

BOOK REVIEWS

Old Testament Law. By Dale Patrick. Atlanta: John Knox, 1985, 288 pp., n.p. paper.

This is an ambitious book, for anyone attempting to write a comprehensive textbook on the nature, content and continuing relevance of Biblical law has taken on an enormous task. But at least Dale Patrick of Drake University and for nearly ten years chairman of the SBL group on Biblical law is well equipped to try. By and large he has succeeded in fulfilling his aims: Anyone wanting an up-to-date introduction to current critical approaches to OT law from a liberal Protestant perspective could hardly better Patrick. That is not to say that Patrick's views would all be accepted by those who share his basic assumptions, let alone by those who approach the subject with fundamentally different presuppositions. But here is mainline critical scholarship putting its case fairly and ironically, and also, quite unusually in my experience, trying to sell the value and relevance of Biblical norms to the late-twentieth-century reader.

After an introductory chapter outlining different approaches to law, chap. 2, "How Law is Studied by Critical Scholars," sketches both the methods and conclusions of source and form criticism and also what is known of law in other parts of the ancient orient. Here he follows standard critical positions. He does not for example question the independence of the E source or the lateness of P, opinions that have been widely debated by liberal scholars recently. He reviews Alt and Gerstenberger's discussion of apodictic and casuistic law and suggests that their distinctions ought to be further refined. There are two categories of case law: remedial case law, which prescribes a remedy when a norm is violated, and primary case law, which sets out obligations without discussing violations. In discussing the non-Biblical collections of law, such as Hammurapi's, he strangely describes them as codes, apparently unaware that legal historians now reject such terminology as the incompleteness of such collections shows they are not attempts at codification.

Chapter 3 discusses the Ten Commandments, reviewing the main suggestions about their date and original form before going on to give a short commentary on each one. This commentary is sane and sensible. He correctly rejects Phillips' idea that they represent Israel's criminal law. He does, though, follow the unfortunate view that coveting is not merely a matter of desire but of overt action. As for the date of the commandments he asserts that only the first two go back to the time of Moses, the others dating from the tenth century. But he suspects that some of them may have been reworded by the Deuteronomists.

The same pattern, discussion of critical issues followed by short commentary, is followed in the succeeding chapters. Chapter 4 deals with the book of the covenant (Exodus 21-23). Here he dates the material to the judges period simply on the grounds that these chapters are presupposed by Deuteronomy and make no mention of a king. The commentary makes very few comparisons between this material and Near Eastern parallels, which would surely have led to modifications of some of his conclusions—e.g., that bride-price was no longer payable in Deuteronomic times. Nor do his views about the prohibition of seething kids in their mother's milk or the separateness of Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread commend themselves.

His discussion of Deuteronomy in chap. 5 looks distinctly dated. The thorough recent commentary of Mayes, let alone recent conservative ones, are not mentioned in the bibliography, and some of the articles cited in the bibliography are ignored in the com-

mentary section where they bear on significant issues. Surprisingly he adopts the old von Rad line that Deuteronomy is essentially a northern document and reflects the preaching of country Levites. He rejects Weinfeld's important alternative approach, and while citing Lohfink in the bibliography he never addresses the points he made.

Chapter 6, "The Holiness Code and Priestly Law," gives more attention to these chapters than Protestant scholars have been wont. He makes good use of the insights of Mary Douglas and Jacob Milgrom in understanding this material but regrettably fails to take seriously the arguments of Jewish scholars for its antiquity.

Chapter 7, "The Written and Unwritten Law," argues that the written law was rarely if ever used as the basis of lawsuits. Judgment was given on the basis of natural justice. The Biblical collections of law are more like homilies than codes: Their modes of address (often second-person), their use of motive clauses, their incompleteness and utopianism all suggest they were not designed as codes. These written laws were really designed to illustrate the principles of justice accepted in the Israelite courts (the unwritten law). It was an innovation of Deuteronomy to insist that the individual laws were binding (e.g. 12:32; 30:10). And it is from Josiah's time that prophets such as Jeremiah start appealing to the written law as their authority. Earlier eighth-century prophets did not appeal to the written law. The NT, with its insistence on the law of love as the overall guiding principle, represents a return to early OT ideals of the unwritten law being primary and written rules being secondary applications.

In this chapter the liberal *Tendenz* of Patrick is evident. The history of law seems to have been rewritten to justify a flexible approach to Biblical precepts. It is of course true that there are few clear appeals to Pentateuchal law in later parts of the OT. But even if there were none, this would not indicate either the unimportance of specific precepts or their nonexistence. The laws of Hammurapi, though a well-known text in Mesopotamia, are likewise not cited in Babylonian courts. In fact as Andersen and Freedman recently showed in their Hosea commentary and nineteenth-century writers like Hengstenberg and Pusey showed in their works there is abundant evidence that the eighth-century prophets Hosea and Amos did not just quote from Exodus but also extensively from Deuteronomy or something very like it.

Chapter 8, "Law and Covenant," explores the meaning of covenant in the Pentateuch, arguing that it has very little if anything to do with treaty texts. While some writers may have overemphasized the identity of covenant and treaty, this is surely going to the other extreme. However, Patrick does point out that seeing law as part of covenant is helpful in that it highlights its continuing relevance to the Christian Church. This theme of the relevance of the law to our generation is amplified in his final chapter. Here again there are many useful and positive remarks, though he does show a tendency to pick and choose which parts of the OT are still useful without really establishing principles to guide us. I am sure a stronger and better case for the use of the OT can be made, but it is certainly an excellent way to end a book addressed to Christian readers of the Biblical law.

In conclusion, then, this is a very good guide to the current discussion of the law in mainline critical scholarship. One would have wished that more attention had been paid to Jewish, Roman Catholic and evangelical discussions. But that to a large extent reflects the rarity and often thinness of alternative scholarly approaches. Time and again reading Patrick one realizes the centrality of Deuteronomy to the whole critical discussion of Pentateuchal law. If only Deuteronomy were not so confidently dated to the seventh century B.C. by liberal scholarship, the whole picture of the development of Biblical law would alter.

In two articles in *Themelios* (1985) entitled "The Date of Deuteronomy: Linch-pin of Old Testament Criticism" I pointed out the necessity for evangelical scholarship to work on the problems raised by that book if ever the liberal consensus about the dating of

Biblical literature is to be shifted. Reading Patrick has underlined for me the urgent need for a sustained series of detailed scholarly conservative works on Deuteronomy and issues related to it if the OT is to be properly understood.

Gordon Wenham

The College of St. Paul and St. Mary, Cheltenham

Job: A Practical Commentary. By A. van Selms. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985, viii + 160 pp., \$8.95 paper. *Revelation: A Practical Commentary.* By L. van Hartingsveld. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985, viii + 103 pp., \$6.95 paper.

Eerdmans has introduced the first two volumes of a Dutch commentary series (1984 copyright) designed to be "practical and expository" and "to provide the reader with clear and concise explanations of every book of the Bible" (back cover).

Van Selms, who produced a technical commentary on Job shortly before his death, provides a simplified critical introduction that notes the book's uncharacteristic content, discusses parallels in wisdom literature, dates the book's writing to between the Babylonian exile (539 B.C.) and not after the fifth century B.C. (though reflecting earlier tradition), and argues that the prologue, epilogue and chaps. 3-31 were original, though chaps. 28; 32-37 were probably later interpolations. He also examines various ways to interpret the character Job and sees the book as protesting against the prevailing wisdom that "a person can trace God's reasonings" (p. 14). Thus interpretation of the dialogues must be performed on several levels, such as theodicy as well as anthropodicy ("justification of man" [p. 16]). This introduction raises many questions, usually suggests at least a rudimentary answer, and provides basic insights for the curious reader to consider. Brevity is the major adversary, since the author strives to make many valuable points that he cannot fully elucidate. For example, in one paragraph he says that the language "is a splendid kind of Hebrew: classic in the full sense of the word," while also apparently endorsing "the presence of Aramaic influences on word-forms and meanings" (p. 6).

The commentary itself is an explanatory paraphrase of Job. There is certainly virtue here, since this approach maintains continuity of plot. While occasionally reaching poetic heights, however, the paraphrase often loses the vivacity of the original. I would have appreciated a commentary that discussed difficult passages at greater length. Though van Selms rightly sees the book as arguing against the traditional theory of retribution, his paraphrase does not show clearly enough that the "friends' " speeches are essentially wrong, since Job's misery is not brought on by sinful behavior. Van Selms does not resolve the tension between overthrowing traditional values and formulating new principles of justice. Neither does he fully appreciate the ambiguity of Job's response, in which the harshness and ugliness of Job's probing language is far from the traditional image of the patient hero. Several specific items in the text needing clarification include sacrifices (1:5), identity of the Redeemer (19:25), and the function of the hippopotamus and the crocodile (40:15 ff.). An annoying feature is the overuse of ambiguous and misleading cross-references to both testaments.

The introduction to Revelation is much shorter, with van Hartingsveld determining that the book was written during the persecution of the Roman emperor Domitian (A.D. 81-96) by an author about whom little is known. Revelation is apocalyptic, van Hartingsveld claims, written in language heavily influenced by Hebrew and utilizing symbolic features like numbers and visions. He argues against the recapitulation theory, in which each of the visions is related to the same subject, and instead sees "clear evidence of a climax in the book" (p. 5), though appreciating interruptions in development of the plot. This introduction, not as substantial as van Selms', does indicate the major issues

regarding Revelation, though it unfortunately avoids acknowledging that apocalyptic is an issue more complex than his presentation suggests. Also, van Hartingsveld uses potentially confusing terminology when he refers to "the prophetic perfect" (14:8) to argue for Hebrew/Semitic perfects lying behind the Greek aorists (p. 7).

The commentary itself is the strongest part of the volume. As a straightforward exposition it makes sense of much difficult language, using pertinent cross-references. Some may not be happy with van Hartingsveld's tendency to interpret Revelation in light of events in the Roman world, but his concern is to understand the imagery of the book in its first-century context before speculating about its prophetic use. Van Hartingsveld's sensitivity to the unfolding imagery is appreciated as he navigates through several treacherous sections, such as chaps. 19–20. He concludes with welcome discussion of theological concepts: Revelation's verdict on the Jews, judgment, the cube (21:9–21), God's plan of history, the millennium, and Revelation's critique of the state. Many may be dissatisfied with the author's discounting of certain imagery as overly harsh and with his contention that John got his prophecy wrong, especially in expecting the immediate return of Christ, but his discussion of the millennium will be appreciated, particularly by premillennialists.

These two commentaries, not designed for advanced study of Job or Revelation, will offer minimal help to serious college or seminary students. Perhaps they are for that character called the "informed layman." I can envision using these commentaries with church groups ambitious enough to want a small guide through some particular difficult terrain. The commentary on Revelation, I think, will serve this market well, though both will require the guiding hand of a teacher willing to fill in gaps and answer questions.

Stanley E. Porter

The University, Sheffield, England

The Servant Songs: A Study in Isaiah. By F. Duane Lindsey. Chicago: Moody, 1985, 170 pp., n.p.

Though much has been written about the so-called servant songs, few evangelicals have undertaken the task of writing a whole book on them. Lindsey is to be commended for his courage and gusto to write what he calls (p. XII) an introduction to the problems and literature relating to, as well as a commentary on, the servant songs.

The book consists of a foreword by Lindsey's colleague K. L. Barker, announcing it as "definitely one of the finest studies" on the topic. Then follows a preface and a 35-page introduction (chap. 1). Chapters 2–4 deal each with one of the four songs that Lindsey (too) conveniently entitles the call, commission, commitment and career of the servant. The last chapter forms the conclusion to which an almost too selected bibliography (2 pages, only commentaries, and all in English) and four indices are appended, including Scripture and Hebrew/Greek word indices. There are ample footnotes (happily at the bottom of the pages), Hebrew and Greek print (often unnecessary), always with transliteration.

