pp., \$45.95 set.

If the quarter-century between 1950 and 1975 may be characterized by a broadening theological plurality, the absence of any theological giants, and the despair of attempting any theological systems-building, then the quarter-century in which we are now living may come to be characterized by a return to systematic theology, albeit one chastened by the pluralism of the modern age. Although the renewal of systematic theology is currently most evident among evangelicals, mainline traditions appear to be joining in this enterprise, as this new two-volume Lutheran work suggests.

The genesis of *Christian Dogmatics* lies in the late 1970s in the realization by certain theological educators that there were no usable textbooks available that were both Lutheran and American. To rectify this situation and to provide a theological resource for ministers a new dogmatics was envisioned. The inescapable fact of theological pluralism, however, suggested the nontraditional route of multiple authorship. This in turn led to another innovation, that of organization. The work is divided into twelve "loci," or points "at which the historic teachings and theological investigations of the church are brought into focus." With one exception each locus is the product of only one of the six contributors, although the work of each author was supposedly criticized by the other five. The loci themselves appear in the two volumes roughly in the sequence of the traditional doctrines of systematic theology.

The point of view of the work as a whole is by design Lutheran. The articles receive a liberal sprinkling of Luther quotations, and the authors generally side with Luther on major controversies. In the same way Luther's principle of justification by faith repeatedly functions as "a critical principle" for "preaching, liturgy, pastoral care, church administration, and so forth," as the editors state in the preface. At the same time, however, the project is intended to speak to the entire Church. The work does not simply advocate traditional Lutheran positions uncritically but seeks to employ insights from various Christian traditions. The authors make a conscious attempt to challenge all churches to continue the task of reform by appropriating the insights of the Reformation.

Taken as a whole *Christian Dogmatics* draws from many sources in a well-balanced manner. Biblical materials, the Church fathers, the Reformation and modern theology are woven together into an intricate whole. Likewise a broad spectrum of theological issues—from the traditional questions concerning the sacraments to the contemporary debate over liberation theology—is addressed, although in-depth interaction with the concerns of feminist theology is notably absent. At most points the authors advocate,

surprisingly, relatively moderate or even conservative positions. One example of this is H. Schwarz's discussion of eschatology. While rejecting any Hal-Lindsey-style "cinematographic eschatology," he cautions against the other extreme "of becoming oblivious to the signs of the times" (2. 582).

Multiple authorship of the work is perhaps the most striking feature. This approach, as one would expect, results in several internal disagreements. For example, in the Christology section C. Braaten chastises evangelicals for the "exclusiveness" evidenced in the Lausanne Covenant's rejection of universalism (1. 559, 563). However, G. O. Forde, in speaking of the work of Christ, criticizes universalism as an abstraction that "does little real good and has no basis in Scripture" (2. 92). His position is joined by Schwarz, who speaks of hell and "a dimensional separation from God and the faithful" (2. 586).

In spite of such differences there is a surprising degree of theological unity displayed in the work. This unity goes beyond the basic Lutheranism of the contributors. All six seem to share the eschatological orientation of much of contemporary theology. More specifically, it appears that each one has been influenced greatly by the so-called "theology of hope," especially as articulated by J. Moltmann and W. Pannenberg. Other contemporary alternatives, such as liberation theology and process theology, are critically evaluated from this basic perspective. Multiple authorship does result in one major difficulty, however. The differing writing styles of the six contributors make for uneven reading. Certain sections lack the flow of those produced by the more gifted writers.

As would be expected in a work of this nature, there is a host of theological criticisms that each reader will find. Although intense theological interaction with the work lies beyond the scope of this review, several positions that the reviewer found problematic should be noted. In an odd way Jenson suggests without clarification that God has a body (1. 175). Sponheim's handling of the problem of evil is weak (especially 1. 440-441). Braaten seems to reject historical inquiry as the basis of faith (1. 477). Hefner unfortunately declares that the priesthood of believers "does not assert . . . that every believer is a priest" (2. 227). Forde understands separation of Church and state as a "political expedient necessitated by bad theology" and a step of self-preservation by the world (2. 459), whereas historically this doctrine has been articulated by the free churches to insure religious and not civil liberty.

Despite whatever shortcomings are present in the work, *Christian Dogmatics* is a significant contribution to theology. It will in all likelihood become the standard text in many American seminaries and promises to be the useful reference tool for clergy envisioned by its editors. As a work representing mainline Lutheranism (and to some extent mainline American Christianity) it is "must reading" for evangelical theologians, who no doubt will find it highly stimulating. Forde's section entitled "The Christian Life," which contains a significant explication of justification by faith, may prove to be the most seminal for evangelical readers. The six contributors—Braaten, Forde, Hefner, Jenson, Schwarz and Sponheim—are to be congratulated for offering their work to the entire Church.

Stanley J. Grenz

North American Baptist Seminary, Sioux Falls, SD

Foundations of Evangelical Theology. By John Jefferson Davis. Baker, 1984, 282 pp., \$9.95.

With this volume Davis has attempted to fill a contemporary theological vacuum. Writing "a general introduction to the study of systematic theology" has hardly been a frequent activity in recent times. Hopefully this bold attempt is an indicator of a revival

of interest in systematics among those who hold to an evangelical understanding of Biblical authority.

Davis begins with a brief historical essay that discusses "the evangelical theological tradition" in its developing context since the Reformation. The title of chap. 1, "Between Fundamentalism and Modernity," leaves little doubt as to where the author places evangelicalism on the theological spectrum, though not all will agree with the details of his analysis.

Following this background sketch Davis charts his course through chapter-length treatments of "Nature and Method in Evangelical Theology," "Divine Revelation," "Reason: A Kingdom-Extending Tool," "The Role of Religious Experience in Theology," "Scripture: Word of the Great King," "Tradition as Theological Authority," and "The Interpretation of Scripture." At the end of each chapter there is a specialized bibliography dealing with its subject matter.

This work has many strengths. Besides serving as a partial remedy to the dearth of recent prolegomena to systematic theology, it also admirably seeks to "give prominence to the missionary context of theological reflection in the church" (p. 9). Davis has applied with some consistency the fruit of recent missiological discussions on contextualization in the realm of systematics. While such a task is fraught with the dangers of "cultural interpretation" (see J. R. McQuilkin, *JETS* 23/2 [June 1980] 113-124), it is necessary if the unique theological questions of each generation and culture are to be addressed.

Davis achieves his objectives to a significant degree. Though brief and quite selective, the various chapters are helpful, compact introductions to each area. Also, Davis has been true to his aim to probe the contemporary currents that affect the evangelistic witness and ecclesiological understanding of American evangelicals today. The size of the volume, its moderate price, attractive layout, and chapter-by-chapter bibliographies will serve to make it a usable and valuable introductory work.

On the other hand, *Foundations of Evangelical Theology* is not without its weaknesses, some of which are of consequence. For example, the very title itself presents a problem to a careful evangelical thinker. It would more appropriately be called "Foundations of an Evangelical Theology." Davis' views and treatments hardly are agreed upon across the evangelical spectrum today.

Davis should be commended for his attempt to give his readers something of an evangelical *Megatrends* at the end of chap. 1 (pp. 34-39). But it is questionable how much of his "Agenda for the Future" is based on dispassionate observations of the theological arena and how much is Davis' personal attempt to set the evangelical theological agenda for the rest of the century. For example, his brief discussion of postmillennialism (p. 39) sounds much more like an advertisement than an objective assessment of the position.

An even more troubling case is found in the final chapter, "The Interpretation of Scripture." In his brief treatment of dispensationalism Davis only serves to further many of the historical and hermeneutical misconceptions about the viewpoint. Although there are still those who hold the conceptions Davis subtly critiques, his out-of-date bibliography explains the deficient summary of the movement today. A rapid reading of R. Saucy's recent "Contemporary Dispensational Thought" (*TSF Bulletin* [March-April 1984] 10-11) reveals a significantly different state of affairs. There is thus irony in Davis' less critical (or sympathetic?) handling of the theonomy position. Here his references reflect a close reading of the pulse of that controversial movement within the Reformed orbit.

It is hoped that the concerns I have expressed may keep the reader from an uncritical acceptance of all that is presented in *Foundations of Evangelical Theology*. To a great degree, American evangelicals are in the debt of Davis. However, that debt can best be paid by the publication of a number of other works in the area of theological introduction

by evangelicals.

A. Boyd Luter, Jr.

Christ Presbyterian Church, San Antonio, TX

Strange Gifts: A Guide to Charismatic Renewal. Edited by David Martin and Peter Mullen. Blackwell, 1984, 239 pp., \$24.95/\$9.95.

The Christian Church, like the Jewish nation, has been guilty of outlawing some of her best people and movements. On the other hand she has at times correctly shunned novelties, aberrations that would have led her away from her true goal. The dilemma, however, remains, for it is extremely difficult to make sound judgment contemporaneously with those people and movements. Church leadership is captured by an acculturation and a theological worldview that creates a tragic blind spot far more than we like to acknowledge.

This book addresses the modern challenge to institutionalized orthodoxy. The research and insights of eighteen contributors is marshaled to provide the reader with an appreciation of the issues involved. A number of the writers are clearly opposed to the charismatic renewal movement, while others are wholeheartedly commendatory. The former are in the majority, or perhaps more vocal.

Not surprisingly, glossolalia is frequently discussed. No consensus is reached about its nature or purpose. A. Walker considers Acts 2 an example of speaking in "recognized foreign languages," while Congregational minister C. Williams regards that passage to be glossolalia, not xenoglossy. D. Davies affirms that "tongues" are not languages, but Roman Catholic writer B. Davies poses the problem of genuine interpretation if there is no language to interpret. R. Noakes charges (intemperately?) into the fray with the declaration that speaking in tongues is "an abnormal manifestation which does nothing to build up the church as it is merely a stream of meaningless syllables, sometimes mixed with a few words." But that seems too harsh.

A number of contributors outlined the ecclesiastical and theological distinctives of the movement. These include a "wildfire" ecumenism, extempore prayer, free liturgical compositions, emphasis on teaching and Biblical knowledge, adventism, triumphalism and fundamentalism. Walker, in an article on the house-church movement, the more sectarian wing of the renewal phenomenon, noted the similarities with ideas propagated by the Plymouth Brethren of the nineteenth century, a comparison more relevant to British readers than to those in North America.

The reader may be surprised that J. Richard appeals to the promise found in the conclusion of Mark's gospel to justify the Church's healing ministry. The dominical words are more safely located in Luke 10:9 than in the disputed Markan passage. N. Challingsworth will not convince many that the primary meaning of charisma is "an extraordinary power (as of healing) given a Christian by the Holy Spirit for the good of the Church," a definition found in Webster's *Dictionary* and reflecting contemporary rather than a thorough Biblical description. M. Israel's reference to Mark 10:15, the need for childlike faith to enter the kingdom of God, is hardly directly applicable to the "childlike" attitude asked of those who want charismatic renewal. But then which writers are not guilty of proof texting? The Biblical tradition is too complex not to encourage this methodology.

One of the disconcerting features was the rapid change of tempo as the reader moves from article to article. Like reading a dictionary, the subject constantly changes. One structure I did discover was that the less laudatory articles are followed by others that are "on side"—a balancing of the ledger, so to speak. I found myself neither convinced by the supporters nor drawn to the opposite pole. But perhaps in that the editors have

done their job well. This is not a book that provides answers; it poses questions. Some of these it appears to solve only to rephrase them. It will best serve the Christian open to the possibility that God is dynamically present in the movement and yet concerned at the (too often) arrogant claims of its followers. For the record I found Hollenweger's "Roots and Fruits of the Charismatic Renewal in the Third World" the most challenging of the contributions. Other readers will find more help in some other excellent chapters.

Ken Newton

Bible College of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia

The Journal of Esther Edwards Burr, 1754-1757. Edited by Carol F. Karlsen and Laurie Crumacker. New Haven: Yale University, 1984, 318 pp., \$25.00.

"We know relatively little," the editors of this intriguing volume note (p. 3), "about colonial women's day-to-day experiences, and even less about their perceptions of themselves and the world in which they lived." We know not much more, it might have been added, about the spirituality of rank-and-file eighteenth-century evangelicals, male and female alike. Burr's *Journal* provides us with a fascinating window into each of these worlds. In 1752 Esther, daughter of Jonathan and Sarah Pierrepont Edwards, had married Aaron Burr, a prominent Presbyterian minister and president of the College of New Jersey. Her subsequent relocation to Newark, where her new husband was pastor of the local Presbyterian church, and later to Princeton, where the school's first buildings were under construction, cut her off from family and acquaintances and especially from her dear friend Sarah Prince, daughter of prominent Boston clergyman Thomas Prince. In order to maintain their relationship, Burr and Prince agreed to keep journals of their daily lives to share with one another. Sarah Prince's journal was not preserved, and even the first few months of Esther Burr's journal have been lost. The document breaks off rather abruptly as well, just prior to the death in swift succession of Esther's husband and father and finally of Esther herself. What survived was previously available only in the form of a heavily-edited Victorian "ladies' book" that bears little resemblance to what Esther wrote. In the present volume the editors have presented us with a fully-annotated critical edition of the original manuscript, now held by Yale University.

Esther Burr, her journal makes clear, spent her days—and the better part of her evenings as well—in the seemingly endless cycle of sewing, cooking and cleaning that must have worn down most women of her time. The increased responsibilities that were her lot as the wife of a prominent clergyman and educator, hardly compensated by the erratic availability to her of less-than-reliable hired help, extended to providing meals and lodging for visiting dignitaries, feeding students' parents during commencement, and cooking for meetings of the presbytery: "Sundry Minnisters to dine and a Whole Room full to Tea and Three to Lodge," reads a too-typical entry (p. 260). In the midst of this hectic schedule, made even more so by the arrival of her children Sally and Aaron, Jr., she fought to find time for her beloved journal: "I write just when I can get time. My dear you must needs think I cant get much, for I have my Sally to tend, and domestek affairs to see to, and company to wait of besides my sewing, [so] that I am really hurried" (p. 50). In spite of her haste, her writing shows her to be a person of rare spiritual insight: "That knowledge of God that does not produce a love to him and a desire to be like him is not a true knowledge—That knowledge of any thing that produces *love* will also produce a desire to be like what we know and *Love*" (p. 124).

The editors' introduction to this volume is of uneven quality. It is marred by egregious errors of fact: Aaron Burr, Jr., for example, is stated (p. 18) to have been the second, rather than the third, vice president of the United States. Rhetorical concerns intrude

into even the dispensing of biographical data: Sarah Prince's father Thomas, for example, pastor of Boston's Old South Church and a New Light leader, is left unnamed for twelve pages (Sarah is first noted on p. 3; her relationship to Thomas is mentioned in passing on p. 15), apparently on the grounds that to have identified him any sooner (p. xi) would have "perpetuat[ed] . . . [the] bias . . . [that describes] women . . . only as men's wives and mothers." Worst of all, that discussion is disfigured by theological naivete: Puritans, we are told (p. 19), struggled with uncertainty because they "could never be sure of continued worthiness" of God's grace; Esther's description of her infant daughter as a bird who begins to sing as soon as she awakes, we are assured (p. 30), "hardly fits with notions of children's natural sinfulness." Indeed, some of the argumentation strains for the implausible in order to "explain" what really needs no explanation: Esther found it difficult to spank her children, the editors tell us (p. 29), "perhaps [!] because she was influenced by John Locke, Samuel Richardson, and others who challenged Puritan beliefs about children's innate depravity." Still, the introduction does at least set this material in its proper social context. The intertwined themes of religion, work and sisterhood, the editors note, bind the journal together, and (p. 36) the "sisterly relations. . . [of] [e]vangelical women. . . [such as] Esther and Sarah . . . were the forerunners of the nineteenth-century female reform associations, antislavery societies, and, ultimately, women's rights organizations." Esther Edwards Burr's *Journal* offers us a unique perspective on Church and society in mid-eighteenth-century America.

George W. Harper

Boston University, Boston, MA

Jacques Ellul: A Comprehensive Bibliography. By Joyce Main Hanks. Greenwich: JAI Press, 1984, xiii + 254 pp.

Having published an earlier bibliography of the works of Jacques Ellul (1981), I am well-positioned to appreciate the momentous achievement of this volume. During a sabbatical year in Bordeaux (1981-82) and many months since that time, Hanks has relentlessly carried out the necessary detective work for this volume. Following a brief biographical sketch of Ellul there are 140 pages on works by Ellul. Ellul's more than 40 books and 600 articles are listed chronologically, helpfully annotated, and indexed alphabetically and by subject. Then there are 110 pages on works about Ellul: book reviews, articles, books, theses, dissertations, symposia and interviews, with a complete author index for the secondary literature. In both parts, not only French and English but many German, Spanish, Italian and other listings are included (with English translations of titles regularly supplied by Hanks).

Few twentieth-century scholars have been as prolific as Ellul. Fewer still have contributed to as many different fields (theology, sociology, history, law) or as many different audiences (European, American, academic, laity, religious, secular). With Hanks' bibliographical guidance at hand it is no longer necessary to get lost in the Ellulian labyrinth. This work is essential for libraries and all serious students of Ellul's work. Hanks' bibliography meets the highest possible standards. It is accurate, reliable, exhaustive, and very helpfully organized, indexed and annotated. It is not only an asset to researchers but a model for other bibliographers to follow. The Society for Philosophy and Technology is to be applauded for undertaking publication of this work and for promising future supplements to the Ellul bibliography beginning in 1986.

David W. Gill

New College Berkeley, CA

Evangelicalism and Modern America. Edited by George Marsden. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984, 220 pp., \$8.95 paper. *Fundamentalism Today: What Makes It So Attractive?* Edited by Marla Selvidge. Elgin: Brethren, 1984, 134 pp.

Both of these volumes are made up primarily of papers given at two conferences. Because of the continuing widespread fascination with evangelicals and fundamentalists, these two collections are made available to a wider audience.

Both books will make helpful, though limited, contributions to the rapidly growing mass of literature on evangelicalism and fundamentalism. Unfortunately neither can lay serious claim to being the comprehensive type of study that is needed in both arenas. Hopefully both will prove to be stimuli, if not steps, in the right direction: toward broad and more objective self-examinations of these vital overlapping sectors of the American religious scene.

The chief value of a side-by-side review of two such volumes is that their individual strengths and weaknesses tend to be seen even more clearly in the comparison. However, it is not without its points of confusion and frustration.

Such a recurring difficulty had to do with the meaning attached to the terms "evangelicals" and "fundamentalists." Though such nomenclature is notoriously slippery, it did not seem to this reviewer that either book finally succeeded in drawing any consistent boundary lines between evangelicals and fundamentalists. (Perhaps it is not possible to do so with clarity and precision. But, if not, we should certainly revise the widespread assumptions to the contrary and revive the mutual respect and appreciation of the kindred movements.)

At first glance, there is a marked similarity between these two collections. *Evangelicalism* contains thirteen essays, *Fundamentalism* twelve. Both give attention to historical roots and development, perspectives on the media, women and science, and the "new right" participation of these two sectors. Interestingly, historian and ETS past president Richard Pierard is the only contributor to both volumes, writing on "The New Religious Right in American Politics" in *Evangelicalism*, and, oddly, on "Reagan and the Evangelicals" in *Fundamentalism*. (The latter inclusion, along with M. Marty's "Fundamentalism as a Social Phenomenon" in *Evangelicalism*, are prime examples of the muddled lines of demarcation between the two groupings in these books.)

The differences between *Evangelicalism* and *Fundamentalism* are more striking and significant than the parallels. Though containing roughly the same number of chapters *Evangelicalism* is considerably longer and is mostly serious scholarship, although pleasantly readable. The forty-five pages of endnotes in *Evangelicalism* are alone worth the price of the book, while the few notes in *Fundamentalism* are all internal. (Sadly, although the format of *Fundamentalism* indicates that it is targeted to a popular audience, it will not likely hit its target with much force.)

Another fairly obvious contrast between these works has to do with who the contributors are. Many of the writers in *Evangelicalism* are evangelical "insiders" themselves, or are at least well known to evangelical leaders (e.g., M. Marty, L. Sweet). Such is not the case with *Fundamentalism*. With the exception of Pierard, D. Rausch and evangelical scientist J. Moore, the reviewer had only passing familiarity (at best) with the other authors. Although such lack of knowledge may reveal this reviewer's ignorance, it may also bolster Jerry Falwell's comment in the foreword to *Fundamentalism*: "Too much of the published material on fundamentalism has been written from 'ivory towers' and is therefore somewhat uninformed and distorted. Parts of this book reveal that" (p. 7). Thus although editor Selvidge introduces *Fundamentalism* by saying that the contributors are Protestants and Catholics who "have experienced or discovered fundamentalist thinking and fundamentalist theology" (p. 9) it seems certain that most are decidedly liberal in conviction. Far from an evangelical persuasion, and even farther from the fundamen-

talist outlook that they are supposed to be accurately evaluating, their occasional glimmers of helpful insight tend to be overshadowed by the unsupported repetition of caricature (e.g. E. Towne's charge of "bibliolatry" in the place of Jesus or the Holy Spirit, pp. 33 ff.) or bizarre psychologizing (e.g. R. Shinn's "Fundamentalism as a Case of Arrested Development").

In summary, it should be made clear that both *Evangelicalism and Modern America* and *Fundamentalism Today* are worthy of gracing the evangelical's library, but for quite different reasons. On the one hand *Evangelicalism* succeeds rather well at its twin tasks of description and evaluation (p. vii) of wider contemporary evangelicals, as well as several selected aspects of the "evangelical denomination" (editor Marsden's phrase in the introduction). On the other hand *Fundamentalism* succeeds in providing an updated hodgepodge of nonevangelical opinions about "fundamentalists" with an occasional evangelical exception taken. Thus it serves as an effective, realistic reminder that those of us who hold to Biblical authority and orthodox theology who desire a "serious hearing" in broader circles have not yet been met with many open arms and ears.

A. Boyd Luter, Jr.

Christ Presbyterian Church, San Antonio, TX

The Pastor As Evangelist. By Richard Stoll Armstrong. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1984, 191 pp., \$9.95.

The author, a minister in the Presbyterian Church (USA) and professor of ministry and evangelism at Princeton Seminary, wants to help ministers to be more effectively evangelistic. He holds seminars with ecumenical constituencies for pastors "in search of an adequate theology and a viable style of evangelism for the contemporary church in a pluralistic world" (p. 16). This book grows out of his concern and his seminars. He is apparently aiming at a reader who is a pastor of a "congregation of a so-called mainline denomination" (p. 13).

The larger part of this book is concerned with the style of evangelism. It is filled with practical suggestions about relationships and communications skills. One whole chapter is devoted to the different ways that one addresses different-sized congregations.

Of greater concern is the first part, in which he seeks to develop a theology of evangelism. It seems painfully apparent that he is writing for ministers that are suspicious if not hostile to evangelism. He is very careful to write in terms they will identify with, and he attempts to defuse their objections as he proceeds.

After considering many definitions he offers his own: "By evangelism I mean reaching out to others in Christian love, identifying with them, caring for them, listening to them, and sharing faith with them in such a way that they will freely respond and want to commit themselves to trust, love and obey God as a disciple of Jesus Christ and as a member of his servant community, the church" (p. 39). At this point he adds a significant footnote: "My original expression was 'sharing one's faith with them,' which suggests that it is the evangelist who does all the talking. For that reason I eliminated the word 'one's,' so that it now reads, 'sharing faith with them,' to emphasize that sharing is a two-way process. The effective evangelist is one who encourages others to share *their* faith" (pp. 188-189).

Armstrong says much more about sharing faith than about what the content of faith ought to be. He does quote approvingly "John Stott's exposition of the gospel" (p. 48) from *Christian Mission in the Modern World*. Armstrong considers it "arbitrary and artificial" but also "a very helpful teaching aid" (p. 50). He insists that Stott's definition of the gospel must be supplemented with W. Rauschenbusch's concept of the kingdom and says,

"The message of evangelism, therefore, must include the good news of the kingdom, in the manner of him whom to know as Savior and serve as Lord is the way to the kingdom, the truth of the kingdom, and the life in the kingdom" (p. 51).

Although he says that "I believe Jesus Christ is the Savior of the world, and in that sense Christianity is the true religion" (p. 71), he also comments: "No religion is true in and of itself, as Karl Barth has shown" (p. 189).

There is very little said about the cross beyond the general statement that "Christ died for our sins." Little is said about the use of the Bible in evangelism, except in the section on evangelistic letter writing that suggests carefully selected quotations from Scripture. Almost any tiny manual for laymen on personal soul-winning will say much more about the content of the gospel and the use of the Bible than Armstrong does here.

Many ministers today trumpet an uncertain sound. This book will help them trumpet more frequently but probably not more clearly.

Donald A. Dunkerley

Proclamation International, Pensacola, FL

The Last Supper and Lord's Supper. By I. Howard Marshall. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981, 191 pp., \$6.95.

I. Howard Marshall has long been known for the clarity of his writing and the bibliographical exhaustiveness of his coverage. This work continues that tradition. It intends to fulfill the "need for a simple but comprehensive survey of current study" (p. 9) rather than a fresh new look at the issue, and it is exactly that. New theories are not propounded (in my view such are not needed), but the serious student is given the best introduction to and summary of the problems yet written. "Last Supper" in the title refers to the historical meal shared by Jesus and the disciples, and "Lord's Supper" refers to the later Christian celebration/reenactment of that event.

The first section concerns backgrounds, examining ancient religious meals and comparing the last supper with Jewish *habureth* meals, the Passover feast, Qumran meals and pagan cultic meals. Marshall believes that the Passover provides better parallels than do the others. Next he discusses the NT accounts of the last supper, especially the problem of the differences between the form of the words of institution in Mark, Luke and Corinthians. Marshall believes that all three are based on the historical words of institution but agrees with Schürmann (against Pesch) that Luke preserves the more primitive tradition. In light of Marshall's statement that "there is no good reason for supposing that any one of the three versions must necessarily be closer to the original form of the account than the others" (p. 38), such a discussion may be deemed unnecessary. Nevertheless it is good to see so sensible an approach to the tradition-critical problem.