As expected from the author and publisher, the stance is conservative both critically and theologically. The color is clearly announced in the preface: Inspiration, inerrancy, unity of all 66 chapters, and predictive prophecy premillennially and dispensationally interpreted are foregone conclusions. Lindsey spends little time arguing for these on the basis of the servant songs. His interest is geared toward exegeting them, and he attempts to show that the servant passages "are directly messianic in their portrayal of the Servant" (p. XII)—viz., Jesus Christ. The general arguments of R.T. France's *Jesus and the Old Testament* (1982) and O. Cullmann's *Christology of the New Testament* (1959) are

followed, while other traditional views are summarized. As to the context of the songs, a heavy emphasis is put on theological motifs (some 13 pages are devoted to eschatology), the historical and literary contexts occupying a scant four pages of chap. 1.

This introduction is, in the eyes of this reviewer, the weak spot of the book. One cannot escape the suspicion that it was written first and in order to justify the exegesis that follows (chaps. 2–4)—i.e., to argue as much as possible that all four servant songs almost exclusively predict some aspect of Christ. And yet, because Lindsey quotes France approvingly, at least no arguments against the synthetic interpretation ensue when he says that there is some progression from a more collective figure in the earlier songs to a more fully individual figure in the fourth (p. 19) and when he admits that neither Isaiah nor his contemporaries could clearly distinguish between more immediate and final deliverance. Hence, as to Isaiah's own limited perspective from which he viewed the future, the traditional (especially for dispensationalists) mountain-peak chart is given (p. 24).

As to the exegesis proper (chaps. 2–4), one gets the impression of reading seminary class notes, fairly thorough but often boring (especially to less advanced readers). While a common figure of speech (metonymy) is defined each time, such technicalities as hapax legomenon (p. 84), merism (p. 51), inclusio (p. 49), hendiadys (p. 126), conjunctive versus adversative *wāw* (p. 132) or an abbreviation such as I QIs^a (p. 69) are not. One happy exception is litotes (p. 46). Such jargon will scare away a number of potential readers. A good number of passages are well discussed; this reviewer liked the treatment of vicarious suffering (pp. 107 ff.) particularly well. Other comments, however, amount to mere rambling. Opposing viewpoints are often too easily dismissed, often without argumentation. Other occasional weaknesses are argument from silence (e.g. p. 100), specious textual support (p. 106), and rather gaseous generalizations. A thorough discussion of the all-important question of the exact extent of the servant songs is also missing (cf. pp. 80 and 92).

Though Lindsey disclaims it (p. 144), one cannot but think when reading his book that Biblical data are forced into the mold of systematic theology and its undergirding hermeneutics. The words "Messiah" and "messianic," for instance, are so dominated by the Christological interpretation (fulfillment) that others simply disappear, especially when it comes to the first two songs: "The term 'messianic' is . . . used in a broad sense of reference to Jesus the Messiah, not necessarily in its more narrow sense of a royal Davidic figure" (p. 141 n. 2). But why make it an either/or issue? Can it not be both/and? This reviewer, for one, still feels that the pyramid illustration is a far better explanation of the relationship between the servant songs, having at its base Israel the nation (42:19), followed by Israel the remnant (48:20), then an individual (49:5–6) and ultimately Christ (especially 53:11c). Thus we have progressive revelation or growing fulfillment until Christ, exemplified in the NT where Scripture (OT) and event in Christ are connected. Thus each text, without diminishing its predictive nature, stands in its own right. There is no need, then, to look for "key parallels" (some of which amount to eisegesis) between the accomplishments of the servant of Yahweh and those of Jesus (pp. 142–143), since the former simply is the forerunner of the latter. Consequently Lindsey could be cured from his preoccupation with fulfillments in Christ of sometimes even minute details of each song. It is the systematician Pieper, whom Lindsey follows, who puts it in this mold. If, then, as Lindsey admits, it is exegetically difficult to identify both speakers and addressees (e.g. pp. 81, 92, 99, 110), why is it so often a mere matter of choice or predilection? Why not admit that certain dearly-held beliefs are not substantiated on exegetical grounds?

These rather acerbic criticisms notwithstanding, the exegetical part of this book is all in all a fair treatment of the servant songs, satisfying most readers who share the

author's presuppositions as given in the introduction.

Daniel Schibler

Basel, Switzerland

The New Israel: A Commentary on the Book of Isaiah 56–66. By George A. F. Knight. International Theological Commentary series. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans/Edinburgh: Handsel, 1985, 126 pp., n.p. paper.

We are generally lacking in good, recent commentaries that bring to bear on the text up-to-date philological and historical insight as well as theological perception. This is especially so as regards some of the major prophetic books such as Isaiah and Jeremiah. Therefore any substantial contribution to the study of these or other texts is most welcome. I am not convinced that the volume under review falls into this category.

The goals of the series of which this book is a part are admirable in seeking to move "beyond the usual critical-historical approach to the Bible and (offer) a *theological* interpretation of the Hebrew text" since "the historical-critical studies of past scholars . . . by themselves are not enough." We agree that historical-critical study, while useful, does not arrive at an understanding of a text as the "word of God" but only as the "word of man." We do not feel, however, that an approach such as is used here makes the matter any more acceptable. What is done by Knight is an uncritical acceptance of critical positions (e.g. the existence of a separate, postexilic writer here designated Third or Trito-Isaiah, TI) without giving any justification for his views or even mentioning alternative understandings. Historical-critical methodology does not provide all the answers, but an unquestioning acceptance of all of its conclusions to serve as a basis of theological enquiry is not an acceptable answer either. In order to provide an adequate theology of a text as relevant to its original audience and to the contemporary Church at least some critical groundwork must be done to determine this audience. This is not done by Knight but rather is assumed.

In seeking theological relevance, Knight makes useful observations. But here too he at times goes beyond the parameters set by the text itself. For example, in his discussion of Isa 56:2b–8 Knight shows the Sabbath as a gift of God's grace, with TI even going to the extent of reinterpreting Deut 23:1 to such a degree that eunuchs share in this grace. This extension of grace to a wider community than Israel itself (see 56:6–7 where foreigners are allowed access to God) is very significant to the Church as well as to Israel. It is not new to TI, however, but occurs also, for example, in 2:2–4; 45:22–23, being one of the themes theologically binding the canonical Isaiah together. Much more serious work must be done before the extension of this promise of grace can be further extended, as does Knight, so that "the unmarried woman, the bachelor, the widow, the homosexual (have) an equally valid and eschatologically significant place in the Covenant." Knight needs more convincing proof that the last category is on the same level as the others mentioned.

The series is directed toward "ministers and Christian educators," but many would probably find the terseness of the text and its use of allusions rather than clear statements somewhat hard going. Careful reading and a weighing of the points made will make the book worth consulting, though it should not be the only volume on these chapters on one's shelf. A "selected bibliography" is included, though one would look long for reference to works by those using different assumptions than Knight's. This is probably more a reflection of a lack of conservative scholarship in the theological understanding and application of the text than any intended slight on the part of the author.

David W. Baker

University of Durban-Westville

1 Kings. By Simon J. De Vries. Word Biblical Commentary 12. Waco: Word, 1985, lxiv + 286 pp., \$19.95.

A primary goal of the Word Biblical Commentary series, according to the editors, is "to make the technical and scholarly approach to a theological understanding of scripture understandable by—and useful to—the fledgling student, the working minister as well as to colleagues in the guild of professional scholars and teachers" (p. x). De Vries suggests that such a task is especially important for the historiographic portions of Biblical literature for two reasons: (1) The historiographic literature is more extensively covered in church-school curriculums; and (2) the traditional Christian hermeneutic respecting this type of literature has been weak (p. ix).

De Vries lays the foundation for his commentary in a substantial introduction. First, he sketches the Near Eastern setting of *1 Kings*, highlighting the geographical, cultural, political and religious features that contribute to our understanding of the text. A minor flaw in this section is the author's overemphasis on the common features of Mari prophecy and Biblical prophecy (p. xxxvii), ignoring the important distinctions scholars have noted (A. Malamat, "Mari," *EncJud*, 11. 987). Furthermore, the major ethnic component of Mari was Amorite, not Aramean (p. xxi). Second, De Vries discusses the concept of sacred history as theological testimony. He shows the uniquely Biblical understanding of history to be focused on primarily two concepts: a transcendent monotheism and the authentic personhood of God (p. xxxi). For the author, the OT constitutes the earliest genuine historiography in that it conforms to four key criteria: (1) It derives its information from authenticated sources; (2) it traces an organic line of development from beginning to end; (3) it realistically shows the interaction between cause and effect; and (4) it offers a believable and essentially reliable portrait of the persons involved (p. xxxiii). Although the text may contain inaccuracies, De Vries contends that the accounts "do not at all *intend* to be taken as literal historical records, and therefore are assessed wrongly when judged by standards of historical accuracy" (p. xxxvi). Third, the author examines *1 Kings* as a literary composition, presenting an overview of past scholarship and suggesting some of the sources behind the book. Finally, De Vries looks at the role of textual criticism in attempting to arrive at the original text. He surveys the available resources and discusses the inherent problems and possible methods associated with the task.

Following his introduction, De Vries presents his commentary on the text of *1 Kings*. At the beginning of each literary unit he lists a current bibliography and follows it with his own translation of the unit accompanied by critical notes. Then, in a section entitled "Form/Structure/Setting," he gives a structural outline of the passage and discusses the text's literary form and setting. De Vries then follows this section with a verse-by-verse commentary and concludes with an explanation of the passage as a whole, occasionally including some points of NT application.

The book has several strong points. Its bibliographical sections are well researched and quite useful for the serious student and/or scholar. Its text-critical sections afford the author the opportunity to provide his own translation, while at the same time providing the reader with insights into the author's text-critical methodology. Readers who may not share all of De Vries' conclusions will nevertheless benefit from his discussion of OT backgrounds and his presentation of Biblical historiography as theological testimony. I personally found many of the author's insights on the Elijah narratives particularly stimulating.

From a methodological perspective, the book raises important questions for evangelicals. De Vries suggests that we interpret the Biblical accounts wrongly when we judge them by standards of historical accuracy (p. xxxvi). Thus he contends that the story of Solomon's judgments between the two harlots has its roots in international culture (p. 58), that speeches are placed in the mouths of Biblical characters (e.g. p. 121, where the

Deuteronomist "makes Solomon the mouthpiece of his ideology"), and that the account of Ahab's death is actually a secondary application of Joram's being wounded in 2 Kgs 8:28 (pp. 266–267). De Vries encourages us to let the Bible say what it intends to say, whether it speaks through factually grounded historiography or through imaginative and didactic narrative (p. xxxvi). The historicity of the events in question is not an issue (p. 226).

In response, I would simply argue that such conclusions must be established through sound methodological principles. De Vries points out fictitious elements in the parables of Jesus, arguing that each parable's message is the crucial issue (p. xxxvii). However, he errs in making a similar claim for the narratives of 1 Kings. The parameters of Jesus' parables may be easily identified: The parables are presented as part of Jesus' pedagogical style, they are usually introduced by a narrator's comments ("and he told them a parable . . ."), and they are often interpreted, applied, or somehow commented on. Not so the accounts of 1 Kings. Rather, the writer presents his information as historical reality. (The accompanying theological interpretation does not affect this aspect.) If OT narrative is to be understood as De Vries suggests, I would like to see more evidence than he provides. Otherwise we may arbitrarily extend the "parabolic" category to any part of Scripture—including the passion narratives, the historicity of which is absolutely essential.

The jacket on De Vries' book highlights the Word Biblical Commentary series as "a showcase of the best in evangelical critical scholarship . . . presented with a firm commitment to the authority of Scripture as divine revelation." The task remains for evangelicals to determine to what extent our historical commitment to the authority of Scripture may be meshed with the critical methodologies propounded in this book and elsewhere.

Bryan E. Beyer

Columbia Bible College, SC

The Wisdom of Proverbs, Job and Ecclesiastes. By Derek Kidner. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1985, 175 pp., \$5.95 paper.

Those acquainted with Kidner's exegetical art, seasoned Biblical-theological thought and delightful writing style will not be disappointed by this introduction to wisdom literature. Although already in print on Proverbs (*Proverbs*, InterVarsity, 1964) and Ecclesiastes (*The Message of Ecclesiastes*, InterVarsity, 1984), Kidner has used this survey to synthesize the diverse themes of Biblical wisdom. Out of fondness for OT wisdom books, Kidner writes with the hope "that all this may whet the appetite for these scriptures themselves and for a thought-out godliness which has the steadiness of Proverbs, the resilience of Job and the sharp realism of Ecclesiastes. In a word, for wisdom not only to study but to live by" (p. 7). However, this book is more than just an appetizer for canonical wisdom. Kidner interacts with contemporary thought on wisdom literature and compares OT wisdom with apocryphal wisdom literature and ancient Near Eastern parallels.