A second major problem is the chronological difference between Mark 14:12 (and parallels), which places the meal on "the first day of [the Feast of] Unleavened Bread, when it was customary to eat the Passover," and John 19:14 (cf. 18:28), which places the crucifixion on the "day of preparation for the Passover." After reviewing most of the evidence Marshall follows Billerbeck (rather than Jaubert), who states that the synoptic gospels and John were using two different calendars and that Jesus actually held the meal twenty-four hours earlier than the official Jewish date. This is plausible, but I prefer the view stating that the "passover" in John 18:28; 19:14 is not the actual Passover but the continuing festal meals of the week following, which were also called "passover" celebrations in the first century. Thereby the last supper and crucifixion were on the traditionally accepted days of Thursday and Friday (see the discussions in W. Lane's

NICNT commentary on Mark and D. A. Carson's *Expositor's Bible Commentary* treatment of Matthew). There is no record that the temple officials would have countenanced paschal sacrifices on two successive days.

In chap. 4, Marshall considers the significance of the meal, asserting that it was both a Passover and a farewell meal, that it prepared for his death as the Isaianic suffering servant, that it inaugurated the new covenant, and that it was proleptic of the messianic banquet in heaven. Marshall argues against a high sacramental view of the bread and cup, stating that the purpose of the bread is to "remind" the disciples of the sacrificial nature of Jesus' death and that the purpose of the cup was to add the concept of the new covenant to the former. While one could have wished for more on *anamnēsis* (memorial) or *koinōnia* (participation), this was on the whole a very satisfying section.

On the Lord's supper in the early Church, there are several interesting points. First, Marshall believes that in Corinth "the bread and wine were taken at the beginning of the meal" (p. 111) rather than at the end or in conjunction with the meal. While this is possible, I think the third is more likely, with the separation occurring at a later time. In this chapter there are good discussions of idolators' feasts and the Lord's supper, meals with disciples during the resurrection appearances, the "breaking of bread" in Acts, and John 6:51-58 as a eucharistic motif.

In his conclusion Marshall provides a very helpful summation in six theses regarding its theological relevance and in twelve theses regarding its significance for today. The former proceeds from the OT covenantal background to the nonsacramental nature (we participate in Jesus' death via faith, and the supper proclaims the sacrificial nature of his death) to our present celebration of fellowship with the risen Lord. There is also a future aspect as we anticipate the heavenly banquet. The latter considerations concern its frequency (weekly), its openness to participants (all believers, even the unbaptized) and leaders (not just ordained ministers but "any believer authorized by the church," p. 156), its symbolism (the attitude is sitting before the Lord, not an altar; the use of a single loaf and a common cup would be in keeping with the ancient feast) and the service itself (the preaching of the Word, the use of liturgical prayers).

I recommend this book highly for students and pastors as well as to anyone who wants a clear, concise summary of the academic issues as well as practical hints as to significance for the Church today. Even where one disagrees with a solution one cannot fault Marshall for his fairness to all sides. It is a model for a good textbook on any topic.

Grant R. Osborne

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

A Cumulative Index to New Testament Greek Grammars. By Timothy Owings. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1983, 204 pp., \$7.95 paper.

Any skilled craftsman or professional welcomes tools or methods that streamline the necessary yet often laborious tasks that are required in accomplishing a given chore. Such a tool has emerged in *A Cumulative Index to New Testament Greek Grammars* for the scholar of the Greek NT.

The *Index* had its inception in the time-consuming endeavors of checking for specific comments on a given NT passage in major and intermediate Greek grammars. The author has chosen what he considers to be eight major grammars currently being used in colleges and seminaries. The five intermediate-level grammars indexed are *Syntax of New Testament Greek* by J. A. Brooks and C. L. Winbery, *A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament* by H. E. Dana and J. R. Mantey, *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek* by C. F. D. Moule, *A Short Grammar of the Greek Testament* by A. T. Robertson and W. H.

Davis, and *Biblical Greek* by M. Zerwick. The three advanced grammars indexed are BDF, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* in four volumes by J. H. Moulton and N. Turner, and *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in Light of Historical Research* by A. T. Robertson.

The *Index* format follows the order of the NT books and lists the above grammars in an abbreviated form with the appropriate page or section number that pertains to a particular verse. Virtually every verse in the NT is addressed in some manner or another by at least one or more of the selected grammars.

Owings prefaces with a disclaimer that the order of the verses in the *Index* does not reflect textual decisions, which are left for the scholar to wrestle with. He considers the *Index* to be an ideal tool for students who have had at least one semester of NT Greek to aid them in dealing with grammatical details in a given text.

The primary value of the *Index* is to eliminate search time in locating pertinent grammatical information as found in more than one of the above grammars. If the student is content to seek the opinion of only one grammarian the *Index* would be of little value, for all the above grammars have their own Biblical indices.

Each of us is indebted in some way or another to all those scholars who have preceded us and who have preserved their labors in written form. Such is our indebtedness to Timothy Owings for seeking to shorten search and study time by compiling *A Cumulative Index to New Testament Greek Grammars*.

Jay L. Davis

International School of Theology, San Bernardino, CA

A New Testament Blueprint for the Church. By John Moore and Ken Neff. Chicago: Moody, 1985, x + 168 pp., \$9.95. *New Testament Models for Ministry: Jesus and Paul*. By Colin Kruse. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1983, xiv + 236 pp., \$7.95.

Moore and Neff have collaborated on their volume from similar backgrounds: Both graduated from Dallas Theological Seminary, and both work with Pastoral Resources. The title of their work is explicit enough to suggest that the authors see the NT as more than a record of the manner in which the NT Church conducted itself. It is a record that is certainly descriptive, but it is also prescriptive—i.e., the method of operation described in the NT should be followed because God chose the best cultural vehicles available in which to couch the truth that was to be communicated. These practices would include, according to the authors, the authority structure of a local church, the role of women, the size of a local group, the exercise of spiritual gifts, the choosing of a “pastor,” and others.

At first glance they seem to have a point, and so we may applaud when we are told (p. x) that this book is “an honest attempt to conform the church’s life to the patterns of the New Testament. It is not merely descriptive, but prescriptive.” In a case such as this it is assumed that description precedes prescription. Before a local church is asked to follow a blueprint it must be able to study it. Yet it is precisely at this point that Moore and Neff have leaped a chasm and left me behind, wondering if I should leap too. Perhaps an overall pattern can be pieced together as long as the NT is serving as a data base. But can we piece together a pattern *in toto* from any given local situation in the NT? I think it unfair to assume that every local situation, after we have studied its description in Scripture, will yield a comprehensive, coherent pattern, but that when it does not we should impose on these local situations a pattern derived in bits and pieces from the whole. It assumes that there was a fixedness, a regularity, about the early Church. I am

not discounting any patterns; rather, I am questioning the legitimacy of the approach the authors take.

It is doubtful that Christians invented all sorts of unique customs through which they could express their faith. There is very little that could not be found paralleled elsewhere in the various cultures of that day. Given this fact I prefer to posit that Christianity gave the believer skeletal truths (some of which were new), which were to be fleshed out in already existing cultural norms. These ways of expressing truth were appropriate, but they were not the only ways of expressing a given truth. The twentieth-century Christian also has these skeletal truths—and they should be expressed in a manner appropriate enough to communicate them to a modern audience. The one qualification, however, is that any form that is chosen should not violate the truth it is meant to express. If we assume that both the truths and their expressions were divinely mandated, then first-century Palestine happened to be practicing the cultural distinctives that would serve to illustrate truth for all time, whether coincidentally or by divine design.

Aside from the few glaring omissions (such as an explanation of why they do not expect the practice of head coverings to be perpetuated), I think Moore and Neff have produced a useful, thought-provoking study of the NT. Indeed, if the NT is a blueprint, this book would be a good starting place for an explication of that blueprint. Commendably the emphasis is on faith in Christ and the relational truth that properly springs from that truth. The authors are at their best when they boil Scripture down to the raw, essential elements and then present them to the reader in a palatable, witty manner. This is especially so when they deal with truths that are not specifically tied to a cultural custom. They write to an American Church setting, but they do not generally confuse Christianity with American nationalism. A large portion of the proposals they espouse would be adaptable to nonwestern cultures.

Though the book is reasonably priced, well designed, and clearly structured, it suffers from a lack of documentation (four footnotes in the entire book) and no indices at all. The book has not gone far enough in a substantive reexamination of three areas: whether there is a pattern in the NT, how prescriptive that pattern is if it exists, and an identification of its specific features. The chief weakness of the book lies with its primary assumption: that the form and organization of the NT Church are to be emulated.

In some respects it is unfair to compare the work of Moore and Neff with that of Kruse. The works do overlap, however, in their treatment of the issue for which I have criticized Moore and Neff. They would agree with Kruse, but they would insist that he has not gone far enough: Those involved in Christian ministry must go beyond incorporating Jesus' mind-set to duplicating his methods. Kruse's own proposal contains a disclaimer in this regard—i.e., he makes it clear that the methodology must be different because "we must carry out our ministries in the last quarter of the twentieth century, and in the cultural, historical and political situations which are very different from his [Jesus']. This will mean that, seeking to follow the example of his identification with people, we shall have to operate quite differently, simply because the people we are called to serve are inextricably bound up in very different milieux" (p. 1).

But, as stated above, Kruse's larger purposes see this question as incidental. From the back cover and preface it is clear that, in his view, the presence of three unified themes (apostleship, servanthood, and the role of the Spirit) in both Paul's and Jesus' ministries suggests that Paul's concept of ministry was based on Jesus' concept. There is a continuity between the two; Paul did not "organize a separate religion *about* Jesus" (back cover) but carried on Christ's work. The explanation for the organic tie between the two has several parts (p. 184). First, "Paul's thought is probably *dependent* upon the historical Jesus. This dependency may be traced through the tradition handed on by those who knew the Lord in the flesh." Second, "Paul's understanding of ministry was

formed by his personal encounter and experiences with the exalted Christ." Third, "Paul believed that the exalted Christ was actively involved in his apostolic mission. At one point [Rom 15:18–19] there is a strong suggestion that what Christ effected through his apostle was nothing other than a continuation of the same ministry he had begun as the historical Jesus."

The approach in the book consists of a look first at Jesus' ministry and then at Paul's. For Jesus' ministry the study is arranged topically: apostleship (Jesus' certainty that he had been sent for a purpose), servanthood, and the role of the Spirit. But when dealing with the same subjects in Paul's ministry Kruse organized his discussion by NT books, with the result that often it is easy to lose the import of a particular passage as it bears on one area or another.

Kruse argues convincingly that Jesus and Paul shared "operational mind-sets" in several key areas—areas that to the modern are germane enough to emulate. Commendably, too, Kruse goes beyond the citing of the shared concepts to an explication and application of the same.

The book is reasonably priced and has moderately complete endnotes, a four-page bibliography, and indices of authors and Scripture references (including other ancient writings).

Positively, Kruse has given us a cogent and concise statement of (as well as thoughtful application for) those principles that Jesus and Paul shared. Negatively, the book is muddled with extended, sometimes needless, evaluations of the authenticity of nearly every major passage introduced to the discussion. An attempt is made to validate this procedure on pages 9–12, but as useful as some of his comments may be in this regard they do not contribute directly and therefore should have been relegated to footnotes or not included at all.

David C. Baker

Winona Lake, IN

Faith and Rationality: Reason and Belief in God. Edited by Alvin Plantinga and Nicholas Wolterstorff. University of Notre Dame, 1983, 321 pp., n.p. paper.

One of the great ironies of contemporary philosophy is that in spite of the pompous epitaphs pronounced by positivists upon metaphysics and theology just thirty years ago, philosophy of religion continues to flourish whereas positivism has all but died out. Especially profitable in recent years has been the application of the tools of analytic philosophy to traditional problems in philosophical theology and religious epistemology. *Faith and Rationality* is a fine example of the application of analytic philosophy to a central issue in philosophy of religion: the question of the relation between belief in God and rationality. The contributors (all orthodox Christians) are not here concerned with showing that belief in God is rational; rather, their concern is with the logically prior question of how we are to construe the relationship between religious belief and rationality. The six essays are the product of a year-long (1979–1980) project of the Calvin College Center for Christian Studies on the topic "Toward a Reformed View of Faith and Reason." Four of the contributors—Plantinga, Wolterstorff, William Alston and George Mavrodes—are distinguished philosophers who have between them made significant contributions to the philosophy of language, epistemology, and aesthetics as well as philosophy of religion. Noted historian George Marsden and theologian David Holwerda contribute the other two essays. Also included are two delightful short stories by Mavrodes that graphically illustrate some of the key epistemological issues under consideration.

The essays by Plantinga ("Reason and Belief in God"), Alston ("Christian Experience and Christian Belief"), Wolterstorff ("Can Belief in God Be Rational If It Has No Foundations?") and Mavrodes ("Jerusalem and Athens Revisited") are all explicitly concerned with the question of rationality and Christian belief. Marsden ("The Collapse of American Evangelical Academia") examines how American evangelicals in the nineteenth century understood the relation of faith to reason, and Holwerda ("Faith, Reason, and the Resurrection") evaluates Wolfhart Pannenberg's "evidentialist" understanding of faith and reason as exemplified in his treatment of the resurrection of Jesus.

All of the essays are informative and well written, and they deserve careful study. I will restrict my brief comments to some of the issues especially prominent in the essays by Plantinga, Wolterstorff and Mavrodes. Plantinga and Wolterstorff are particularly concerned to defend three theses: (1) "Classical foundationalism" is epistemologically bankrupt. (2) The "evidentialist challenge" to religious belief is inadequate and should be rejected. (3) "Reformed" or "Calvinist" epistemology provides a satisfactory account of the relation between belief in God and rationality. Mavrodes' excellent essay, in addition to making significant contributions of its own to the discussion, offers an incisive evaluation of the positions advocated by Plantinga and Wolterstorff.

The "classical foundationalist" is said to be one who maintains that only two sorts of propositions can be candidates for propositions that it is rational to hold immediately (viz., not on the basis of inference from other rationally acceptable propositions): propositions that are self-evident, and propositions that are incorrigible (viz., about one's states of consciousness; pp. 3, 47-55). The difficulties of this position (widely acknowledged in contemporary philosophy) are clearly presented (pp. 59-63). The "evidentialist challenge," which may or may not be grounded in classical foundationalism, is said to consist of two claims: "First, if it is not rational to accept some proposition about God then one ought not accept it; and second, it is not rational to accept propositions about God unless one does so on the basis of others of one's beliefs which provide adequate evidence for them, and with a firmness not exceeding that warranted by the strength of the evidence" (p. 136). Both contemporary critics and defenders of Christian theism generally agree that the evidentialist challenge (or something very much like it) must be met. Thus apologetics is usually conducted within the parameters of this challenge. But this whole approach is fundamentally misguided, according to Plantinga and Wolterstorff. And the latter's essay in particular is a sustained argument for the inadequacy of the evidentialist challenge. Instead of a religious epistemology formulated in response to the evidentialist challenge, Plantinga and Wolterstorff propose a "Calvinist" or "Reformed" epistemology, which appears to be a rigorous restatement of the views of such Reformed thinkers as Calvin, Bavinck and Barth. But this is not simply another rehash of Reformed presuppositionism. The authors are thoroughly at home in contemporary epistemological debates and argue their case with a rigor lacking in most presuppositionists. The distinctive thesis of Reformed epistemology is that the rationality or epistemic propriety of belief in God in no way depends on appeal to sufficient evidence. One can rationally accept belief in God as epistemically basic ("properly basic" is Plantinga's term), and thus such belief is not dependent on supporting evidence (pp. 72-73). Belief in God is said to be basic to one's noetic structure—that is, it is a member of the set of beliefs that are rationally acceptable but that are epistemically basic in the sense that they are not derived from other rationally acceptable beliefs. Reformed epistemology claims that one can be entirely within his/her epistemic rights in believing in God even though such belief is not based on sufficient evidence (p. 90).

These essays provide much philosophical meat to chew on, and future discussions of religious epistemology dare not ignore the arguments of *Faith and Rationality*. But in spite of the many merits of these seminal essays I have strong reservations on several points. The charge that classical foundationalism is bankrupt is of course nothing new.

But it hardly follows from this that all forms of foundationalism fail. Indeed the concept of rationality seems to demand a foundationalist epistemology of some kind. This is implicitly recognized by Plantinga and Wolterstorff for, as Mavrodes points out (p. 202), the notion of a set of "properly basic" beliefs is certainly foundationalistic. However, the uniqueness of Reformed epistemology lies in its inclusion of belief in God in the set of properly basic beliefs. This is a bold and creative move that, if successful, would revolutionize religious epistemology. But why should belief in God be considered properly basic? Some justification is in order. What is needed are criteria that clearly distinguish beliefs that are properly basic from those that are not and an argument showing that on the basis of such criteria belief in God can legitimately be regarded as properly basic. But this is missing in the essays, and this lacuna leads to what has been elsewhere called the "Great Pumpkin Objection" to Reformed epistemology: If belief in God is accepted as properly basic, what is to prevent someone from legitimately taking the belief that the Great Pumpkin returns every Halloween as properly basic? Plantinga is well aware of this objection and, as he has done elsewhere, he here claims that belief in God is properly basic whereas belief in the Great Pumpkin is not even if we cannot specify criteria by which such judgments are made (pp. 74–78). But this seems very unsatisfactory. Surely we are entitled to demand some specification of what it is about belief in God that qualifies it as properly basic. Now part of the reason for Plantinga's weak response to the Great Pumpkin Objection is the particular understanding of rationality that is operative in the essays: Rationality is construed in terms of epistemic permission instead of obligation (see the comments of Mavrodes, pp. 196–197). My rational beliefs are said to be those I am epistemically permitted to hold. Belief in God is rational just in case I am permitted to hold that belief, and I am (epistemically) permitted to hold that belief only if there are no compelling epistemic reasons for not doing so. And thus failure to show why belief in God should not be considered properly basic is taken to be sufficient warrant for including it in the set of properly basic beliefs. But surely an acceptable notion of rationality must include the much stronger sense of epistemic obligation: If it is rational for me to believe that p , then I ought to believe that p ; not to do so is irrational. It is simply that I am permitted (viz., within my epistemic rights) to believe that p . Does Reformed epistemology ultimately reduce to fideism? Plantinga denies that it does (p. 87), but what is not at all clear is whether it can avoid a relativizing of rationality norms with the result that a theist is rationally entitled to accept belief in God as properly basic but an atheist is equally entitled to accept belief in God's nonexistence as properly basic. Finally, it should be noted that many, like myself, will find the arguments for the inadequacy of the evidentialist challenge to be less than convincing.

Regardless of whether one ultimately accepts all of the conclusions advanced, *Faith and Rationality* deserves wide reading among evangelical theologians and philosophers. Some background in basic epistemology would be helpful, but it is not necessary. This text, perhaps combined with one from a very different perspective—such as Richard Swinburne's *The Existence of God* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1979)—would make for a most stimulating course in religious epistemology.

Harold Netland

Tokyo, Japan

Beyond Fundamentalism: Biblical Foundations for Evangelical Christianity. By James Barr. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1984, 195 pp., \$9.95.

In recent years James Barr has focused his considerable theological acumen on evaluating the hermeneutical foundations of evangelicalism. His most recent analysis main-

tains the critical rejection of the inerrantist position manifest in *Fundamentalism* (Westminster, 1978), but he has adopted a more moderate tone.

In the preface Barr defines clearly his purpose. He states: "This is intended rather as a pastoral book. It seeks to offer help to those who have grown up in the world of fundamentalism or have become committed to it but who have in the end come to feel that it is a prison from which they must escape" (p. vii). His basic approach is to contend that the Bible itself implies and even requires an errantist position disparate from fundamentalism and evangelicalism. In his view evangelicalism has selectively interpreted the Biblical data, whereas a consistently Biblical position leads away from evangelicalism. Thus he is seeking to educate thinking evangelicals out of their theological box.

Though the author's more genial tone is welcome, one could have hoped for a more balanced presentation from a scholar of such imposing credentials. An examination of the cited works and the bibliography yields a paucity of references to the current inerrancy discussion among evangelicals, particularly those in North America. Reference is made to Darby, the Plymouth Brethren, and the *Scofield Reference Bible*, but the reader searches in vain for dialogue with the arguments of articulate contemporary evangelicals such as Carson, Kantzer and Nicole. Barr seems to be content to argue his position persuasively without seriously interacting with the best scholarship of the position that he is exhorting his readers to abandon.

Nevertheless this work is of great importance for evangelicals for several reasons. Here is a concise, cogent criticism of the evangelical hermeneutic from one who understands evangelicalism and its implications. In scrutinizing several traditional texts used by evangelicals—for example, 2 Tim 3:16 and 2 Pet 1:21—Barr has exposed the ever-present danger of careless exegesis—a salutary warning. Of greatest benefit is that Barr has clearly delineated the major areas of disjunction between the evangelical and the nonevangelical views of the Bible. Here is a trenchant rejection of evangelicalism, relatively free of innuendo, broadsides and other un scholarly accretions.

Barr's challenge cannot be ignored, and it must not remain unanswered. The gauntlet has been thrown down. At stake are the minds and lives of the individuals to whom Barr has appealed so persuasively. The recognized viability of the evangelical position demands a response to the points articulated by Barr.

Daniel J. Estes

Cedarville College, Cedarville, OH

Inerrancy and The Church. Edited by John D. Hannah. Chicago: Moody, 1984, 422 pp., \$12.95 paper. *Challenges to Inerrancy: A Theological Response*. Edited by Gordon Lewis and Bruce Demarest. Chicago: Moody, 1984, 414 pp., \$13.95 paper.

These two volumes consist of evangelical essays that adequately summarize the doctrine of Scripture of key figures and periods from the early Church to the twentieth century.

Inerrancy and the Church is a competent inerrantist response to *The Authority and Interpretation of the Bible: An Historical Approach* (1979) written by Jack Rogers and Donald McKim. Two of the theses of Rogers and McKim in particular come under close scrutiny: (1) The historic position of the Christian Church has been to regard the message of the Bible as true and authoritative but its words as fallible, and (2) inerrancy is a novel idea of the Protestant scholastics.

Twelve essays are included covering the views of Scripture and inerrancy of the early Church (Hannah), Augustine (W. R. Spear), the scholastics (J. F. Johnson), Luther (R. D. Preus), Calvin (J. I. Packer), John Owen (S. N. Gundry), Wesley and British Wesley-

anism (W. T. Dayton), Jonathan Edwards (J. H. Gerstner), American Wesleyanism (D. E. McCarthy), Baptists (T. J. Nettles), nineteenth-century Princeton (D. C. Davis) and Berkouwer (C. W. Bogue, Jr.).

The essays are of good quality. The writers know their subjects and quote profusely from the primary sources, and they interact capably with the most important secondary literature. They are successful in their attempts to handle their respective materials fairly and not to quote out of context (the reviewer wishes Rogers and McKim had been as careful). The result is a good resource for research into the various areas covered by the book.

Did the writers interact with the Rogers and McKim theses? For the most part the answer is yes. The Rogers and McKim proposal is shown to be "of faulty and unscholarly method" (p. 140 n. 164), "having an axe to grind" and so attempting to "squeeze" figures "into the alien mold of their own mind-set" (pp. 184-188), "seriously misrepresenting the positions" of historical figures (pp. 219-221), and "reading Berkouwer's view of Scripture into church history" (pp. 408-411). Unfortunately some of the writers in the latter part of the volume (Gerstner, McCarthy, Nettles and Davis) failed to interact with Rogers and McKim.

Challenges to Inerrancy "purposes to disclose some of the most influential of modern theological presuppositions leading to belief in an errant Bible and to assess them in their contexts by standard criteria of truth" (p. ix). The writers accomplish this goal. The volume includes essays on the views of Scripture of the Enlightenment (Demarest), romanticism (H. O. J. Brown), liberalism (D. C. Davis), twentieth-century British theology (H. D. McDonald), neo-orthodoxy (R. Nicole), the Niebuhrs (Lewis), existentialist theology (F. H. Klooster), recent Roman Catholic theology (R. L. Saucy), process theology (N. L. Geisler), Berkouwer (H. Krabbendam) and liberation theology (V. C. Grounds). J. H. Gerstner gives an exposition of the case for inerrancy developed at the old Princeton. Brown concludes the volume with an honest and thought-provoking essay on the presuppositions and implications of errancy. He addresses the tough questions (for inerrantists as well as errantists) and sounds a strong warning to evangelical errantists as he effectively compares the current debate over inerrancy with the Arian controversy of the fourth century.

Moody Press, long a leader in evangelical devotional and semipopular publishing, is to be commended for a successful move into the production of scholarly works. These volumes would be appropriate for advanced college classes and make good seminary texts.

Robert A. Peterson

Biblical Theological Seminary, Hatfield, PA.

The Scripture Principle. By Clark H. Pinnock. San Francisco: Harper, 1984, xx + 270 pp., \$14.95.

Pinnock, a respected evangelical scholar, has aimed in this book "to present an understanding of the Scripture principle and the authority of the Bible in a positive, systematic, and relevant way" (p. vi). This is an ambitious purpose indeed, and Pinnock is to be commended for undertaking such a difficult task, especially in view of the heated debate presently swirling around the doctrine of Scripture.

The book is structured around three basic dimensions: (1) the divine inspiration of Scripture, (2) the human character of the Biblical text, and (3) the ministry of the Spirit in relation to the Bible. Pinnock expresses his thought about these topics in a clear and interesting manner as he intentionally writes for the average reader as well as the technical scholar.

In spite of the vast and theologically varied literature on the doctrine of Scripture, the writer shows an unusually broad and insightful familiarity with such material. Just his bringing together of so many key issues and sources relevant to the Scripture principle makes this a very useful and significant work for theological students.

The author clearly departs from the traditional orthodox view of the Bible. Yet he capably criticizes "liberal theological revision" with its "flat denial of the Scripture principle in the classical sense" (p. xiii).

Pinnock alleges that the orthodox or old view of the Bible has tended "to exaggerate the absolute perfection of the text and minimize the true humanity of it" (p. xii). Accordingly it is argued that this "strict inerrancy" view actually goes beyond what Scripture teaches about itself and is irreconcilable with the phenomena of the Biblical text. Pinnock believes that the traditional statement of inerrancy has not always been developed in the most balanced and sensible way and cannot be defended in the face of modern literary criticism of Scripture.