Chapter 1 sets OT wisdom literature in historical and theological context. Kidner touches on the unique pedagogical approach of wisdom, its universal appeal based on the Creator's sovereign design, the contribution of the "Solomonic Renaissance," the occurrence of wisdom in the OT as a whole, and finally the "fear of the Lord . . . that keeps the shrewdness of Proverbs from slipping into mere self-interest, the perplexity of Job from mutiny, and the disillusion of Ecclesiastes from final despair" (p. 17). These topics

deserve more than seven pages, and discussion of the relationship between OT wisdom and law is needed.

Chapter 2 (on Proverbs) begins with the function of Proverbs 1-9 as an introduction to the random collection of sayings typical of Proverbs. Concentration is on the contrast between "Madam Folly" (the deadly harlot) and "Lady Wisdom" (the lifegiver and principle of all creation). Kidner's treatment of the Solomonic collections is particularly helpful for sorting out some apparently contradictory proverbs and guarding against either criticism or presumptuous expectancy of Proverbs' sweeping generalizations. The "Words of Wise Men," "Words of Agur," and concluding exhortations of a mother (balancing the advice of a father introducing the book) are nicely summarized and placed in context as well.

Kidner's subtitle for chap. 4, "A world well managed?", correctly assesses the issue raised by the book of Job. Broader than the question of why the innocent suffer, the themes of the prologue take the reader behind the scene to probe the governmental justice of a sovereign Creator. "Where we might wish to argue that omnipotence ought to have stamped out evil at its first appearance, God's chosen way was not to crush it out of hand but to wrestle with it; and to do so in weakness rather than in strength, through men . . . rather than through flat refusals" (p. 59). Included are theological summaries of the narrative sections and of the three main parties in the dialogue: Job's narrow-minded comforters, Job in his agony and hope, and the Lord himself whose reply humbles the pretentiousness of all.

The discussion of Ecclesiastes (chap. 6) opens with a summary of two interpretive approaches. The first views the book as Qoheleth's debate with himself; the second, preferred by Kidner, sees Qoheleth challenging the secularist. The bulk of the chapter is a concise Biblical theology of Ecclesiastes. Some may have difficulty accepting the conclusion that, to Qoheleth, the prospect of afterlife remains an open question. But Kidner's case, both grammatically and contextually, merits careful attention.

Chapters 3, 5 and 7 on contemporary thought and higher-critical matters promise great value to any who lack the time to survey, or need introduction to, the literature in this field. Various viewpoints are impartially represented, and critical evaluation is irenic. Solutions to critical problems are well supported by contextual arguments and comparison with ancient Near Eastern parallels. Conclusions reached regarding problems in Job seem dependent on Andersen (*Job*, InterVarsity, 1976).

Chapter 8, which integrates the three books, demonstrates that the three are not as discordant as often thought. The outcry of Job is not totally unknown to wisdom in Proverbs. And Qoheleth is not so much completely annulling traditional wisdom as he is asserting the exceptions, a "yes-but" mentality. Each book, however, states its case with "single-minded pursuit . . . leaving any resulting imbalance to be corrected in due course by an equally massive counter-weight" (p. 123).

The book provides three appendices. The first compares each OT wisdom book with its ancient Near Eastern counterparts, an abundance of examples included. The second and third introduce the apocryphal books of Ecclesiasticus and Wisdom of Solomon. Kidner points out similarities and also demonstrates how canonical wisdom diverges from comparative literature.

John W. Hilber

Daniel. By John C. Whitcomb. Chicago: Moody, 1985, 172 pp., n.p. paper. *First Corinthians*. By Robert B. Hughes. Chicago: Moody, 1985, 157 pp., n.p. paper.

These volumes, both by ETS members, are part of the Everyman's Bible Commentary

series, and both are based on the *NASB*. Neither of the two presupposes any knowledge of technical Biblical studies or claims to deal exhaustively with the Biblical text. However, these are exegetical, rather than devotional, commentaries (though the Whitcomb book includes many homiletic comments). Both include footnotes and selected bibliographies that refer to scholarly works (in English), including journal articles. *Daniel* also makes reference to the original languages in English characters.

Whitcomb's considerable knowledge of historical matters relevant to the book of Daniel was already evidenced in his *Darius the Mede* (Presbyterian and Reformed, 1959). Historical and archaeological data are the strength of his new commentary, most of it being presented to support the Danielic authorship and historical accuracy of the book of Daniel. That apologetic purpose also dominates the introduction, and much of the historical material could probably have been better included there. As it is, such matter is scattered through the commentary where it sometimes distracts from the flow of Daniel's thought.

The author's outline follows the chapter divisions of the English text. Each chapter in the text corresponds to a chapter in the commentary, except for Daniel 10–12, which is treated in a single chapter. Exegetical workmanship is not a strong point in this volume. Whitcomb does not present a continuous commentary on the entire text but only on the verses and phrases he considers most significant. (Daniel 7–12 receives more continuous treatment than the earlier narrative chapters.) The interpretive method seems to be generally deductive rather than inductive. Meanings are ascribed to various features of the prophecy and an attempt is made to relate the text to numerous alleged cross-references, but the exegesis of both text and references sometimes appears arbitrary.

Dispensationalist eschatology dominates this commentary. Daniel 7–12 is regarded as focusing on natural Israel to the exclusion of Gentile believers. The "little horn" of 7:8, 11 and the "king" of 11:36–37 are seen as referring to an eschatological antichrist. The Church age is fitted into a postulated gap between the sixty-ninth and seventieth heptads of Daniel 9. Two distinct resurrections a thousand years apart are discovered in Dan 12:2. Unlike most dispensationalists, Whitcomb believes the subject of 11:40b–45 is not the antichrist but rather the "king of the north" (whom Whitcomb identifies with Ezekiel's Gog).

Except for ancient sources, Whitcomb's three-page bibliography apparently omits nonevangelical works. However, he presents a good list of evangelical resources.

Hughes previously authored a volume on 2 Corinthians (Moody, 1983). His treatment of the text is much more continuous than Whitcomb's, and his interpretive method is more inductive. Constant attention is given to the relationship of each part of the text to other parts and to the grounding of the entire epistle in the implications of God's work in Christ. At times the prose style is slightly repetitive or opaque, but the exegesis is never atomistic.

A short introduction consists mostly of a survey of "the key problems and truths" in the epistle as well as a brief discussion of Paul's prior contacts with the Corinthians (unlike most commentators, Hughes believes the epistle was written after Paul's second visit to Corinth, mentioned in 2 Cor 13:2). The letter is erroneously stated (p. 16) to have been written during Paul's second missionary journey (instead of his third); this may have been a proofreading error. An outline, independent of English chapter divisions, is also given here. It would have been helpful if this section had included at least some material on the cultural background of first-century Corinth.

A short review can give only a sampling of the views presented in the commentary proper. The male in 1 Cor 7:36–38 is seen as the virgin's father, not her betrothed. Paul's discussion of head coverings in 11:3–15 is explained in terms of contemporary practice. The much-debated baptism "for the dead" in 15:29 is tentatively explained as "vicarious

baptism for Christian who died without being baptized." Interestingly, the author views "the perfect" of 13:10 as "the church's face-to-face experience with her Lord at His coming." The discussion of chaps. 12-14 presents no polemic against modern Pentecostalism.

Evangelical and nonevangelical works are listed in the two-page bibliography, which also includes works on 2 Corinthians (five out of the thirty sources). Lenski's commentary on 1 Corinthians is a strange omission, since his volume on 2 Corinthians is included.

Werner Allan Lind

Richmond Bible College, Boston, IN

Greek Accents: A Student's Manual. By D. A. Carson. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1985, 167 pp., \$8.95.

Probably the initial questions that come to the minds of many (even those who are committed to teaching accents) when they read the title of this book are: "Why would one want to write an entire book on Greek accents?" "Why would one want to buy such a book?"

Real benefit may be gained from some of the material presented in this book. For example, the discussion found on pp. 15-18 is not readily found in most common Greek grammars, and the reinforcing use of some of these terms on pp. 20, 28 is very beneficial.

There are, however, some things that I feel would have been more helpful than the presentation of an extended list of rules that the student is encouraged to learn. It seems to me, after many years of working with students who are trying to master the Greek language, that we should explain what causes certain accents to be as they are rather than just requiring the learning of more rules. For example:

(1) Carson follows the age-old pattern of creating a new rule (NR.5) to state that the genitive plural of the first declension has a circumflex over the ultima without explaining that it is not an exception but merely a combination of GR.4.2 and the idea presented under VR.2 and VR.2.2 (cf. Buck, *The Greek Dialects*, 41.4).

(2) VR.13 states: "In the subjunctive mood, all accents of verbs in the omega system adhere to VR.1 (the recessive rule) except the accents of the first aorist passive and the second aorist passive." The exception is not necessary since this is in fact nothing more than a combination of VR.1 and VR.2.2. The circumflex again reflects a contraction (cf. Buck, *Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*, sec. 420).

(3) I was encouraged by the explanation for the presence of a circumflex over the ultima in the future of liquid verbs, but my elation was lost on reading the suggestion that the *ei* became *e* because of the shifting of the accent. On the contrary, it is clear historically (and in a perusal of the principal parts—namely, the aorist passive—of the verb used) that *e* was in fact the original form of the verb (cf. Buck, *Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*, par. 188; Dana and Mantey, p. 51).

Carson makes another statement in chap. 37 with which I feel constrained to take issue: "The study of advanced morphology, for instance, would lead the student to 'discover' some 'new' rules." It has been my experience that a healthy dose of "advanced morphology" at an early stage enables the student to operate with fewer rules and leads to a much greater understanding of the language. It also makes the study of the accents more interesting because the student begins to realize how important they are in such a morphological study.

When I first saw this book I hoped that it would turn over new ground. Instead, it seems to be just a reshaping of material already covered in a simpler form elsewhere. It would be helpful to have some of the facts contained in this book available at one's

fingertips as a reference tool. But the ordinary Greek student may find it to be more of a luxury than a necessity.

Donald G. McDougall

Talbot School of Theology, La Mirada, CA

Scripture Index to the New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology and Index to Selected Extra-biblical Literature. By David Townsley and Russell Bjork. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1985, 320 pp., n.p. paper.

The age of the computer has made the preparation of an index such as this a much more economical task than it once was, and users of the *NIDNTT* will be very grateful. The first 263 pages are given over to a Scripture index. From p. 265 to the end of the book, indexes are provided for OT apocryphal and pseudepigraphical literature, QL, some Jewish Hellenistic writings, some early Christian literature, and references to the Mishna and the Babylonian Talmud. The final two pages are lists of *errata*. A dagger following an entry alerts the reader to check the *errata*; an asterisk following an entry indicates that different versification exists among the versions or between one of the versions of the MT.

The book is well printed, well bound, and obviously useful. My chief criticism is the decision to include all page references in exactly the same typeface, regardless of whether the Biblical or other reference in question occurs in a context where substantial comment is made. Of course to indicate those page numbers where substantive comment occurs by using a device like italicized numbers necessarily involves the authors in a certain amount of subjectivity and considerably more work. But from the user's perspective it is tedious to track down endless references of marginal usefulness. In short, we are grateful for a helpful book, but we would have been much more grateful if the extra energy had been expended to make this a much more useful tool.

D. A. Carson

New Testament Survey. By Merrill C. Tenney. Revised by Walter M. Dunnnett. Grand Rapids/Leicester: Eerdmans/Inter-Varsity, 1985, xx + 454 pp.

The late Merrill Tenney's survey of the NT has done yeoman's service in classroom and church in two earlier forms (1953, 1961). Dunnnett has brought the book somewhat up to date by adding a new chapter on the NT's Jewish background (a serious lacuna in the original version), considerable bibliographical material, and various other (mostly brief) new sections or comments.