Underlying Pinnock's thought is his conviction that "the New Testament does not teach a strict doctrine of inerrancy" (p. 77), but "it [the NT] might be said to encourage a trusting attitude, which inerrancy in a more lenient definition does signify" (p. 77). Quite clearly, then, a Scripture principle is proposed here that promotes the general trustworthiness of the Bible but not exact inerrancy in detail. Consequently a functional definition of inerrancy is encouraged in place of emphasis upon the absolute inerrancy of the original Biblical MSS since the unavailability of such materials supposedly makes the issue rather irrelevant (pp. xvii, 55, 76-77, 96-97). As the author notes: "It is important for us to stress the practical effectiveness of the accessible Bible in facilitating a saving and transforming knowledge of God in Jesus Christ" (p. xviii; cf. pp. 54-60, 75-76, 104).

In his attempt to counterbalance the alleged neglect of the humanity of the Bible by traditional inerrantists, Pinnock ends up overstressing the human element in Scripture and not giving adequate place to the divine role in producing Scripture. Not surprisingly, then, he concludes that there are "kinds and degrees of inspiration" (p. 35; cf. pp. 33-36, 202) or levels of authority (pp. 56, 67, 88). This weakened view of the divine origin of Scripture along with Pinnock's inclination to Arminianism undoubtedly helps account for his dissatisfaction with the strong emphasis on divine sovereignty in the views of inspiration held by such notable Calvinists as B. B. Warfield and J. I. Packer (pp. 101-102).

Orthodox inerrantists (e.g. N. Geisler) are accused of actually using a deductive approach (instead of a professed inductive methodology, which Hodge and Warfield also claimed to employ) by presupposing their conclusion about inerrancy and then adducing alleged Biblical evidence to support it (pp. 30, 101, 230).

Pinnock's lenient inerrancy proposal obviously allows for much broader and more flexible parameters within which the phenomena of Scripture may be interpreted than the strict inerrancy view does. For example, without necessarily committing himself to any of the following views, his Scripture principle would apparently permit one (1) to hold that the Bible is flawed because of the human weakness of Biblical writers and the imperfection of Biblical language (pp. 98-100), (2) to understand some of the miracles of the Bible as legendary (pp. 118, 121-125), (3) to view portions of Matthew's gospel as fictional embellishment based on midrashic interpretation—i.e., a type of redaction criticism propounded by R. Gundry (p. 118), (4) to question the divine authority of some of Paul's teaching—e.g., 1 Cor 7:25, 40 (p. 49), (5) to classify the early chapters of Genesis as written in saga form (the Barthian view) without expecting detailed historical facticity (pp. 67-68; cf. pp. 116-119, 123-124), (6) to interpret Jonah as didactic fiction (p. 117), (7) to date the final form of Daniel in the Maccabean period (p. 117), (8) to question the Pauline authorship of Ephesians and the pastorals (pp. 118, 142), (9) to accept the pos-

sibility of a didactic inflation of numbers by Biblical writers (p. 78), (10) to believe that "Paul's use of a small detail like a grammatical singular in Galatians 3:16 is not proof of detailed inerrancy but evidence of precisely rabbinic practices" (p. 44), and (11) to rely more upon the relevant conclusions of OT scholars than an appeal to allegedly irrelevant statements of Jesus (p. 39).

As a whole, the case against strict inerrancy is not convincingly set forth in *The Scripture Principle*. More specifically, Pinnock fails (1) to clearly refute the traditional exegesis of Biblical passages pertaining to inspiration, (2) to really prove that the inductive process by which strict inerrancy is drawn from such exegetical evidence is only pretentious or actually deductive, and (3) to adequately justify his capitulation on many points to liberal Biblical criticism. Consequently orthodox inerrantists will see no reasonable cause to alter their convictions (1) that the weight of evidence from properly interpreted Biblical passages about inspiration overwhelmingly supports their viewpoint and (2) that the genuine phenomena of Scripture do not overthrow strict inerrancy but are reconcilable with it.

Pinnock evidently sees validity in a twofold perspective of the Bible: (1) a precritical, pragmatic and virtually fideistic approach to Scripture (e.g., p. 45), and (2) a post-Enlightenment openness to scientific literary criticism. While a proper approach to Biblical criticism and a practical approach to Scripture are both desirable and can be compatible, it seems to this reviewer that Pinnock's two different perspectives of Scripture are irreconcilable and inescapably lead to two disparate concepts of the Bible. Pinnock does not satisfactorily synthesize these two viewpoints, and this unresolved problem creates ambivalence instead of logical coherence in presenting his Scripture principle. Possibly this disharmonious dual perspective has its philosophical roots in Pinnock's problematic idea of two kinds of truth (pp. 35, 67).

He labors in the last section of his book (chaps. 7-9) to provide a much-needed balance between the objective character of revelation in Scripture and the subjective working of the Spirit to illumine and apply Biblical truth to the believer. The emphasis on the need to respond obediently to Biblical truth is spiritually wholesome and most commendable. However, Pinnock often blurs the distinction between such concepts as revelation, illumination, interpretation and application (pp. 67, 88, 169-170). Likewise, sometimes it is difficult to discern whether he is referring to new extra-Biblical revelation from the Spirit (pp. xiv, 67, 163) or to different interpretations and fresh or multiple applications from a given and completed revelation (pp. 175, 193, 195).

Unfortunately, Pinnock's proposed Scripture principle with its very lenient view of inerrancy does not offer evangelicals a Biblically sound and logically consistent position to stabilize Christian faith and to withstand the onslaughts of destructive Biblical criticism.

Henry W. Holloman

Talbot School of Theology, Biola University, La Mirada, CA

The Interpretation of Holy Scripture. By Walter M. Dunnnett. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1984, 210 pp., \$6.95 paper.

The agenda that Dunnnett sets before himself in this volume is "to address a number of issues related to the whole task of interpreting the Bible" (p. xii). The breadth of this task, coupled with the author's decision not to restrict himself to specific lines of inquiry, account for both the strength and the weakness of the book.

Its strength lies in the sheer number of issues that the author discusses as relevant to any hermeneutical endeavor. While the book as a whole is set out on a topical basis,

chaps. 4—6 are designed to trace historical developments within hermeneutics. Using the axis of history along with a topical orientation, Dunnnett ensures that the major issues are raised. Reading the book will serve to acquaint the reader with many of the debated matters under the rubric of hermeneutics.

Because of the extremely wide parameters of his program, Dunnnett's book lacks focus. In microcosm this can be seen in the treatment of individual topics. His chapter entitled "Revelation and Inspiration" is especially weak. J. Barr, J. D. G. Dunn, P. Feinberg, P. Helm, and the "Chicago Statement on Biblical Hermeneutics" are all cited, but at the end of the chapter it is not clear in what position Dunnnett wishes to place himself. After stating that the Bible points to "a high view of inspiration" (p. 34) Dunnnett asks, "Does this high view of inspiration necessarily include what is called 'inerrancy'?" (p. 35). He then proceeds to waffle his way to the end of the chapter without providing a definite answer to his own question. Similarly, in his chapter "The New Testament Use of the Old" the author writes: "One needs to be aware of the objective relation between the two Testaments, not only an existential appropriation" (p. 41). No "objective relation" is given to the reader, unless perhaps the next sentence is intended to suffice: "The plane of history is important, and so is the theme of promise" (p. 41). Thus the broad scope of the book results in the weakness of a blurred focus on individual topics. It is as if the reader is in an express train, whizzing across the continent. With scenery passing rapidly before one's eyes, the passenger is unable to gain an adequate appreciation of any given locale. In the same way the number of issues that Dunnnett addresses mitigates against a sufficient treatment of any one of them.

When one considers the book as a whole the same weakness is evident. Indeed, it ends with examples of how one may interpret legitimately various literary genres within Scripture (chap. 11: "Models of Interpreting Scripture"). But the reader is left wondering how the argument of the preceding chapters contributes to this final thrust on practical application. Even in the matter of the ordering of chapters, the blurred focus keeps the reader from obtaining a grasp of the foundations of hermeneutics. One would think that in the flow of the book the chapter called "Revelation and Inspiration" should come before the chapter entitled "The Authority of the Bible," since the question of the Bible's origin is generally considered to be logically prior to any consideration of its authority. Yet this expected order is reversed in Dunnnett's book, contributing to the fuzzy picture when one considers the book as a whole. When the book is finished, one is not left with the message of the writer. He discusses many issues relevant to hermeneutics, but we do not know what he is saying about hermeneutics.

A subsidiary methodological question must be raised. The reader is left wondering how useful it is for the author's stated purpose to string together quotations and views representative of various camps with no direct editorial judgment made by the author. Dunnnett has allowed the volume of secondary literature cited to drown out his own voice. His own portrait of hermeneutics is lost in a mosaic of secondary literature. Even when he seems to be rejecting a given piece of literature, he usually does so by quoting someone else without giving reasons why one stance is to be preferred over another. One would expect a book on interpretation to find its way through the maze of secondary literature with a bit more finesse.

Aside from this methodological question, three matters of oversight deserve mention. First, while a treatment is given of the NT use of the OT, no mention is made of the interpretation of Scripture occurring within a single testament. Thus one mode of hermeneutics within the Bible (intertestamental interpretation) is allowed to eclipse another (intratestamental interpretation). Second, in the same chapter ("The New Testament Use of the Old") a conspicuous void is present in the author's treatment of typology. No mention is made of R. M. Davidson's major work (*Typology in Scripture: A Study of Hermeneutical TYPOS Structures* [Berrien Springs: Andrews University, 1981]). Third,

in his chapter entitled "Language: Its Meaning and Use" Dunnett comes dangerously close to affirming the outdated assumption of the primacy of word over sentence as the basic unit of meaning in a text. He writes: "If we would grasp the language of a spoken message or a document, we must first know the meaning of the words contained therein. Words are the units of thought as they come together in sentences" (p. 90). E. D. Hirsch, Jr., has a note on "the primary units of speaking and understanding" that would provide a helpful balance on this score (*Validity in Interpretation* [New Haven: Yale University, 1967] 85).

If Dunnett's book can serve as an encouragement for the reading and study of the Bible, then it is worthwhile. Taken as an introduction to the complexity of issues within hermeneutics, it has achieved its purpose. Taken as a clear statement on the nature and practice of hermeneutics, it is deficient.

Mark Reasoner

Knowing God's Word. By Stanley A. Ellisen. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1984, x + 294 pp., \$9.95 paper.

Although this book will not be quoted by scholars, it may well find its way onto the bookshelves of many evangelical pastors and laymen. The author writes: "Though many fine 'introductions' and 'surveys' of the Old Testament are available dealing with technical matters of backgrounds and apologetics, simple guides to the content, movements and personal applications of these books are not so plentiful" (p. ix). Ellisen has sought to fill this void. One might question whether 289 pages (the last five pages are lined for notes) are enough to introduce the books of the OT. Ellisen has done so by more or less eliminating technical discussion and making most of the critical and hermeneutical arguments fairly one-sided.

After a six-page introduction dealing with principles of interpretation, the Hebrew calendar, and a basic OT chronology, there are five main divisions: Pentateuch, Historical Books, Poetic and Wisdom Books, Major Prophets, Minor Prophets. Each division begins with an introduction. Then the individual books are introduced (title, authorship, historical setting, purpose) and outlined. Five to ten paragraphs detailing the "unique contributions" (highlights) of the book conclude the discussion. A limited bibliography follows each major division.

From Genesis to Malachi Ellisen adopts traditional views of authorship (Moses for the Pentateuch; Solomon for Ecclesiastes; possibly Jeremiah for Kings). Our evangelical penchant for naming authors of anonymous books is clearly seen. Many might question Ezra's authorship of Chronicles in the light of S. Japhet's linguistic arguments (supported by Williamson and Kidner in recent commentaries).

Ellisen is a dispensational premillennialist. He views the Abrahamic covenant as totally unconditional. This covenant is foundational to all that God will do with the human race. "Though partially fulfilled in Israel's history, and spiritually fulfilled in Christ's first coming, the complete fulfillment of all its elements awaits the second coming of Christ, Who is Abraham's 'Seed' (Gal. 3:16)" (p. 16). An interaction with some contrary opinions may have been helpful here. We would also have benefited from a statement as to how the "spiritual fulfillment" of the Abrahamic covenant is seen in the Church. Presumably this comes about through the establishment of the new covenant in the blood of Christ (1 Cor 11:25), although this is nowhere stated. Standard dispensational interpretations are also to be found in the literalness of Ezekiel's temple (p. 204), the re-institution of animal sacrifice in the millennium (p. 205), and the intercalary Church age between Daniel's sixty-ninth and seventieth weeks (p. 214). Ellisen is careful to point

out that the OT law was not intended as a way of salvation but as a way of life (p. 24). Dispensationalists have been trying to correct this misconception of their teaching for decades (cf. C. Ryrie, *Dispensationalism Today*, pp. 113 ff.).

The book is filled with helpful comparative and chronological charts. The author is obviously concerned that the OT books be understood in their historical and canonical contexts. In light of this concern it is surprising that only one map is included in the whole book. The wide-margin format is an asset for jotting notes and references.

Ellisen is at his best in introducing and discussing the poetic and wisdom books. He discusses succinctly the nature of poetry in general and especially the distinctives of Hebrew verse. He correctly recognizes the major crisis in the book of Job. "On trial is a stalemated religious system with a distorted view of both God and man, that only reluctantly bows to deeper truths of God's person" (p. 124). He classifies the Psalms from the form-critical stance of Sabourin and recognizes their liturgical use. The main hermeneutical problem of the Song of Solomon is given extended discussion. Ellisen sees the book as a "lyric idyl" and says it is to be interpreted typically rather than allegorically.

Criticisms that can be leveled against the book are not totally the fault of the author. Two cursory readings yielded no less than twenty typographical and editorial errors along with a few poorly-worded sentences. One is not sure whether the date 1871 for the end of the reign of Pharaoh Senusert III was a typographical error or the opinion of the author (p. 19). Most historians date the end of his reign about 1840. Another criticism might be what evangelicals used to characterize negatively as "the assured results of Biblical scholarship" among liberals. We are well aware that many of the critical and hermeneutical questions in the study of the OT are not so easily solved as this book might lead us to believe. Some of its conclusions, while perfectly valid, should be stated more tentatively.

A third criticism concerns the outlines for some of the Biblical books. Many are more mnemonic than literary. One wonders if an outline such as this is more helpful in understanding a book than that which the original author used in structuring his work. Architecture often gives clues to meaning and purpose (e.g. *tôledôt* outlines Genesis; cf. also U. Cassuto's approach in his commentary on Exodus [p. 3] and J. Baldwin's chiasmic understanding of Zechariah in her Tyndale commentary [pp. 74 ff.]).

Finally, at least for this review, two statements need to be questioned. First, is anti-Semitism really a sin for which atonement cannot be made (p. 114)? And second, is the denial of predictive prophecy a "humanist's" problem (p. 207)? Might it not be better to call him a "skeptical" since some Christians are now calling themselves humanists?

Ellisen has put together a book from his twenty-five years of classroom experience that would be of great help to an adult Sunday-school teacher. It is well organized and makes clear the background and context of each OT book. A pastor might use it for quick reference and for homiletical insights at various points in his study. If the new *Survey* by LaSor, Hubbard and Bush is above the level of college freshmen (review in *JETS* 27/1 [March 1984]), this book might be a bit below that level. As a college textbook it might be used to supplement an introduction like that of Archer.

David H. Johnson

Faribault, MN

Exegetical Fallacies. By D. A. Carson. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1984, 153 pp., \$7.95.

The author focuses on some major exegetical and methodological flaws that plague the serious exegete. The book is an adaptation of lectures first delivered at Western Conservative Baptist Seminary in Portland, Oregon, and thus it is not a highly technical

discussion but one that is comprehensible for pastors and seminary students. Nevertheless even the expert will probably find at least some of his or her faults reflected in these pages.

The organization of the book is clear and easy to follow. The book consists of an introduction, four major chapters, and a brief conclusion. The introduction functions as an apologetic. Carson admits that a concentration on fallacies can be dangerous: The one who does the criticizing may become inflated with pride, and the beginner may be paralyzed by the fear of making an error. Nevertheless he thinks that an exposé of exegetical fallacies is justified because the end result should be a more precise and sensitive interpretation of the Scriptures. The expert will not find in this work an attempt to catalogue all of the major exegetical fallacies. Indeed, in the conclusion of the book the author briefly suggests some other areas (e.g. the use of statistics and structuralism) that may be used improperly, and he suggests that the areas listed should be discussed more fully in the future.

The heart of the book is found in chaps. 1—4. The following issues are discussed: (1) word-study fallacies, (2) grammatical fallacies, (3) logical fallacies, and (4) presuppositional and historical fallacies. Forty-eight different fallacies are identified, and thus it is clearly impossible to detail them all in a brief review. The book is literally full of specific examples that illustrate the particular fallacy being discussed. This part of the work could engender some controversy, for the author cites many well-known authors (mostly evangelical) and demonstrates how they are guilty of the specific exegetical fallacy that he is analyzing. Mercifully, the author shares with the reader two of his own exegetical flaws. The citation of mistakes by other scholars clearly gives the book a controversial flavor, but it also makes the book more interesting and applicable, for the reader can see in a specific Biblical text the impact of an exegetical fallacy.

The most extensive discussion relates to the study of words. Here Carson identifies sixteen different errors. Most of these will be very familiar to the expert: the root fallacy, anachronisms, verbal parallelomania, etc. The author concludes this chapter by emphasizing that words must be understood in their context and that at least an elementary knowledge of linguistics is necessary for responsible word study.

The chapter on grammatical fallacies discusses the significance of the aorist tense, first-person aorist subjunctives, the middle voice, the article, conditional sentences, etc. Carson rightly points out that grammatical studies have received little attention recently, and thus this part of the book, in my opinion, is particularly valuable. He emphasizes that the aorist tense does not necessarily indicate "once for all" or "completed" action; instead, the aorist must be carefully interpreted by taking all the contextual factors into account. The middle voice is not always reflexive, nor does it always indicate that the subject is acting of itself. The author concludes the chapter with a very insightful discussion on the article, the Granville Sharp rule, and the Colwell rule, emphasizing that the latter two must be used cautiously and in a qualified way, for many have applied these rules beyond credible limits.

In the chapter on logical fallacies Carson defines what he means by logic (see pp. 92–93) and argues that logic is by its very nature universal. Different logical fallacies are explored: the excluded middle, sloppy syllogisms, non sequiturs, inadequate analogies, etc. The chapter on presuppositional and historical fallacies is quite brief. Two of the five areas Carson discusses are uncontrolled historical reconstruction and fallacies of motivation. The former is methodologically suspect, according to Carson, because it spins out an historical schema for, say, the NT period and in doing so argues that the proposed reconstruction demonstrates the historical unreliability of large parts of the NT. But how can this be methodologically defensible since the only evidence we have—viz., the NT—is discounted because of a speculative reconstruction? Carson says that the error of the motivational fallacy can often be detected in radical redaction critics, for the latter

ascribe a theological motivation to virtually every change in the synoptic accounts, thereby detecting a theological agenda when the evidence is too slim to support such a view.

This book, in my opinion, is a must for teachers, pastors, and serious Bible students. Carson's methodological approach is full of wisdom, it is penetrating, and it is clearly expressed. Most will agree that the exegetical fallacies the author describes are prevalent, but there will undoubtedly be more disagreement on the specific examples drawn on to illustrate the fallacy under discussion. For instance, he cites fairly often the methodological flaws of those whose exegesis leads them to view positively the ordination of women. Clearly, all will not agree with some of Carson's exegetical conclusions, even if they are sympathetic in principle with the methodological flaws he details. Such inevitable disagreements reveal the complexity of the exegetical task and the need for further work on methodology, for the author does not solve (or even attempt or claim to solve) all the methodological issues that face the interpreter. But the book is an insightful and provocative methodological study, and it should stimulate more discussion on this crucial area. For that alone we should be grateful.

Tom Schreiner

Azusa Pacific University, Azusa, CA

A History of Ancient Israel. By J. Alberto Soggin. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1984, xviii + 436 pp., n.p.

The dust jacket adds the subtitle "From the Beginnings to the Bar Kochba Revolt, A.D. 135." Soggin writes in a personal and polemic style that tends to hold the reader's interest well. J. Bowden's translation has yielded an English version that is also quite readable.

Especially for one who has read Bright and Noth, Soggin's pessimism toward the possibility of reconstructing a reliable history of Israel is amazing. In a chapter on methodology the author makes clear that he follows recent trends in Biblical criticism and historiography that have upset the fairly general consensus that existed in the field previously. Soggin approaches the Biblical text completely as a modern historian—that is, he insists that while the traditions of Israel may serve as evidence for historical reconstruction, they were "contaminated" by the special interest of those who preserved them as well as by later theological or philosophical reflection, psychologizing, and even imagination. For Soggin it is a given that Biblical criticism has established the tendentious nature of the text, so that greater certainty about historical reconstruction ("probability") can be achieved only when contemporary documents—e.g., the Moabite stone—are available as a supplement or when criticism can establish that the text used sources of an historically reliable nature—e.g., court records. Thus for Soggin the books of Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah "are of relatively little use to the historian" because in them "sacred history decisively gains the upper hand over secular history" (p. 37).

Surprisingly, in his summary of the various Biblical and non-Biblical sources Soggin skips over the NT, though he does include the apocrypha, Josephus, Philo and Eusebius. Actually, he makes limited use of the NT in his chapter titled "Under the Romans," pointing out several places where he feels the Biblical material is inaccurate.

Soggin begins his actual history with David and Solomon. Despite the lack of extra-Biblical reference to the united monarchy, its existence is "probable." However, much of Samuel and 1 Kings 1–12 must be considered on the level of an historical novel. The text views David in a positive light and Saul in a bad light because David was the one who gained the upper hand.

Next Soggin turns to "traditions about the proto-history of the people," including the patriarchs, Egypt and the exodus, the conquest, and the judges. These traditions, the author argues, first began to take shape in the period of the monarchy and were reworked much later.

Soggin agrees with the conclusions of Thompson and van Seters that the various ethnic groups, places, and individuals in the patriarchal narratives must be viewed in the context of the united monarchy or later. He also accepts the theory that the account of the pilgrimage to Sinai and the giving of the law has been inserted into an earlier account that gave the route of the exodus as Sea of Reeds to Kadesh and Kadesh to the promised land. Moreover, it was only during the Babylonian exile that Moses became an important figure in the traditions of Israel. According to Soggin, trying to determine whether Moses was historical is rather like trying to determine the historicity of Romulus. As for the conquest, the tribes of Israel were not actually formed until after the settlement in the land. The process of settlement occurred between the Amarna age and David, but we cannot know much about how it happened. Only a few events in the book of Judges are likely to depend on actual happenings. In any case, says Soggin, the impression the book leaves of Israelite tribal cooperation under a charismatic leader is false.

A detailed discussion of Soggin's views would be out of place here, but there are a number of places where he failed to consider alternative explanations. For example, Soggin considers the Biblical text (2 Kgs 23:29) to be in error when it says Necho went "against the king of Assyria" (p. 246). Yet in many places the preposition 'al has the force of "to" or "towards" (cf. *NIV, NASB*, and 1 Kgs 20:43). In any case, the Chronicler (2 Chr 35:13, 20) gave the preposition as 'el. Consider also Soggin's comment on the statement in 2 Kgs 17:24-41 that the population of northern Israel after the fall of Samaria was mixed and its religion syncretistic: "There is no proof of this, so the description must be taken to be polemical" (p. 290). In other words, since we cannot prove the author of Kings was right, we must assume he was wrong.

The appendices on archaeology (D. Conrad) and chronology (H. Tadmor) are brief and stress methodology more than detailed results. Tadmor's article has a helpful chart of important synchronisms. Conrad concludes that "archaeological data and the text of the Bible cannot be brought together directly: each needs to be interpreted" (p. 360).

Some of the more significant typographical errors should be mentioned. On p. 55 the last sentence in section 6.1.2 has been hopelessly garbled. The term "temple" has mistakenly been used for "palace" with reference to 1 Kgs 7:1 (p. 77, section 2.5). Zimri is said to have become king in the seventeenth year of Asa of Judah (1 Kgs 16:15), but it should be twenty-seventh year (p. 202, section 3.1). On p. 273, section 6.2, the dates involved with Nehemiah's mission should be corrected from 533 and 532 to 433 and 432. Azekah, Gezer and Ono are west of Jerusalem, not north of it (pp. 278-279, section 8.1). I cannot understand the reference to Zechariah 9 and 14 on p. 286 (section 2.3).

Soggin has at least shown the subjectivity involved in trying to relate extra-Biblical evidence to the text itself. He has also demonstrated how little can be known for certain about Israel's history if one assumes that the Biblical documents for the most part exhibit a later reflection on that history rather than an authoritative account inspired by God. Soggin compares his history with Israel's traditions about itself, saying that both are "no more than an attempt" and "open to discussion." Undoubtedly many will want to engage in vigorous debate with Soggin's attempt, regardless of their position on the reliability of the Biblical data. Probably the strength of Soggin's book lies in its methodological discussions rather than in its detailed reconstructions. For this reason it promises to be an important work in the field.

Thomas John Finley

Talbot School of Theology, La Mirada, CA

Woman in the Bible: An Overview of All the Crucial Passages on Women's Roles. By Mary J. Evans. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1984, 160 pp., \$5.95.

Evans' book is a comprehensive, brief and fair survey of the Biblical passages that deal significantly with women. A thesis under the supervision of D. Guthrie was the basis of the work, and the book retains the organization of a graduate thesis. The doctrinal passages in the OT are treated first (pp. 11–23), followed by an examination of the descriptions of women's roles in practice in Israelite society (pp. 24–32). A brief chapter (pp. 33–41) is devoted to the place of women in the Jewish and Greco-Roman worlds. Next the gospel passages that discuss women are analyzed. The largest single section (pp. 61–116) deals with the doctrinal passages in Acts and the epistles, while the passages that describe the roles actually taken by women are treated in the penultimate chapter. A short conclusion draws the results of the study together and offers some general suggestions for the Church. This variety of organization makes it easy to find the exegesis of any given passage but difficult to see a specific thesis until the conclusion. The "bookish" quality of the average thesis is happily not present.