Many cosmetic changes have been made. Tenney was fond of beginning a paragraph with a terse topic sentence in the passive voice ("Doctrine is emphasized in the Third Gospel"); Dunnnett consistently alters this to the active ("The Third Gospel emphasizes doctrine"). Tenney's *Supra* becomes "Above." Such changes are a reviser's prerogative and generally neither greatly add to nor detract from the book's original substance. At times, however, one wonders if nuance—a Tenney distinctive—has been sacrificed for presumed clarity. Dunnnett's "If the South Galatian theory is adopted" loses both the grace and the calculated tentativeness of Tenney's "If, then, the South Galatian theory be adopted." The latter phrasing is better suited to the context of Tenney's larger discussion.

Dunnett's updating often takes the form of an additional footnote (e.g. pp. 113, 134, 233, 301, 353, 367). At other points he supplements with paragraphs (e.g. pp. 23–24, 138, 143–144, 157, 158–159, 159, 164, 199, 422–423), a sentence or two (e.g. pp. 100, 162), or whole new sections (e.g. pp. 116–125, 404–405).

Thus Dunnett's work is truly a revision, and one that decidedly improves on an already popular mainstay of many a NT survey class. In addition to what has been said already the expanded bibliographies, helpfully moved from the back of the book to the end of each chapter, will be more than ample for the average user, and most important new titles are usually included. Maps, charts and illustrations have also been improved or moved to more appropriate locations. (One notable nonimprovement, however, is the cluttered black-and-white map on pp. 236–237. It may have been cheaper to print than the color version, bound in extra and unpaginated, in the original, but the reader was better served before.)

This is not to say that the revision could not be further improved. Tenney's statement on the NT's use of the OT (p. 18 in the original) is substantially (though not completely) correct and should not have been totally deleted. Seneca's reference to destroying unwanted children (*De Ira* 1.15.2) would be a colorful supplement to the note on p. 58. Where are the more recent studies of Farmer and Stoldt on pp. 146 ff., where there is so much blank space? Whether Papias' quotations of the gospels "agree most closely with the text of Matthew" (p. 151) is somewhat speculative, since no such quotations are extant. It is not clear why Eusebius (c. 260–340) is placed at A.D. 375 (p. 161). Where is Cranfield's Mark commentary on pp. 171 ff. (more blank space) and Gerald Hawthorne's on Philippians (p. 330)? Kurt Aland, for one, would dispute the 1456 date for the appearance of the Gutenberg Bible (p. 420); he says that the exact date (which he places at 1452–1456) cannot be established (*Der Text des Neuen Testaments*, p. 13). The entries on p. 435 are out of alphabetical order.

More seriously, the crucial added chapter on Jewish background is disappointing. What is there is fine as far as it goes, but less than two pages hardly does justice to the apocrypha and pseudepigrapha. Then in the middle of an already clipped discussion Rom 10:4 is adduced in a context that might well make the Paul who wrote Romans a bit nervous (p. 118; cf. 121). The QL material is more extensive (six pages). But the chapter terminates in mid-air, lacking an interpretive summary that readers on the level the book is written for greatly need. One fears that the average reader will not quite know what to make of the lore Dunnett records because he does not spell it out explicitly enough.

Finally, it is obvious that some of Tenney's discussion reflects the feelings and findings of a past generation (cf. the many very old bibliographical references). Yet it is a tribute to the quality of his research (and Dunnett's additions) that omissions or misrepresentations of NT criticism's findings are not glaring. Given the intended audience, the number of critical problems broached is sufficient. More importantly, the impression Tenney gives of problem areas is uniformly one that reflects not a triumphalistic conservatism but a thoughtful assessment of truly problematic data—admittedly ever in the context of a firm evangelical outlook.

Tenney's work thus continues to be of value for its wonted applications (especially survey courses). It fills a gap between e.g. Gromacki's unsatisfactory (because too bibliocistic and partisan in tone) survey on the one hand and e.g. Guthrie's, Kümmel's, and R. Martin's survey-introductions on the other, which are a bit too ambitious for most beginning and many intermediate Bible students.

Other books are in certain respects or at given points preferable to this one for the application just noted, but few if any consistently combine Tenney's serious-minded quest for truth (and therefore solid results) with his well-known spiritual fervor. Here is an object lesson in how active faith and piercing reason may be wed in the pursuit of a grasp

of those phenomena and verities through which the Church first sprang to life. In terms of method alone, Tenney (assisted now by Dunnett) has much to offer the student—and probably teacher too.

In a personal letter Tenney observed: "If scholarship is only a profession, it is simply the dissemination of knowledge which is from the first doomed to obsolescence. If it is a mission, it means the enlightening and stimulation of generations to come as its results affect their lives." Tenney's scholarship was his mission, and his book in this revamped form will deservedly continue to produce the results he predicted.

Robert W. Yarbrough

Liberty University, Lynchburg, VA

Jesus Christ: The Witness of History. By Norman Anderson. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1985, 176 pp., \$6.95 paper.

The first edition of this book was published in 1969 under the title of *Christianity: The Witness of History*. The second edition, entirely revised and reset, is more accurate in its title since most of the book discusses the historical veracity of the person Jesus Christ. The author has written books on Islamic law, the world's religions, and the NT and has brought to bear on each one his legal knowledge and experience.

One might wonder why this book was revised. No explanation is given by the author, either in his preface or in any forewording remarks. Some new material has been added and the wording has been changed in places. The new material does update the book with the mention of authors not cited in the first edition. The wording may have been changed in places to accommodate a more popular audience since the first edition is based on a series of lectures given in October 1969 at Trent University, Ontario, Canada.

Anderson explains in the preface what he wants to accomplish: "to go back to the First Century and consider the phenomenon presented by the New Testament," whether it is convincing or not. He addresses this question by stating that Christianity does not rest solely on "existential criteria." This is true, he says, because "the existential experiences of one individual can be regarded as having no more than a subjective value for himself alone, unless they can be tested and compared with those of others." The author attempts to show that Christianity rests on historical veracity and that it is just as relevant to modern twentieth-century man as it was two thousand years ago.

The book is divided into four chapters: (1) "The Historical Basis: Is It Convincing?" (2) "The Central Figure: How Are We to Regard Him?" (3) "The Roman Gibbet: Was It Inevitable?" (4) "The Empty Tomb: What Really Happened?" The book is an attempt to counter the challenge of those who question "the historical basis on which the New Testament is founded" and of those who say that Christianity is "not unique in its authority of final claims."

The author investigates the evidence not only from the NT but also from extra-Biblical sources. He does not try to overwhelm us with the immensity of the evidence or create a catalog of the evidence as others have done. Rather, he fashions his argument around the most important facts. If you are looking for rigorous reasoning from a professional philosopher, you may be disappointed. Anderson does not approach the subject as a philosopher but as a lawyer. He reviews the various arguments concerning the person of Christ, especially those that question Christ's life, resurrection and deity. The arguments, then, stand or fall on the basis of the evidence that has been handed down to us by the testimony of many witnesses, not on one individual's "existential experience." The result is that Anderson sees the scales tipping overwhelmingly in favor of the historical veracity of the NT and in particular of Christ.

Many apologists will want to know what apologetical method the author holds in writing this book. He does not say. The book has an evidentialist cast to it, but the author does not actually commit himself to any one methodology. Regardless of your particular apologetical position this book is well worth reading and is an invaluable tool in debating the historicity of Jesus. The author, "a lawyer among theologians," has done us a great service in the writing of this book.

Kenneth R. Elliott

Jackson, MS

Paul and His Converts: How Paul Nurtured the Churches He Planted. By F. F. Bruce. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1985, 155 pp., \$5.95 paper.

Bruce introduces the theory behind this volume: "In spite of the vast cultural differences between Paul's day and ours, the Christian mission today faces situations not essentially different from those which confronted Paul, and the younger churches of the twentieth century pass through experiences with which the young churches of the first century were well acquainted" (p. 12). Bruce's theory and title are intriguing. Might we be helped by collating Paul's comments to these "young" churches? Inspired by J. B. Phillips' *Letters to Young Churches*, Bruce employs Paul's letters to Thessalonica, Corinth and Philippi as his own letters to young churches. With the beginning Bible student in mind, Bruce provides an overview of Paul's qualifications and gifts as an apostle and a summary of the situations of the early churches. For each letter he summarizes the historical background of the church, the occasion of the letter, and Paul's teachings in the sequence in which they appear in the letter. He concludes by highlighting the teachings of each letter that Bruce thinks are especially pertinent to twentieth-century Christians.

Bruce's continuing desire to employ his NT studies in a way that enriches the Church today is laudable. If readers desire to have a compendium of Paul's teachings to these young churches by an author with a moderate and balanced scholarly background, they will be well satisfied. Bruce well summarizes Paul's "words of wisdom" "for the problems of personal Christian life" (p. 12). He also treats the Bible in this book as completely reliable.

The "How" of the title and the mention in the introduction of "the *strategy* to be followed in the propagation of the gospel" (p. 12) are misleading. I had hoped to have a compendium of the actions (not just the teachings) Paul followed when he nurtured these three churches. What did Paul do to nurture them? Certainly he taught them about crucial Christian topics. But did he exhort, command, leave alone? Did he use co-workers and, if so, how? Did he stay in these cities one month or one year? The title is excellent, but it led me to expect more than I received.

Although Bruce's book is written simply, he includes some insightful and well-phrased ideas. For instance, the Roman citizen Paul is primarily responsible for the Christianizing of the Gentile Roman empire, which has affected all of European civilization (p. 17). Paul's difficulties at Corinth centered on his lack of use of "learned arguments (such as the followers of Apollos doubtless appreciated)" (p. 69). Paul employs the term "brother" to include a woman in 1 Thess 4:6 (p. 1). When Paul calls the head covering of a woman her "authority" in 1 Cor 11:10, "it symbolized her right to pray and prophesy as a responsible member of the congregation" (p. 85). In the conclusion Bruce notes that Paul "asserts that male and female are spiritually equal in God's sight, he lays down the same rule of chastity for men as for women, and shows a profound and (for his time) quite exceptional insight into the mutual expression, surrender and union of two per-

sonalities which are involved in the sexual act" (p. 145). If Paul should ask the Corinthian church "Is Christ divided?" he might very well ask us: "Why should you call yourselves Lutherans, Calvinists, Wesleyans, Barthians and so forth? Luther, Calvin, Wesley, Barth and the others are servants of Christ through whom you found the way of faith or learned the will of God more perfectly" (p. 146). And most haunting of all is Bruce's comment that "Paul might indeed be a little puzzled if we propounded [the problem of harnessing the resources of the laity] to him; the distinction between clergy and laity would be a new idea to him, and one that would make little appeal to him" (p. 149). Indeed, Bruce has demonstrated that Paul's teachings to these young churches are pertinent for the churches of today.

Bruce has some minor points that need more substantiation. What "language" rules out that 1 and 2 Thessalonians were sent to different sections of the Thessalonian church (p. 57)? Why cannot the "severe letter" (2 Cor 2:3-9) be identified with 1 Corinthians (p. 96)? Why are Peter and James the "superlative apostles" instead of the visitors themselves (p. 113)? I think Bruce somewhat misunderstands Paul's boasting in suffering in 2 Corinthians 11. Being let down in a basket in Damascus was not contrary to the other difficulties (p. 115).

In summary, how Paul nurtured the churches he planted is an excellent topic into which the Church should delve. *Paul and His Converts* is a fine collection of Paul's teachings to Thessalonica, Corinth and Philippi that the pastor or teacher can with confidence use with the introductory Bible student. Although Bruce encourages his audience to read first Paul's own letters, including them in the body of the book would be of practical assistance to the reader. Bruce's clear presentation reflects an extensive knowledge of the Greco-Roman world and of the critical secondary arguments for each letter.

Aída Besançon Spencer

Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, South Hamilton, MA

The Pauline Circle. By F. F. Bruce. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985, 106 pp., \$4.95.

This book is a series of articles originally written by Bruce for a column in the British periodical *The Harvester*. In his usual readable style and with his keen dry wit, Bruce examines eleven of Paul's associates and disciples. Those people examined in detail include Ananias, Barnabas, Silas, Timothy, Luke, Priscilla and Aquila, Apollos, Titus, Onesimus, and Mark the cousin of Barnabas. In addition there is a chapter on other co-workers of Paul and another on his hosts/hostesses. The slim volume includes an excellent index, a rarity in books like this one.

Bruce uses all the letters attributed to Paul as his primary source documents. In addition Acts is used as an historically reliable secondary source that can shed light on Paul's brief references in his letters. In fact Acts provides the chronological framework by which Bruce locates many of Paul's letters.

The book's purpose is not to set out new theories about people associated with Paul but rather to succinctly describe the personality of the people, their relationship with Paul, and their part in the spread of the gospel. At this level the book is successful. Bruce, without undue imaginative constructs, helps the reader to get a feel for each person. This is not a sterile description of the individuals as one might expect in a Bible dictionary; the portraits of Paul's co-workers are warmly sketched. A minister or Sunday-school teacher could greatly benefit from Bruce's insights. For example, Bruce notes that when Paul sent Timothy to Philippi, Timothy was being asked to undertake a forty-day one-way trip on foot, a fact easily overlooked by those just casually reading the Bible. One

can gain real appreciation for the commitment between Timothy and Paul.

Because of the nature of Bruce's approach, many presuppositions about the dating of the letters of the Pauline corpus and other technical matters are simply not dealt with. This is no real limitation for those who possess either Bruce's *Paul—Apostle of the Heart Set Free* or his commentaries on Acts or on some of the Pauline letters. I found the chapter on Mark (whom Bruce identifies as John Mark and also the author of the second gospel) to be one of the most helpful. The insights from the chapter on Paul's additional fellow co-workers were helpful if only to show the great number of people involved in Paul's ministry.

This book will prove useful for those who need a nontechnical but insightful look at those associated with the apostle Paul.

William S. Henderson

Ballston Spa, NY

Romans: A Shorter Commentary. By C. E. B. Cranfield. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985, 388 pp., n.p.

In 1975 (vol. 1) and 1979 (vol. 2) Cranfield's commentary on Romans was published in the ICC series as an update of the older Sanday and Headlam volume. The commentary made such an impact that Cranfield was urged to prepare "a shorter, less detailed, Greekless version" for those who "have no Greek," thereby reaching a wider readership (p. vii). This abridged version contains the essential comments of Cranfield (often verbatim) minus extensive footnotes, bibliography, Greek expressions (apart from a few transliterations and references to aspects of Greek grammar and syntax), and the extensive introduction.

The 44-page introduction in the original publication is summarized in nine pages. Cranfield shares his perspective regarding the textual integrity of Romans, Tertius' role, when and where Paul composed the epistle, how the gospel came to Rome, the composition and organization of the Roman church, and the occasion of the epistle. He generally supports a traditional understanding of these issues. The introduction concludes with a (schematic) outline of the epistle's content.

The focus of the commentary is the explanation of Paul's message in its original context. As Cranfield states in his comments on Rom 1:3-4, "our present concern is anyway with Paul's own meaning." Only rarely does Cranfield suggest applications to the modern context (e.g. pp. 38, 308, 312). The main theme of the epistle in Cranfield's view is to be found in 1:16-17. The gospel is God's "effective power active in the world of men to bring about deliverance from His wrath in the final judgement and reinstatement in that glory of God which has been lost through sin" (p. 19). This gospel is effective because "in it God's righteousness is being revealed" (p. 20). The remainder of the commentary demonstrates how Paul develops this theme through the various sections of the epistle.

Cranfield divides the epistle into eight sections. These are further subdivided, and the segments are introduced by an English translation followed by sequential comments on each major sentence or phrase. The Scriptural material is printed in darker print for easy recognition. Usually a summary of the segment's content will precede the more specific comments. On occasion extended "essays" consider particularly crucial or debated aspects of Paul's epistle. For example, Cranfield discusses the various interpretations suggested for 7:7-25 (pp. 154-159) and after analysis comes to the conclusion that Paul is describing a Christian (vv 14-25) without specific autobiographical reference. The commentary concludes with a brief subject index.

Cranfield's strength is perceived in his balanced consideration of various possible interpretations and his clear argumentation leading to a particular conclusion (e.g. 9:3–5; pp. 222–224). The reader has no doubt concerning the issues and Cranfield's stand on a particular issue.

Although the design of the abridgment is to adapt the essence of the previous two-volume commentary for a wider audience, this goal may be hindered by Cranfield's proclivity to use complex periodic sentence structure and the frequent references to aspects of Greek grammar and syntax.

For the individual who already owns the two-volume work, the abridgment is of little value. For those who desire the essence of Cranfield's contribution to our understanding of Romans, the abridgment is an excellent resource. His efforts will stand as one of the major attempts in this century to understand Paul's message. His views are moderate if not conservative, tending to support traditional understanding of the epistle.

Larry Perkins

Northwest Baptist Theological College, Vancouver, BC

The Bible and the Image: The History of Photography in the Holy Land, 1839–1899. By Yeshayahu Nir. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1985, xx + 294 pp., \$39.95/£39.95.

Photography buffs (among whom I include myself) will love this book. As its subtitle indicates, its contents survey the history of photography in Palestine during the last sixty years of the nineteenth century from the earliest daguerreotypes through calotypes and wet-plate photographs. Those interested in comparing modern color snapshots taken in the Holy Land with earlier black-and-white photographs taken of similar scenes there might wish to read, for example, an article on the subject in *BAR* 11/6 (November/December 1985). But for those who wish to feast their eyes on 110 remarkable black-and-white reproductions of some of the most memorable photographs ever taken in the Levant, Nir's sumptuous volume is the one to consult.

The author's choice of photographs is admirable in terms of both quality and breadth. Although a few of the photographs are somewhat blurred—entirely understandable, given the primitive technology employed in those early years as well as the difficult conditions under which the photographers themselves labored—most of them are extraordinarily sharp and clear. They range widely over the whole country, although of course concentrating on areas, sites and people of particular fascination to the author (and presumably to his intended readers). On occasion people and/or animals moved while the photograph was being taken, producing a semi-transparent image known as a "ghost figure." Often the photographer developed his negative or reproduced its image in laterally reversed format, obviously concerned more about its aesthetic effect than about its value as a precise copy of what his camera's eye had seen.

The topics covered in Nir's volume are impressive indeed. He discusses the work of explorers and pilgrims, of artists and propagandists and photojournalists. He observes that Protestants tended to photograph landscapes and other unspoiled scenes while Catholics were more likely to take pictures of churches and other shrines built over holy sites. He dwells at some length on the special category of missionary photography, which among other things attempted to reproduce as accurately as possible scenes from Bible times ("Boaz and Ruth," etc.). His choice of photographs of the local inhabitants of various sections of the land concentrates on the Jewish populace, but by no means to the exclusion of a wide variety of other ethnic groups. He also provides an interesting discussion of negative native attitudes toward photography of people as opposed to photography of

places, attributable in some measure to a desire not to violate the second commandment.

The sweep of the book allows one to observe how the same scene has changed its appearance—sometimes radically—through the years. The series of Tiberias waterfront pictures taken at different times by different photographers down to the year 1916 (dispite the book's subtitle, the latest photograph in the volume was taken in 1918) helps us to visualize the removal of the older buildings and the construction of the newer ones. The skyline of today's Jerusalem, so different from what it was even ten years ago, has undergone massive and radical changes during the past century and a half. Of almost equal fascination are the nearly-buried columns at Samaria and the rubble-strewn landscape at Capernaum, both prior to the excavation and reconstruction that occurred early in the twentieth century. Photographs with an especially human touch include the one portraying the dignified gentility of the Bethlehem beads-sellers, seated behind wares spread on the ground in carefully arranged display—quite a contrast to their raucous descendants who, loudly and aggressively, press their presence on today's visitors to the birthplace of David and Jesus.

For me personally, two photographs in Nir's volume stand out with special clarity and meaning. The one depicting the narrow passageway in front of the Wailing Wall reminds me of the way the site looked on my first visit to Jordan in 1964, three years before Israeli bulldozers moved in and the present esplanade was constructed. The haunting photograph of Robinson's Arch with a "ghost figure" standing immediately under it recalls the ground-level access that invited close inspection before the current massive excavations that began in the spring of 1968.

Nir's urbane prose is spare indeed, but never mind: He has proven once again that one picture is worth one thousand words.

Ronald Youngblood

Major Cities of the Biblical World. By R. K. Harrison, editor. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1985, 292 pp.

This book presents individual articles on twenty-five cities of the Biblical world, one article on two related cities, and one composite on seven cities of Asia Minor. The cities described are Alexandria, Antioch of Syria, Athens, Babylon, Bethel, Bethlehem, Caesarea Maritima, Capernaum, Corinth, Damascus, Ebla, Hazor, Jericho, Jerusalem, Mari, Nazareth, Nineveh, Nuzi, Philippi, Rome, Samaria, seven cities of Asia Minor (Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamum, Thyatira, Sardis, Philadelphia, Laodicea), Thebes [Egypt], Thessalonica, Tyre and Sidon, and Ur. The authors of the articles represent a fairly broad range of evangelical scholars, mainly from the United States and Canada.

In the introduction the editor indicates that the book attempts to catch the flavor of ancient Near Eastern life by examining selected major cities of the Biblical world. However, the editor does not give an adequate basis upon which these relatively few cities of the total available for discussion were chosen. True, he does say that some cities chosen had a longer period of occupation than others, and a few are not mentioned in the Bible, but through their culture all have some bearing on the OT. One wonders: If Antioch of Syria is chosen, why not Antioch of Pisidia? If Hazor, why not Megiddo and Gezer? If Bethel, why not Ai? If Jerusalem, why not Hebron (where David first reigned)? If Damascus, why not other important Decapolis cities (e.g. Pella and Philadelphia-Amman)? If Samaria, why not Shechem? If Thebes, why not Memphis?

Helpful is the overall view of the life of the cities represented. Emphasis is particularly placed on the historical background of the cities and, where possible, the connection they had in the historical events of the Bible. Interesting information about the pagan

religions of the people is often presented, and the geographical setting of the individual cities usually is given. All of this is helpful in better understanding the cultural context of OT and NT times. Description of important cities not mentioned in the Bible (such as Ebla, Mari and Nuzi) also enhances cultural understanding. Some of the articles, such as on Babylon and Mari, are particularly full and well balanced.

However, there is considerable unevenness in the treatment given in the individual articles. Some of the articles are actually skimpy (e.g. Alexandria and seven cities of Asia Minor). The editor states in the introduction that "the findings of archaeology have been enlisted in order to illustrate more clearly the roles that these centers of culture played in scriptural narratives." However, some of the articles evidence very little use of the archaeological material available (e.g. Jerusalem, Caesarea Maritima, Bethlehem). Particularly in the former two cities there is a wealth of material coming to light in current archaeological excavations and research. It is true that some articles such as on Babylon and Hazor give some detailed information on the archaeological evidence uncovered. In some cases there is considerable bibliography given, including excavation reports and references. But usually there is little source material given.

One might expect that important problems, such as on Biblical chronology, might be handled in dealing with the evidence from certain cities. But such is not always the case. The article on Hazor does not really deal with the date of the conquest, but the article on Jericho does. It is commendable that in the Ebla article the earlier contention that the Ebla tablets possibly refer to all five cities of Genesis 14 is discounted.

One might think that the book is trying to serve as a small encyclopedia on the subjects discussed, but as much or more detailed information and perspective can be gained in articles contained in the one-volume *New International Dictionary of Biblical Archaeology* (Zondervan, 1983), the three-volume *Illustrated Bible Dictionary* (InterVarsity, 1980), the five-volume *Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible* (1975), and in the case of cities in the Holy Land the four-volume *Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land* (Prentice-Hall, 1975-1978).

Overall, however, *Major Cities of the Biblical World* can be of service to laymen and to the busy pastor who might not have other fuller encyclopedia information.

W. Harold Mare

Covenant Theological Seminary, St. Louis, MO

The Uses of the Old Testament in the New. By Walter C. Kaiser, Jr. Chicago: Moody, 1985, xvi + 270 pp., \$12.95.

This work is a major study of the New Testament's use of the Old. It is well conceived in that it handles specific texts rather than merely offering theories. The thesis of the book is that the human OT prophets understood the essential meaning of their passages in the same way NT authors used these texts. There is no distinction to be made between the human author and the divine author when it comes to the meaning of OT texts in the NT. Much of this argument depends on judgments made in the first section of the work on the apologetic use of the OT in the NT along with the preface and introductory chapter. This review will concentrate on this section after overviewing the rest of the work since many key points in the section need examination.