Guthrie's completeness and fairness have rubbed off on his student. Her treatment of the Biblical texts presents all the major options, examines them fairly if briefly, and a reasonable conclusion is deduced. She treats those who disagree with her with the utmost courtesy. In view of the difficult hermeneutical questions that plague this topic, she presents her position clearly but not dogmatically.

Her evenhanded treatment of the texts does not imply that she has no perspective of her own. Certain points appear repeatedly in her analysis, and these are brought together in the conclusion. The central point appears to be that the Bible's teachings regard women more highly than the cultures of antiquity did. From the creation narratives on, Scripture presents women as different from but not inferior to men. Men and women are different, "and that distinction can and must never be negated" (p. 132). To complement each other, rather than to be identical to each other, is the Biblical vision. Complementary roles, however, do not rule out equality in a number of areas. For example, men and women are united as heirs of God. While the "senior leaders" in the Church were male, there were female leaders, and their leadership appeared to be "no different in kind from male leadership" (p. 132). In short, the author is really neither feminist nor traditionalist. She comes closer than any of her predecessors to not forcing the data onto a Procrustean bed.

Space limitations prevent detailed analysis of her exegetical decisions. I found most of the exegesis convincing, but there are still some nagging questions, mostly related to her treatment of 1 Timothy 2. Her treatment of this passage reduces the prohibition on women teachers to a prohibition of *ignorant* women teachers, an analysis I still think is unsatisfactory (cf. my remarks in *JETS* 26 [1983] 286–287).

Two major problems exist in the book. First, she missed some major literature. Evans hurts her case by some of her omissions, especially in the discussion of Col 3:18–19 (p. 77), where the exegesis would have been greatly enriched by reference to E. Schweizer's excellent discussion of the same passage in his 1976 EKKNT commentary.

The second and most glaring weakness is that her discussion of Greco-Roman antiquity is not on the same level as the rest of the book. Many of her sources are dated. She appears ignorant of the standard work of S. B. Pomeroy, *Goddesses, Whores, Wives, and Slaves*, among others. She never cites primary sources of Greeks or Romans (with the exception of Pliny), in contrast to the good sections on Judaism and QL (where primary sources are cited often). These problems are not just mechanical; some serious problems are generated, including errors of fact. For example, stoics did not reject marriage, as Evans claims (p. 41). As well, the ascetic ideal of the philosophers "mostly grew out of the pessimistic dualism where all material things were viewed as evil" (p. 41). Such a dualism is Iranian, not Greek or Roman. There may not be a clear agreement among

philosophers on the value of material things, but there is a consensus that they are not evil. Furthermore the rise of asceticism in late antiquity is a complex phenomenon that cannot be dismissed with one cavalier generalization (p. 41). I was honestly surprised at the serious weaknesses in this section, given the otherwise solid character of the book.

Despite the fact that only four pages are devoted to this topic, this weakness returns later to bedevil her. The discussion of long hair in 1 Corinthians 11, where Paul "must have been aware" that there was no natural difference in hair length, ignores p. 40, where the "the protestations by moralists about the 'natural' difference in hair styles for men and women" are mentioned. More seriously, the relationship of Paul's commands to their environment is not adequately dealt with. She claims (and I agree) that Paul tailors the roles of women to accepted practices within the culture of the individual churches (p. 130), but she never compares the Christian roles with secular counterparts. The section dealing with the relationship of Christian women to outsiders (pp. 115-116) betrays this problem as well. Paul requires all Christians to be perceived as good people in society. But what happens when there is a conflict between Christian norms and secular norms? She notes such a conflict over whether women are to obey their husbands. If secular society required obedience and Paul did not (and both assertions require qualification and proof), how would Christian women be perceived? Does Paul require women to be hypocrites? More importantly, does the tension between emancipation and tradition say something about Pauline thought? These deficiencies give one the uneasy feeling that the NT stands outside its culture rather than addressing it.

From a technical standpoint there are an annoying number of inaccuracies in the book, ranging from missing diacriticals to wrong references. As well, patristic authors should never be cited by page in a translation, as Chrysostom always is. They should be cited according to the numbering system used by the editions in the author list of PGL or not at all.

Despite the problems, there is much careful work here that is very helpful. I have already recommended the book to others and will continue to do so. Moreover, the problems do not invalidate her call for the Church to rethink its attitudes from the ground up. The strengths of this book make it the fairest introduction to the issue (even if one disagrees with Evans' position) and a good contribution to the literature. Its imperfections should only remind us that we still await a book on this subject that combines responsible exegesis, sound theology (which Evans does) and an awareness of the meaning of the NT within its cultural environment (which Evans does not).

James G. Sigountos

Alliance Theological Seminary, Nyack, NY

Themes from Isaiah. By Ronald Youngblood. Ventura: Regal, 1984, 174 pp., \$3.50 paper.

Evangelicals are people of the book. They say that their "only rule for faith and practice" is the Bible. When it comes to actual knowledge of the Bible by laymen, however, evangelicals are often sadly lacking. This is especially true of the OT. For a large number of evangelicals, knowledge of the OT consists largely of the Bible stories they learned when they were children. If they hear an OT sermon it is often moralistic or allegorical. If evangelicals are going to really be people of the Bible they must begin to have a better understanding of the OT.

Youngblood's *Themes from Isaiah*, one of the commentaries in the Regal Bible Commentary for Laymen series, is very helpful in assisting laypeople in the Church to understand Isaiah. This commentary is exactly what it says it is: a commentary for laymen. It is not technical in any way, and it is easy to understand. It could easily be used in a

Sunday-school class for one quarter. Even though the commentary is easy to understand, it is in no way simplistic. It is a brief commentary that is true to the text.

Without getting technical, Youngblood lets the reader know that the only way to understand Isaiah is by using an historical-grammatical approach. Though he never uses that term (it would probably confuse most of the book's intended readers), he clearly demonstrates that Isaiah cannot be understood without considering the historical situation in which he wrote. He lets the reader know that understanding Isaiah means understanding the words and phrases Isaiah wrote. This is not a book of allegorical interpretations but rather one of Biblical interpretation.

The one major weakness with the book appears to be with the apocalyptic passages. As he deals with the so-called "little apocalypse" (Isaiah 24-27) it appears that Youngblood sees little if any of the prophecies being fulfilled during the postexilic period or the period of time following the first coming of Christ even though the Scriptures indicate that they were. For example, when discussing the passage in 24:21-22 that speaks of the judgment and imprisonment of the "host of heaven," Youngblood ignores passages like John 12:31; Col 2:15; 2 Pet 2:4; Jude 6, which clearly indicate that these prophecies have already been fulfilled at least in part. Another example is found on page 82 where the author says: "The kingdom of the world will become 'the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ' (Rev. 11:15), the messianic kingdom. We are now living in this present age, but we will some day inhabit the age to come (Eph. 1:21)." Is the author saying that the present age in no way fulfills the prophecies of the messianic age? One also wonders why he allows Edom and Moab so often to be symbolic of God's enemies when the text does not seem to demand it (pp. 76, 99). All in all in the apocalyptic sections one is often frustrated because Youngblood does not give a clear answer to the much asked question, "When will this take place?"

Despite the inadequacies in the apocalyptic sections, this is a book that will be very useful in the Church. It will not only help people understand Isaiah better but will also help them understand how to study the rest of the OT.

Lee Ferguson

Columbia, SC

Daniel and Revelation: Riddles or Realities. By A. Berkeley Mickelsen. New York: Thomas Nelson, 1984, 266 pp., \$14.95.

Biblical eschatology has never been an easy topic of discussion for the Church. The textual data that one must interact with is highly symbolic, is written in three languages, and spans multiple genres of Biblical material. Mickelsen has selected one of the genres for a detailed but popular topical treatment of eschatology. The genre of apocalyptic as revealed in the books of Daniel and Revelation is the focus of this expository study. His declared aim is to steer a middle course between an excessive, dogmatic interpretation of this material that leads to an exact prediction of what the future holds and a type of agnosticism towards the material that leaves one wondering if these books say anything at all to the Church. In fact the burden of his book, besides presenting his own understanding of this material, is to reject any approach to these books that results in a detailed calendar of events for the end (pp. ix-x; see also the rather sensationalized back dust jacket—a disturbing current trend in the promotion of books on Christian topics). Mickelsen views himself as a premillennialist since he sees an earthly kingdom followed by a distinct new heaven and new earth (p. 235). It would be fair to describe him as a "symbolic premillennialist" since he does not see a literal thousand-year earthly kingdom in Revelation 20.

The book is arranged topically as different themes presented in the two books are examined. Exposition centers on questions such as how big your God is (chap. 2), how God has communicated with his people (chap. 3), why moral evil deceives and destroys (chap. 4), how important human government is (chap. 5), what is distinctive about God's people (chap. 6), and how much God wants us to know about the end (chap. 7). The presentation of the themes moves back and forth between the books as different principles aimed at application of the material are set forth. In raising these principles, the figures of apocalyptic genre are explained. Each chapter closes with a review that ably summarizes the contents of the unit in a page or two.

The decision to structure the book in this manner enables Mickelsen to present his material in a very beneficial form for his popular audience, though it also prevents him from burdening himself with a careful consideration of the contexts of the passages he discusses. As such, this book's structure is mildly frustrating to one who wants support for points made, desires some help in overviewing fairly the eschatological debate, or wishes a consideration of the flow of argument within both Daniel and Revelation. This latter area is particularly important in dealing with the eschatological approaches to the material. One's frustration is somewhat enhanced by the failure to name groups to whom Mickelsen's view stands opposed and his erratic and occasional use of footnotes (Mickelsen often merely alludes to the other side as "some interpreters," though it is clear to those who know the debate that he has in mind futurists like those in dispensational premillennialism). Of course Mickelsen has aimed at a popular audience, but he chooses to cite material in the notes only when it is supportive of his own views. Some recognition of sources that disagree would be a courtesy to those in popular Christendom who are wrestling through this topic because it is likely that anyone who reads this book will be deeply interested in this issue. He suggests that those who hold a view different from his imply that the view they hold is the only possible Biblical view, a charge that is often true. But is it a service to the Christian community to present the other side in the same way?

When Mickelsen handles the topics of evil, human government, the character of God, and God communicating with his people, he does a very good job of handling the figures and raising principles that any believer studying these books can apply. For example, his presentation of an "already-not yet" kingdom is clearly set forth and highlights a key NT theme (pp. 63, 71–72). Numerous examples of clear presentations of key points of teaching from these Biblical books could be set forth from virtually every chapter. Mickelsen has many helpful points to make on these issues and can be read profitably in these areas.

The discussion of how much God wants us to know about the end is the most important chapter in terms of the eschatological debate within evangelicalism (pp. 183–229). It is the weakest chapter in the book. Mickelsen takes Acts 1:7 to be the theme verse for NT eschatology in that it makes clear that we cannot know the "times and seasons" of the end (pp. 183–185, 188–189, 194, 202, 227). The point about calendar setting is true enough. But does that mean that one cannot know about the events of the end or look for them? Mickelsen's exposition at this point seems to ignore the thrust of the Olivet discourse where Jesus told the disciples, and thus through them all believers, to be watchful and to be ready for his return. When one reads Mickelsen's denial that the locale of Armageddon is uncertain (p. 205), one wonders why the OT and NT seem to stress that Jesus' return is tied to the Middle East. (Why flee Judea in Matt 24:16? Acts 3 seems to anticipate a "local return.") It would seem that Mickelsen's figurative interpretation has run too far at this point. When in discussing the numbers of apocalyptic he notes that some are symbolic, all would agree with him. The debate is over which numbers. His chart on Dan 9:24–27 on pp. 200–201, where he argues that the "sevens" is a symbolic number that is "epochal years" ranging in length from 94 years for the

seven "sevens" to 474 years for the 62 "sevens" to 44 years for the final single "seven," shows the strain that an overly symbolic treatment of apocalyptic numbers puts on an interpreter. Such a variation in the treatment of the same figure of speech seems unlikely. He suggests that the number 666 is totally meaningless for modern interpreters of Revelation (p. 211). But Mickelsen surely knows that any figure has a referent to which it points. Such treatment of the text's details is not convincing. Finally, to argue that the repeated use of a thousand years in Revelation 20 is only a figure for "a long period" (p. 206) would be more believable if the figure had only appeared once or twice in these verses, but its sixfold use in the space of seven verses would seem to suggest that the number itself is important. Why simply repeat "a long time" six times in seven verses? Unfortunately, these are a few of several examples where Mickelsen in this chapter may have oversimplified the eschatological discussion. There are points in this chapter about some of these Biblical figures that those opposed to Mickelsen's approach will need to consider, but the chapter as a whole is not convincing if one thinks carefully through options that Mickelsen does not raise.

In sum, this book on Daniel and Revelation is a mixed bag. Where it addresses the character of God, the deceptiveness of evil, the privilege of being God's people, and the nature of God's communication to men, the book is a fine presentation of Christian truth. But when it argues that its understanding of NT eschatology is the middle road, well balanced between excessive prediction and a total agnosticism, one senses it has lost its way—though some of the warnings and emphases it makes should be considered by those of more futuristic persuasions.

Darrell L. Bock

Dallas Theological Seminary, Dallas, TX

God's People in Crisis. By Robert Martin-Achard and S. Paul Re'emi. Edinburgh/Grand Rapids: Handset/Eerdmans, 1984, 134 pp., \$8.95 paper.