The book is divided into four further parts after part 1. The prophetic use, typological use, theological use, and practical use of OT texts comprise these sections. Each unit is introduced, and then two illustrative passages are discussed. The discussion of Leviticus 19 and James is particularly well done (pp. 221-225), while points made about the continuity of Scripture will be of interest to those who are concerned about eschatological

questions (pp. 172–174). Is “renewed” covenant the best way to describe Jeremiah 31 (pp. 145–159)?

To his credit, Kaiser knows the key points of tension in each of the passages discussed and attempts to address the key theological concerns directly. Even if one disagrees with the overall thesis, this focus makes the work an important study that deserves attention as interpreters wrestle with the theological and hermeneutical legitimacy of the OT in the NT.

The tone of the introductory section is set in the preface where Kaiser opens by warning about the excessive influence that redaction and canon criticism are coming to have in NT studies. What is disturbing is that Kaiser’s definition of redaction criticism (p. ix) looks more like a definition of tradition history. Nevertheless, Kaiser warns that the first step in this move to a redactional and canonical emphasis is the OT in the NT issue. The culprit is a “permissive” handling of the OT by the NT. Kaiser’s solution is to unify meaning in the human authors’ intent.

Will the thesis stand? It seems that the thesis, while attempting to keep a point of connection between the OT text and NT application that prevents any charge of arbitrary fulfillment being raised, is too narrowly conceived to explain the Biblical data. Though the attempt is worthy and (this reviewer believes) defensible, Kaiser’s model does not seem to be the best way to articulate the connection.

(1) Kaiser’s treatment of 1 Pet 1:10–12 seems inadequate in limiting the scope of the prophet’s ignorance to only the time of fulfillment. Though the reviewer agrees with his syntactical approach to this text, the way in which sources are handled is disturbing. Kaiser states that grammarians respond “overwhelmingly” in favor of his option (p. 19). Yet a check of the sources cited shows that the grammarians are more cautious and less certain. What Kaiser does not mention is that when Robertson cites 1 Peter 1 he distinguishes this text from the Acts 7:49 example, saying that tautology may be present here but that it is not certain. On p. 20, Kaiser cites BDF (p. 155) as saying that 1 Peter 1 is “a tautology for emphasis”—but the BDF citation should read “a tautology for emphasis?” He finally cites the lexicon as supporting a tautologous reference, but the lexicon words the entry as “to *what time* or *what kind of time*.” Kaiser is correct that the most likely translation of this phrase is not “searching who or what time” (*RSV*), but the lexicon is arguing that two questions are involved in the prophet’s search to understanding their message: (1) time and (2) quality or nature of the time of fulfillment. The syntactical point Kaiser makes does not entirely solve the lexical issue of the passage. Thus 1 Peter 1 suggests that more than time is uncertain for the prophets, for they do not comprehend the nature of the time frame involved as well. As this survey of the sources shows, the grammatical tools are hardly overwhelming in their support of Kaiser’s exegesis of this passage. In fact the impression of the text is that the prophets searched for the time of the utterance because they were perplexed about the appropriate setting of the remarks once they were given. Only in the searching of their setting did the Spirit subsequently come to show them that what they said has a “not yet” element to it. This distinction shows less knowledge than Kaiser suggests is present. In addition, the absence of a temporal referent is a significant omission that affects the meaning (or else our eschatological debates are meaningless). Of course, what one does want to assert with Kaiser is that Christological associations in these prophetic texts are not illegitimate.

(2) The treatment of Dan 12:6–9 is also problematic (p. 23). Kaiser argues that sealing in Daniel is not for hiddenness but for certainty. But his argument is a case of illegitimate totality transfer, for he cites Isa 8:16 for proof of this usage but ignores in this very context Dan 12:10 where the promise revolves around future understanding. In addition, the discussion in Dan 12:11–12 relates to points mentioned in 12:7. In other words, Daniel sought explanation because he did not comprehend the message of the vision. If this is so, a human prophet can be a vessel for a divine communication, which he does not

comprehend—a major blow against Kaiser's fundamental thesis.

(3) Exemplary of the handling of some difficult passages is the treatment of Hosea 11. He attempts to make "my son" a technical term for "Messiah" in Hosea, when the parallelism of the line in Hos 11:1–2 looks back at the exodus to a period before the king (p. 49). One could argue that this passage is in the wrong category since a typological approach could argue that Hosea looked back, while Matthew asserted correctly that God was repeating the fundamental exodus pattern. Again Kaiser's citation of sources is a problem since the note (n. 11) that he cites for his point argues that Matthew made the prophetic association. By the way, for Kaiser typology is "applicational" and deals with "significance" if only the NT author makes the connection (p. 106). But if the "pattern" of history is repeated is there not prophetic design in the history of the repetition? Kaiser's appeal to the larger context of Hosea 11 ignores the fact that the chapter is clearly proceeding in an historical, chronological progression. This may have influenced Matthew, but it does not mean that Hosea intended Jesus in the 11:1 reference about the exodus. Kaiser's effort to turn Egypt into a figurative symbol ignores the historical flow of this context.

(4) The result is that Kaiser minimizes the function of the progress of revelation in the NT's ability to use the OT. The NT authors read passages of the OT in light of the totality of OT hope, a perspective that Douglas Moo could refer to as "hermeneutical axioms" in his work on Jesus' passion. The absence of a discussion of this factor in Kaiser's model causes his strong defense of the understanding of the human prophet. Yet its inclusion allows one to articulate connections between the OT and the NT without being left to arbitrary fulfillment on the one hand or ignoring of factors in the OT context on the other. These four points in the fundamental argument leave Kaiser's thesis in need of some revision.

However, it should be noted that the book contains many helpful concepts that may work on some passages. Concepts such as "generic promise" (p. 71) may help with Moses' understanding of the difficult term "seed," in that numerous and individual referents reoccur in Genesis as a basis for an individual focus in Paul's argument. Kaiser's emphasis on antecedent revelation only in exegeting the OT text (p. 68) is a needed emphasis. One should work first with OT meaning and then work from it before reading NT concepts back into the text. The suggestion that NT writers may use larger contexts than the passage cited follows Dodd and is a helpful reminder that may help with some texts.

In short, the use of the Old Testament in the New is a complex area. As Kaiser notes, it is too easy to charge the NT writers with caprice in their citations. On this point one can wholeheartedly agree. Kaiser has provided a discussion that helps us to see the dangers of making this charge. And though this reviewer does not think his entire model works or that his solutions in individual cases are always convincing, Kaiser is to be thanked for calling to our attention the key points. With further labor, perhaps evangelicals will move toward finding a more comprehensive model by building an approach that can draw from Kaiser's better points.

Darrell L. Bock

Dallas Theological Seminary

The Uses of the Old Testament in the New. By Walter C. Kaiser, Jr. Chicago: Moody, 1985, xvi + 270 pp., \$12.95.

It must be said at the outset that this is one of Kaiser's best contributions. For many years the author has given concentrated attention to problems of Biblical hermeneutics and especially to the way the NT writers interpret the OT. In the present work Kaiser

synthesizes his research and succeeds in clarifying his views with respect to both general and specific questions.

The book is very well focused in its purpose. Put simply, the author seeks to answer a crucial question: "In their attempt to show that the Messiah and many of the events in the first century church had indeed been anticipated by the Old Testament writers, have the New Testament writers fairly cited the Old Testament quotations according to their real truth-intention and original writer's meaning?" With typically vigorous style, Kaiser is unrelenting in answering that question, and his thesis is unequivocal: The apostles, when they support their teaching by an appeal to the OT, do not use midrashic or *peshet*-type interpretations, nor do they rely on a theory of dual authorship (divine and human), but rather they use the OT according to the original author's intended meaning—no more and no less.

After an introductory chapter Kaiser organizes the material into five parts. Each part consists of two chapters, and each chapter is devoted fully to an exegesis of a selected passage. Part 1 treats the apologetic use of the OT and discusses Acts 2:25–33 (quoting Ps 16:8–11) and Matt 2:6, 18 (Hos 11:1; Jer 31:15). Part 2, on prophecy, examines the way Mal 4:4–5 and Joel 2:28–32 are used by the NT writers. The next two chapters treat typology, particularly Paul's reference to the wilderness experience of the Israelites (1 Cor 10:1–13) and the use of Ps 40:6–8 in Heb 10:5–7. Part 4 covers the theological use of the OT: Acts 15:13–18 (Amos 9:9–15) and Hebrews 3–4 (the OT "theology of rest"). The final part, dealing with the practical application of the OT, focuses on 1 Cor 9:8–10 (Deut 25:4) and on the allusions to Leviticus 19 in the epistle of James (this last chapter, which consists of a mere four pages, simply summarizes a recent scholarly article by L. T. Johnson). A concluding chapter brings together very clearly the results of Kaiser's investigation. An added bonus is the useful bibliography, where articles (and a few books) dealing with specific portions of Scripture are classified on the basis of the book of the Bible discussed.

Kaiser's decision to organize the material as he has must be applauded. Choosing a few selected passages allows for fairly extensive treatment—certainly more satisfying than the common practice of providing brief solutions to difficult problems. Moreover, his selections are genuinely representative of the most important kinds of exegetical questions raised by the NT writers' citations of the OT, and so we are given some indication as to how he would deal with other comparable problems.

One should point out that, even apart from the main thesis of the book, Kaiser's discussions can be heartily recommended as providing interesting exegetical essays on important Biblical passages. Not every interpretation offered is equally persuasive, of course, and one can always find matters that call for criticism. For example, I have real difficulties with some of Kaiser's linguistic arguments, such as his sharp distinction between *dechomai* and *lambanō* (p. 28, following D. Fuller) or his comment that the preposition *para* in John 14:17 indicates "a nonfluctuating relationship" (p. 94, apparently on the grounds that it is the same word used in v 23). Again, his view that *pleroō* in the context of Matthew 2 indicates the completion of events that had previously taken place (p. 52) sounds very much like an *ad hoc* definition; at least he offers no evidence for such a meaning.

More significant is the occasional adoption of debatable judgments without support. On p. 44, for example, he states: "We believe that Matthew was writing for an outside (i.e., nonbelieving) audience as well as for the community of faith." That is probably correct, but the issue is one strongly debated among scholars, and readers deserve more than a "We believe." One must also object to Kaiser's appeal to the Antiochene principle of *theoria*. This matter comes up on pp. 29 and 71, but nowhere does he document his understanding of the principle; there is not even a brief footnote that may help the readers check things out. Considering how problematic the whole area of patristic exegesis is

and how unlikely it is that the Antiochene interpreters had a Kaiserian hermeneutic, one would have hoped for a more serious treatment of this issue.

In spite of these other concerns, Kaiser's exegetical treatments are on the whole quite valuable, and most of his specific interpretations seem to me persuasive. His discussion of "generic fulfillment" (which builds on the work of W. J. Beecher) is basically satisfying; not a few evangelical students, I suspect, have long worked with a similar interpretive framework. This is the way Kaiser formulates it: "The fundamental idea here is that many prophecies begin with a word that ushers in not only a climactic fulfillment, but a series of events, all of which participate in and lead up to that climactic or ultimate event in a protracted series that belong together as a unit because of their corporate or collective solidarity" (p. 67). I do not know of anyone who would object to this conception.

I make that point because Kaiser (here and elsewhere) presents his approach in a strongly polemic tone and as an alternative to what conservatives usually do, and yet the exegetical conclusions in this book do not seem to me to differ in any substantive way from the common evangelical approach. For example, his discussion of Psalm 16 (quoted by Peter in Acts 2) includes this sharp comment on p. 40: "Once again, we must warn the Christian church that Peter's view clearly states that David's prophetic status allowed him to have a clear prevision of Christ's resurrection. Such a strong affirmation blows to bits all kinds of theories about hidden, double, multiple, or increased meanings or senses (meaning) of the text."

His own interpretation, however, concludes by stating that David saw himself as one of the particular fulfillments to God's promises, so he could be confident that even death would not thwart those promises, which would be ultimately fulfilled by the one who conquers over death (p. 41). What is the substantive difference between this and the better evangelical treatments (Delitzsch, Perowne)? And how can Kaiser claim that Peter's words in Acts 2 do not suggest some kind of "fuller" meaning than is immediately apparent from a grammatico-historical exegesis of Psalm 16? Are we really to believe that prior to Christ's resurrection anyone reading Psalm 16 could have figured out that David spoke of someone who would die and then rise again? A similar question can be raised with regard to Num 24:17-18, which according to Kaiser contains an "obvious messianic reference to our Lord's first ('star') and second ('scepter' and 'rule') coming" (p. 184). Is one then expected to infer that Balaam had a clear ("obvious") understanding of the difference between the two comings of Christ?

Kaiser himself is conscious of the fact that, in spite of his claims, his actual exegesis does not seem strikingly distinctive. After dealing with the question of whether John the Baptist was the fulfillment of the Elijah prophecy in Malachi, he comments: "Some will argue that this is nothing more than what most name 'double fulfillment of prophecy'" (p. 88). He goes on to deny that inference and gives three reasons, but it still seems to me an illusion to think that there is no semantic distance at all between the historical meanings that Kaiser himself attributes to the OT passages and the meanings attributed to them by the NT writers.

The fundamental difficulty, of course, is Kaiser's resistance to the view that a literary text may mean more than what the author intended. Now I must agree that authorial intention is a central element in exegesis. Hermeneutical approaches that seek to cut themselves loose from that element cannot be taken seriously. On the other hand, it is useless to deny or to ignore that every interpreter—including the NT writers as interpreters of the OT—brings something of his preunderstanding to the text. Remarkably, I could find only two brief references to this problem, and both were thoroughly negative (pp. 28, 206). Accordingly, Kaiser operates with a neat, clear-cut distinction between meaning and application, as though it were really possible for the reader to perceive the meaning of a text in isolation from the historical context in which he lives.

Kaiser feels it is necessary to prove, therefore, not only that Matthew did not distort

the text of Hosea from which he quoted, but also that Matthew did not add his own interpretation to the text (p. 53). The assumption seems to be that if any meaning is added then the original meaning is in some sense violated. Perhaps it would have been helpful if Kaiser had not formulated the options as strictly antithetical. On p. 48, for example, he asks: "Did Matthew properly use Hosea 11:1 or did he abuse Hosea's context and meaning?" If those are the only alternatives, then of course one must side with Kaiser, but most readers will suspect that this is a misleading way of formulating the problem.

Similarly, in a brief discussion of Matt 2:5-6 (quoting the Micah prophecy) Kaiser states: "There is not a shade of arbitrary exegesis or a *pesher* method of handling that text" (p. 46). Fair enough, but that hardly affects the claim that Matthew, as an inspired writer, may have seen more in Micah's words than would have been apparent to the prophet. And the rather casual way in which Kaiser dismisses the changes that Matthew has introduced into the text confirms the reader's suspicions that not every option has been given "equal treatment."

Another important example of this problem is on p. 17, where Kaiser states that when OT texts were used for the purpose of argument, those texts must have been understood in their original meaning. Then he asks: "If this meaning could not be the agreed platform from which the discussion began, then what was the sense in appealing to OT texts that could be arbitrarily inflated with meaning to carry all sorts of subjective interpretations?" (Again, one must protest that strict correspondence with original meaning and arbitrary inflation of meaning are not the only options.) Incidentally, Kaiser seems sure that the Jewish community would not have accepted the arguments from Christians unless their interpretations followed "the natural grammatical syntactical meaning of the text" (p. 229). The truth, however, is that one need not read too far in Jewish literature to demonstrate that this would not have been the case at all. Many factors other than (or at least in addition to) grammatical exegesis determined whether an argument was acceptable.

In spite of his claim to have the Antiochene exegetes on his side, Kaiser's all-out war against any form of *sensus plenior* constitutes a massive judgment against the Church of Christ throughout the centuries. Even today, of course, most Christians depend quite heavily on moderate allegorizing as they seek to make sense of their Bible. Kaiser acknowledges this fact and expresses "deep sadness" over it (p. 229). Now it is true that the Scriptures ought not to be interpreted in an arbitrary fashion, and we must do what we can to help believers see this. But are we forced to conclude that the faithful have consistently failed to read their Bibles aright? Is there really no way to bridge the gap between professional exegesis on the one hand and what Christians seem to do naturally every day?

Clearly, there are many questions that Kaiser has not addressed, while his own treatment has raised a fair number of new ones. Nevertheless, this is a book to be read. The viewpoint presented here is one that calls for considerable reflection and further debate.

Moisés Silva

Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia

Jews and Christians: Getting Our Stories Straight. By Michael Goldberg. Nashville: Abingdon, 1985, 224 pp.

Within the past decade several conferences have spawned not only dialogue but a proliferation of literature examining the spiritual legacy that unites and divides historic

Judaism and Christianity. Goldberg has entered the confabulation with his volume.

The major premise of his two major works (the other being *Theology and Narrative*) is that "initially all our rock-ribbed beliefs about our lives are grounded in some bedrock stories," which Goldberg calls "master stories." Accordingly, narrative theology provides a paradigm for all the most fundamental questions one can ask as human beings. The differences between Jews and Christians are not therefore creedal. Rather, the differences are due to the identification of each group with two different "master stories." The Jew forms his understanding of life and one's relationship to God through the narrative of Israel's exodus from Egypt. The Christian life and cosmological view is based on the person and work of Jesus.

Goldberg's work is divided into three main sections. In the first seven chapters the exodus narrative is detailed. The second seven chapters deal with the Jesus narrative. The final section, a short epilogue, serves to provide the reader with a summation of the narrative differences. The author has been selective in the employment of key passages in each narrative and has selected the Matthean account for his investigation of the Christian story. The exegesis is not detailed or theoretical. Rather, the author's intention was to "call attention to the relationship between what these passages *have to say* and what they *have to say to us*" (p. 17).

In the exodus narrative, Goldberg's best insights are discovered in his treatment of Moses' authority (chap. 2) and in his explanation of the plagues (chaps. 5—6). In regard to Moses' authority, Goldberg asserts that the narrative portrays Moses' act of deliverance both "thoroughly and intrinsically" in the word and thematic motifs. Specifically Goldberg points out that "even though Moses is now in the out of the way Midian . . . the words used to describe Moses' defense of Reuel's daughters are laden with meaning: *veyoshia*—'and he saved them'—and *hitsilanu*—'and he rescued us'" (p. 43).

This idea of Moses' authority is also recognized as being divinely ordained through the literary motif of the plagues. Goldberg writes that "all through the course of the Master story as a whole: comprehending the narrative structure as a whole lies not so much in looking for strict logical connections as for tight literary ones" (p. 70). He asserts that the motif of the plagues is not a progressive worsening but a literary progression that culminates in the reversal of authoritative roles between Moses and Pharaoh. This role reversal is seen in Israel herself, where initially she must bear the brunt of the plagues. Finally she is spared the suffering that accompanies the remaining plagues. In the final plague the Israelites are called upon to become active participants in achieving their salvation. "Thus the two are yoked together as co-partners in redemption" (p. 101).

Goldberg's narrative exposition of Matthew identifies a Mosaic parallel in the Christian master story. The tyranny of Herod, from which Jesus is rescued, and the forced entrance into the wilderness by the Holy Spirit for the temptations have their corresponding parallel in the exodus story of Moses. However, the Christian story takes a slight thematic turn with the disclosure of Jesus' message. No longer is the cry "Let my people go"; rather, the message is "Repent." No longer is the crux of Israel's problem an alien oppressor. The problem lies within Israel herself. The solution is therefore not within the ability or inclination of Israel, and the concept of co-partners in redemption ceases within the Christian master story.

For Goldberg the differences between Jews and Christians have at their heart the differing conceptualizations of the partnership of God and man as revealer-receiver. For the Jew, God came down to the mountain to meet Moses and at the same time Moses went up the mountain to meet God. The Christian sees only the efficacious work of grace in Christ Jesus.

The interaction between Jews and Christians has been historically wrought with pain, misunderstanding and skepticism. Goldberg's volume will provide the reader with midrashic insight into the exposition of the exodus narrative. However, this reviewer

must pause and ask, "Why not employ the gospel of John in the exposure of Mosaic parallels and the radical departure of Jesus' message to Israel?" It is true that the Matthean account, being the most Jewish of the synoptics, does contain OT parallels. However, strong cases have been made that John's gospel shows Jesus to be the true prophet like Moses (Deuteronomy 18). This criticism does not devalue the worth of Goldberg's work.

John M. Kenney

The Stony Brook School, NY

Raised Immortal: Resurrection and Immortality in the New Testament. By Murray J. Harris. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985, 304 pp., \$10.95 paper.

This volume is part of the New Foundations Theological Library published in England by Marshall, Morgan and Scott and by arrangement in the United States by John Knox Press. Some of the well-known titles in this series are *Old Testament Theology* by Ronald Clements, *New Testament Prophecy* by David Hill, *Divine Sovereignty and Human Responsibility* by D. A. Carson, and *Reconciliation* by Ralph Martin. Gratitude should be expressed to Eerdmans for publishing this title by Harris in lieu of an apparent editorial decision on the part of John Knox to discontinue publishing the series.

The basic thesis of this book is twofold: (1) Resurrection and immortality are inseparable ideas. Although the terms are not synonymous, neither are they antithetical. (2) Resurrection and immortality are complementary ideas. Resurrection ensures that Christian immortality is regarded as personal rather than as ideal, racial or pantheistic; as corporate rather than individualistic; and as somatic rather than spiritual (p. 234). Hence the idea of "the immortality of the soul" is a pagan Greek concept and should have no place in Christian terminology (p. 237).

Harris develops his thesis by exploring five topics through eight chapters. Chapters 1-3 discuss the resurrection of Christ. Chapters 4-5 examine the resurrection of believers. Chapter 6 evaluates the phrase "The General Resurrection." Chapter 7 explores the immortality of God and man in the NT, and chap. 8 probes the relation between resurrection and immortality in the NT. A ninth chapter formulates conclusions. Two appendices on "The Terminology of Resurrection in the New Testament" and "The Terminology of Immortality in the New Testament" follow. The book concludes with a select bibliography and four indices: modern authors, subjects, references, and principal Greek words.

The reviewer not only appreciated the careful exegesis and theological depth of the discussion but also the great pastoral value of the subject matter. Having experienced the death of loved ones and the imminent prospect of death personally, the reviewer was once again reminded through reading Harris' exposition of the great provision God has made for his people through the person and work of Christ, especially in terms of his resurrection, exaltation, ascension and *parousia*.

Harris states his purpose on p. 2: "To examine not only the New Testament data on resurrection and on immortality as separate themes, but also, and more importantly, the relation between these two ideas in New Testament teaching."

He begins by examining five major NT passages on the resurrection of Christ: 1 Cor 15:1-11; Mark 16:1-8; Matt 28:1-20; Luke 24:1-53; John 20:1-21:23. The discussion interacts with the work done by Grass, Bode, Evans, Fuller, Leon-Dufour and Rigaux. Significant conclusions are: Verses 9-20 of Mark 16 "were almost certainly not in the original text of the gospel" (p. 14). The resurrection narratives should be approached from the standpoint of motive and purpose rather than the reconstructed stages of for-

mation of the narratives. These purposes were apologetic, liturgical, evangelistic, Christological, ecclesiastical and missionary (pp. 35–36).

Chapter 2 develops the resurrection of Christ from four standpoints: the empty tomb, the appearances, the nature of Christ's resurrection body, and the question of historicity. Significant conclusions: Although an empty tomb does not demand faith, when interpreted it may serve as the ground for faith in Christ (p. 43). The appearances were in part accommodations to human faithlessness (p. 49). The order of appearances geographically was probably Jerusalem-Galilee-Jerusalem (p. 52). The appearances of Jesus after his resurrection were incursions into the material, visible world from the spiritual, invisible world. This shows the radical change in resurrection to a new mode of existence (pp. 56–57). NT scholars have given up too easily in attempting to harmonize the resurrection narratives. A suggested schema by Harris follows on pp. 69–71.

Chapter 3 is organized around four points: the resurrection as vindication; resurrection and exaltation; resurrection and ascension; and resurrection, the new age, and the coming of the Spirit and power. A critical need, according to Harris, is to distinguish between the exaltation and the ascension of Jesus. They are not the same. The exaltation took place on Easter. The ascension took place forty days later.