God's People in Crisis contains two brief commentaries in one volume: a commentary on Amos by Martin-Achard, and a commentary on Lamentations by Re'emi. The book is another in the International Theological Commentary series published by Eerdmans, the purpose of which is to offer a theological interpretation of the Biblical text by various international scholars, with a special sensitivity to "non-Western" issues. The very premise of the series is dubious, since it would seem that the interpretation of a particular passage should be rooted in its historical, grammatical context, not in a twentieth-century context, western or otherwise. True, applications of the text may differ in various cultures, but this should in no way affect a text's basic interpretation. The first volume in this series, *Inheriting the Land* by E. J. Hamlin, contained a radical reworking of Joshua according to the tenets of liberation theology and offered little help in the analysis of the text itself (see my review in *JETS* 27 [1984] 343–345).

Since the commentaries on Amos and Lamentations are two entirely separate works with no relation to each other, they will be reviewed separately here. To its credit the commentary on Amos is much more balanced in perspective than Hamlin's work. There is little liberation theology that intrudes itself upon the text. For example, he notes that since Amos himself seems to have been a man of means, his chastisement of Samaria's wealthy "does not depend on the class struggle but on the vocation that his God has laid upon him" (p. 4). And he correctly observes that the fundamental purpose of the prophet is not merely to expose the wrongs of an "oppressive society" but also "to confront his contemporaries with the true God, the God of Israel" (p. 10).

The commentary is marred throughout, however, by the author's adherence to a re-

daction-critical view of the authorship of Amos, whereby the book "contains notes, glosses and annotations" made by Amos' Judahite readers between 622 and 580 B.C. (p. 6). Thus, according to Martin-Achard, "it is important for us to distinguish between what goes back directly to him [Amos] and what is the work of his successors" (p. 7). Unfortunately a major portion of the commentary is taken up with speculation as to authorship and redaction. So, for example, Martin-Achard states concerning the opening verse of Amos that "the text here has been particularly worked over, doubtless as the result of various editorial modifications" (p. 11). Regarding the oracle against Tyre (1:9–10), Martin-Achard asserts that "this oracle, shorter than those preceding it, is lacking in originality" (p. 18). Or again, concerning 2:4–5, "this text could only have been written towards the end of the kingdom of Judah and within the framework of the tradition inaugurated by Deuteronomy" (p. 20). Regarding 5:13 Martin-Achard writes: "This is possibly a marginal comment made by a reader of Amos who prudently concludes that the time to which the prophet refers is so evil that it would be better to keep silent about it" (p. 43).

Perhaps the most glaring example of Martin-Achard's redaction-critical technique is his treatment of the closing verses of the book (9:8–15). Verses 8–10 contain the declaration that the Lord will not utterly destroy Israel, a message of hope in the midst of the gloom of much of the rest of the book. To Martin-Achard this constitutes a hopeless contradiction, so the passage "must be the work of a Judean who distinguishes between the sinful nation (Israel) and Judah, which had survived the judgment up till now. . . . We can see how Amos' successors have understood and reinterpreted his message in the light of the new events that Israel had lived through since the 8th century" (pp. 65–66). For a similar reason vv 11–15 can not be from Amos but must be from "a distant disciple of Amos who, under the inspiration of the Spirit, will have added this consolatory ending to the prophet's gloomy message" (p. 66). As evidence of the postexilic nature of the passage Martin-Achard cites similar examples from other "postexilic" prophetic literature—namely, Isa 63:9; Mic 7:14; Jer 29:14. So his conclusion is that "Amos thus remains the witness to the 'No' that God says to the guilty nation, but his anonymous commentator adds a 'nevertheless'" (p. 67).

The commentary itself, when not dealing with authorship/redactor questions, is in general too brief to be helpful. And Martin-Achard's treatment of chap. 5 is particularly confusing, since his commentary on the text follows a "better" order: vv 1–6, 14–15, 7, 10–12, 16–17, 8–9, 13, 18–27. For the conservative exegete there is little to commend in Martin-Achard's work.

Re'emi's commentary on Lamentations is on the whole a much better work. The introduction is fairly good, though brief, and in the commentary the exegetical discussion is much fuller than in Martin-Achard's Amos. The Biblical cross-references are especially helpful, and there is occasional technical discussion of the Hebrew text. At several points the commentary itself was a bit difficult to follow. For example, on pp. 94–97 the section labeled "6" (thus supposedly treating only v 6) actually deals with vv 6–10, and even contains a rather detailed discussion of vv 12–15 on p. 95. But the section on pp. 96–98, which is labeled "vv 11–22," gives no treatment of v 12 and not as much on vv 13–15 as was in the previous section. More careful editing would have eliminated these inconsistencies.

My major disagreement with Re'emi's commentary concerns the authorship of the book. His arguments against Jeremianic authorship of Lamentations are unconvincing (he says that Jeremiah would never have called Zedekiah "the Lord's anointed" [Lam 4:20], nor would he appeal to foreign nations for help [4:17]; but Lamentations 4 is giving the nation's perspective on the tragic events and does not necessarily indicate Jeremiah's approval), especially in light of the large number of parallels in Jeremiah's life and the words of Lamentations—parallels that Re'emi himself cites in the commentary (for example, the poet is thrown in a pit [3:53], as Jeremiah was [Jer 38:6]; he is the laugh-

ingstock of all his people [Lam 3:14], as was Jeremiah ["I am in derision daily; everyone mocks me," Jer 20:7]). And since Re'emi concludes that the poet lived about the same time as Jeremiah did, why not hold that the author was Jeremiah himself rather than an anonymous contemporary who went through the same experiences as Jeremiah?

Other than the authorship question (which, unlike Martin-Achard's work, is not a recurring topic for discussion in the commentary), Re'emi's small commentary on Lamentations contains much that is helpful. It might even make buying *God's People in Crisis* a worthwhile purchase.

Todd S. Beall

Capital Bible Seminary, Lanham, MD

Paul: Apostle of Weakness. By David Alan Black. New York: Peter Lang, 1984, 332 pp., \$27.00 paper.

Of 83 occurrences of *astheneia* and its cognates *asthenēma*, *asthenēs* and *asthenein* in the NT, 44 appear in the Pauline corpus. Yet, says Black, there has been "virtually no intensive or comprehensive study" of Paul's weakness language (p. 3). So he sets out in this volume, apparently a revision of his doctoral dissertation at the University of Basel, "to define *astheneia* and its cognates from context to context as they appear in the letters of Paul and to reconstruct from this data the Pauline concept of weakness" (p. 7).

Following Barr and Hill, Black's method stresses the immediate context of the words under scrutiny, seeking "the plain and obvious significance of the words as the author intended them to be understood with reference to the contemporary situation" (pp. 4-5). Black considers the historical circumstance of the epistle in which the word appears, the grammar, syntax and vocabulary of the passage surrounding the word, and the word's significance in Paul's argument in the epistle as a whole. Hence Black devotes only a brief chapter to the classical, LXX and other NT usage of *astheneia* and its cognates before moving to the Pauline texts.

Black's method is seen at its best in his discussion of 1 Thess 5:14. He rejects many commentators' facile equation of *tōn asthenōn* with "the weak" in 1 Corinthians 8 and Romans 14, because there is no indication in the Thessalonian correspondence that Judaizers or ascetics were a problem for the church in that city. Yet the triadic structure of 5:14, with *tous ataktous* and *tous oligopsychous* identifiable with the specific audiences of 4:9-12 and 4:13-18 respectively, leads Black to believe that a definition of *tōn asthenōn* is possible. He objects to Frame's hypothesis that the weak are the immoral ones of 4:3-8, because Paul's tone in that pericope is severe and hardly consistent with the verb *antechesthe* in 5:14. Instead Black relates *tōn asthenōn* to 5:1-11, arguing that this passage implies the presence of some believers who "are 'weak' in that they have grown weary of waiting for the End and thus face the danger of being overcome by spiritual sleep" (p. 46). Not only does this make the order of the exhortations in 5:14 the same as that of the passages to which they refer, with 4:9; 4:13; 5:1 all introducing a new subject with *peri*, but this kind of weakness is especially likely in the context of the persecution the Thessalonians were enduring.

Using this method (although, it must be said, not always with this rigor), Black examines every occurrence of *astheneia* and its cognates in Paul's letters. He discovers that Paul's concept of weakness is distinctive and radically Christocentric: "Paul has made the word-group the vehicle of a profoundly important element in his teaching and parenesis. Indeed, one may even speak of Paul as 'the Apostle of Weakness.' The title is justified inasmuch as Paul has given a sharper theological definition to the word-family than is evident elsewhere, so that we may with some justification regard him as the

creator of the 'doctrine' of weakness. Not only is every essential point of the NT concept of weakness reproduced in the apostle's writings, but also Paul takes us a stage further by his explicit identification of Christ and weakness, which gives to the primitive Christian motif a distinct christological meaning" (p. 2).

Black concludes that there are three major subthemes (p. 228), or nuances of meaning, that embrace all of Paul's uses of the weakness words and thus comprise Paul's doctrine of weakness. First, "anthropological" weakness is a "sign of humanity" (p. 228); "thus, the concept of 'weakness' becomes an apt designation for the extent of man's participation in the old aeon, insofar as man is mortal and subject to the troubles, illnesses, and temptations of the present age" (p. 228). Black includes in this category weakness related to *sarx* (e.g. Rom 6:19), which leads to human "salvation-weakness," or inability to earn God's favor (e.g. Gal 4:9; Rom 8:3), as well as Paul's references to physical illness (e.g. Phil 2:26-27).

Second is the "christological" (p. 235) subtheme, where "Paul speaks of weakness as a platform from which the power of God is exhibited in the world" (p. 235). Paul develops this concept in his letters to the church in Corinth, where his opponents were ridiculing Paul and his gospel as weak. Paul reminds his readers that Christ himself was weak and that therefore Paul's weakness is not a liability but an asset, for through his union with Christ "this bearing of the weakness of Christ is the apostle's greatest mark of legitimacy" (p. 238). Hence Paul readily admits his weakness (that he and his gospel are unimpressive by worldly standards), but he turns his enemies' arguments upside down: "I will all the more gladly boast of my weaknesses, that the power of Christ may rest upon me" (2 Cor 12:9b).

The third subtheme is the "ethical" (p. 240), which Paul develops in 1 Corinthians 8 and Romans 14. The weak in these passages are those who are unable to enjoy their liberty in Christ due to oversensitive consciences, particularly regarding eating meat that had been offered to idols. "The duty of the strong (those without such qualms) is not only to avoid placing stumbling blocks before the weak, but also to remove them" (p. 251).

Black seems to me guilty of overstretching his categories when he lists physical illness in his "anthropological" subtheme. While it is true that sickness is one of our limitations as human beings, surely it is not Paul's intent to make this point in passages such as 2 Tim 4:20. Furthermore, trying to fit the texts to the Procrustean bed gets Black in trouble in his discussion of Gal 4:13. After stating that *astheneia tēs sarkos* "is clearly in keeping with (common) euphemistic usage, meaning 'bodily infirmity'" (p. 75), he contradicts himself by suggesting that Paul used *sarx* to allude to the old aeon.

Yet Black's conclusions are sound (with the above qualification). Although they will doubtless not surprise anyone (indeed, Link's article in *NIDNTT* lists essentially the same categories for Pauline usage), Black's conclusions are nevertheless significant as the product of a full-length study and one that consistently applies proper word-study method. Furthermore, while many scholars produce impenetrable prose, Black's writing is a model of readability.

I must note that there are a few points where Black's exegesis is open to question. For instance, he posits that *asthenēs* in 1 Cor 9:22 signifies any who are powerless to merit salvation. For if we adopt its "ethical" sense, as most scholars do, *kerdēsō* in 9:22 must have a different meaning than in 9:20-21, where it connotes evangelism. But how then does Paul "become weak"? This problem Black does not even consider. Another example is 1 Cor 12:22, where Black takes *asthenēs* in its "ethical" sense without even demonstrating that we must attach a specific application to it. After all, we do not feel constrained to identify the eyes and ears (12:17) with particular segments of the Corinthian church.

A final criticism: Black sometimes goes on tangents unrelated to his purpose. The

discussion of whether 1 Tim 5:23 prohibits Christians from drinking (pp. 216 ff.), for instance, did not enlighten me concerning Paul's theology of weakness.

These negative points, however, are relatively minor. We may commend Black for defining his task well and accomplishing it carefully and thoroughly. This volume is an important addition to Pauline studies. Of equal significance, moreover, is its importance to the life of the Church. While avoiding extreme views ("Paul does not praise weakness, nor does he develop a cult of the lower class" [p. 100]), Black affirms that the Pauline concept of weakness holds much comfort for the Christian. "Rather than wrestle with God for freedom from their weaknesses and limitations, the faithful see in these the power of another" (p. 247).

But most crucial for today's Church is what Black leaves unsaid. Paul's doctrine of weakness in the Corinthian correspondence marks the death of triumphalism. In a day when one's bank balance is for many a barometer of spirituality, Black's study leads us back to a truly Biblical theology and lifestyle. He therefore makes a much-needed contribution to the health of the Church as well as to Pauline scholarship.

S. D. Hull

Brookdale Presbyterian Church, St. Joseph, MO