The next two chapters discuss the resurrection of believers. Conclusions here will continue to provoke controversy: There is an inner spiritual resurrection at regeneration and an outer somatic one either at death or at the *parousia*. 2 Corinthians 5 refers to the somatic resurrection, not to an "intermediate body" or heaven itself. Although Harris leaves the options open for death or *parousia* as the time of resurrection, he himself inclines toward the death view (p. 100). The continuity between the present body and the future body is personal, not material (p. 126). 2 Cor 5:8; Phil 1:23 clearly teach personal fellowship with Christ after death. The person survives death, not the "soul" (p. 140). The Christian dead are in heaven. References to Hades are from the perspective of men living on the earth (pp. 141–142). It is not possible to determine whether the "non-human cosmos" will experience re-creation or be replaced by a new creation (pp. 168–171).

Chapter 6 discusses the appropriateness and inappropriateness of the words "General Resurrection." Harris argues that the term "resurrection" has such positive connotations when applied to believers that it must be employed with careful qualifications if applied to unbelievers. Unbelievers do appear before God for judgment in "some undisclosed bodily form that permits continuity of personal identity" (p. 177). But resurrection is not a "soteriologically neutral term signifying reanimation"; it is a "positive concept denoting the receipt of permanent spiritual embodiment comparable to Christ's, and the enjoyment of eternal life." Therefore, the two resurrections—to life, to judgment—depicted in John 5:29 as occurring simultaneously may be separated by a protracted interval according to Rev 20:4–6. Conclusions here are uncertain, involving the whole question of a millennium on earth following the *parousia*.

The last section of the book develops the doctrine of immortality. There is a critical need, according to Harris, to distinguish between these two terms. Immortality is possessed only by God (1 Tim 6:16), who alone can grant immortality to man. Man is not immortal and does not have an immortal soul (pp. 190–191). This immortality will be received as a gift from God to believers in Jesus Christ at the resurrection of believers in the last day (p. 196). At that point living believers will be transformed and dead believers resurrected (p. 216).

In conclusion Harris denounces any disjunction between resurrection and immortality in NT theology. Immortality guarantees that resurrection is seen as a state rather than as simply an event, it shows resurrection as a permanent rather than as a temporary condition, and it supports resurrection as a transformed state sustained by the life and power of God.

This is a very stimulating book. Readers may fault it on this point or that, but the reviewer enjoyed reading it and recommends it to anyone who is interested in the subject.

Carl B. Hoch, Jr.

Grand Rapids Baptist Seminary, MI

Church, Ministry, and Sacraments in the New Testament. By C. K. Barrett. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985, 110 pp., n.p.

This slender volume comprises the Didsbury Lectures, delivered by Barrett to the British Isles Nazarene College in November 1983. All four lectures underscore a paradox, the theme of the book: "In the New Testament the church is at the same time central and peripheral" (p. 9). The inference drawn from this paradox is that error arises when either one or the other limb of the paradox is neglected.

As the title indicates, the argument investigates the concept of the Church, its ministry, and its sacraments, from the thought of Jesus into the *Frühkatholizismus*. Barrett sees no evidence that Jesus anticipated the Church as it exists today, "extending through at least nineteen and a half centuries and still showing no sign of coming to an end" (p. 24). He allows some evidence that Jesus contemplated a short waiting period between the resurrection and the *parousia*—"perhaps a single generation" (p. 24). The resurrection and the *parousia* are a different matter, however. They constitute what Jesus clearly proclaimed: God's vindication of his suffering and death. But there is the rub: "The resurrection happened; the *parousia* did not" (p. 24). This left Jesus' followers with a great deal to sort through.

At this point Barrett draws heavily upon the now commonplace "two-age motif." It proves to be in a nutshell the essence of the paradox that Barrett is espousing. There is little or no difficulty defining Israel, the people of God, in the OT. Nor again is it difficult to imagine the final state of the people of God in heaven. "But what of the church, which is neither the one of these things nor the other" (p. 14)? Barrett calls it "an eschatological monster." It is, I think, an unfortunate choice of expressions. But he means by it no irreverence, only that it escapes normal categories. It is not easily, if at all, describable. It was not only undesirable but perhaps impossible for the followers of Jesus not to seek fellowship. But how does such a fellowship, called into existence as it is by the hope of immediate translation and eternal fellowship, function in the interim? It is not as though what transpires in this "interim" is unimportant. On the contrary, God appears to be using the present anguish to prepare his people for eternal bliss, "so that what appears an interlude, peripheral to God's purposes, becomes central and indispensable" (p. 25). Nor is it that the fellowship can be dispensed with. "There is no part of the New Testament that does not attach some kind of significance to the fellowship of the followers of Jesus; but there is at the same time something provisional, temporary, penultimate, about who they are and what they do" (p. 13). Moreover, it is the tendency of the Church to take on Babylonian qualities while in exile, but these qualities, which appear foreign and peripheral, serve the Church in expressing the death and life of Jesus. So it was with the ministry and sacraments.

By the end of the NT period, says Barrett, something like what we now call "the ministry" was beginning to emerge. But this development itself underscores the paradox of which he is speaking. Ministry in its truest sense was entirely egalitarian. The Holy Spirit bestowed *charismata* as he willed. All Christians were ministers in this sense. Such a ministry "is of divine origin and authority; it is not amenable to human organization; it is spontaneous and free; it is in no sense hierarchical and carries with it only such authority as is inherent in the immediacy of the Spirit's action" (p. 35). But so long

as a community exists in this world the question of leadership will emerge, and it did for the Christian community as well. The "ministry" emerged only gradually, the *presbyteroi* being at first only and literally "the elders." Other functions such as the *diakonia* may have been *ad hoc* appointments of the Holy Spirit (even if through community prayer). In its effort to be true to its *raison d'être* the Church utilized both spiritual and "worldly" criteria: spiritual gifts, age, social position, wealth. "There is little or no attempt to deny that these exist, or to allege that they are of the devil—that would eliminate one wing of the paradox; but they are never allowed to run away with the church—that would eliminate the other" (p. 53).

Likewise, on the surface the rites of immersion and communal meals were not much different from the initiatory and sacrificial rites of other communities. Barrett even makes a good case for conditioned expectations on the part of early Christian converts. Thus Paul and John may well have been combating *ex opere operato* views of the sacraments. Both Paul and John (each differently, owing to different contexts) argue against such views and so "hold baptism and the supper to the central Christian fact of Christ crucified and risen that the two actions become central manifestations of the essential pattern of Christian existence" (p. 75). It is necessary to hold to the paradox, says Barrett, such that the sacraments, which always hover on the brink of the banal and perverse, should be the focus of eternal Christian promises.

Barrett goes on to demonstrate how attempts to resolve this essential paradox of centrality and peripherality shaped *Frühkatholizismus*. "Early catholicism" includes more of the so-called "late" NT than I would allow, but his point is well taken. The second-century Church evidences a more developed (perhaps better, "modern") sense of ministry, and has codified its sacraments—that is, it has attempted to determine their efficacy and validity. Its quest for security led it inevitably to self-control. But Barrett's point, though sympathetically made, is critical and challenging. By its very nature the Church cannot gain this natural but worldly kind of security without forfeiting its true ground of existence. The Church really is a company of pilgrims. It needs not so much guarantees of its permanence as reminders of its temporariness. "The church had and has an impossible task, for it can affirm itself only at the cost of denying its own proper being" (p. 78).

Barrett's work has much to commend it. It reads well, like the collection of lectures it is, with a minimum of footnotes—and all foreign terms translated for the benefit of the nonprofessional. Moreover, limited as it is to the first two hundred years of Christianity, his contrast between the first century and *Frühkatholizismus* is not directed in any specific way to Rome. Protestants in general, and evangelicals in particular, merit the criticism of having become too comfortable in this age. The worship of the Church—indeed, the Church itself—is led, directed, even "controlled" by the ministry. The problem, exclaims Barrett, is that "except in the sense that every Christian is a minister, a servant, of Christ in the church, the ministry could be dispensed with" (p. 54). Barrett is not advocating that we relinquish all attempts at leadership. Rather, leadership functions properly when it sees itself as peripheral to the larger purposes of the Church, just as the Church functions properly when it sees itself as peripheral to the larger purposes of God. Most—perhaps all—of the "functions," "services" and "ministries" of the NT originated with the Holy Spirit. *Charismata*, gifts of divine grace, are bestowed and directed by him. "Paul describes the worship of the church as arising not from a liturgical order but from spontaneously offered contributions springing from the whole company" (p. 35).

But how do we replace or subordinate our natural criteria for ministry, sacraments, etc., with the supremely important guidance of the Holy Spirit? How do we risk allowing the Holy Spirit free rein in our worship services—indeed, in our lives—without losing the sense of doing things "decently and in order" (i.e., without losing control)? It is true but trite to say that we must relinquish control in order for the Holy Spirit to have his

way. Control may be relinquished for good or evil, as Paul discovered at Corinth.

It is at this point that Barrett is not as helpful. He has raised a number of poignant questions but has offered few answers. On the one hand this cannot be considered a deficiency. He specifically states that drawing practical implications was beyond his objectives; "there was no time for this in the Lectures," he pleads (p. 8). On the other hand a work that concludes that we have not taken the NT seriously enough, that asks essentially "whether we have learnt to balance our peripherality against our centrality" (p. 101), is in my opinion obligated to proffer some suggestions as to how this balancing act should be performed. They are not here. The book can be recommended, therefore, to those willing and able to tie these loose ends together on their own. There is plenty of latitude for resolving these dilemmas. Barrett has boxed no one in. Rather, he stirs the imagination and stimulates creative thinking, and he does it very well.

Robert W. Herron, Jr.

Lee College, Cleveland, TN

Beyond the Curse: Women Called to Ministry. By Aída Besançon Spencer. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1985, 223 pp., \$10.95.

Spencer clearly states her purpose in the introduction: "The authoritative and reliable Scriptures are exegetically studied in depth to ascertain exactly why women are and should be called to minister as leaders" (p. 13).

Beginning in the beginning, Spencer acknowledges Genesis 1—2 as foundational for understanding male-female relationships. Her conclusion is that "Genesis 2, like Genesis 1, declares and explains male and female equality, joint rulership and interrelationship" (p. 29). This statement is true insofar as it goes, but it does not necessarily explain how men/husbands and women/wives relate to each other. Their equality in terms of personhood or being in the image of God and in relation to creation is a point well taken by Spencer. However, she does not consider Paul's interpretation of Genesis 2 (1 Tim 2:12—13; 1 Cor 11:7—9) in her explanation of Genesis 1—3 in this section. According to Paul, Adam's prior creation is part of the reason for restricting the woman's role in teaching and exercising authority, and it establishes his headship in marriage, which is the reason for the wife's submission to her husband (Eph 5:23). Spencer does not discuss the marriage relationship in depth because of her focus on women in ministry.

From Genesis 1, Spencer infers that "male and female are needed to reflect God's nature" (p. 21). Neither man nor woman can do it alone. This view overlooks the fact that elsewhere in Scripture the image of God is not related to the male-female relationship (Eph 4:24; Col 3:10). Spencer's view also raises the question of how single persons can mirror God's image. She uses this theory to support her view of women in the ministry. "Females as well as males are needed in positions of authority in the church to help people better to comprehend God's nature" (p. 29). Spencer's interpretation also assumes that gender has eternal significance. Gender, however, may be something God created only for this world.

Spencer sees the rule of the husband in Gen 3:16 as a part of the curse. As such, effort should be taken to relieve it and strive for equality, just as men work to make their labor less bothersome and more pleasurable. If the rule of the husband is only part of judgment and not instituted at creation, her view is the logical conclusion.

Spencer gives a detailed picture of the first-century view of women. She summarizes that women were exempt from learning the law because their place was considered to be in the home and because they were to be protected from the possibility of unchastity. Rabbinic opinion differed as to whether women were capable of learning the law. Jesus'

attitude toward women was of marked contrast to his culture. In the case of Mary and Martha (Luke 10:38–42) he shows that religious education is more important for a woman than homemaking. Jesus chose women to be the first witnesses to his resurrection. This act is significant, especially in Jesus' day. Yet Spencer reads too much into it when she writes: "He wanted these women whom he had taught to go on to take authoritative leadership positions themselves. That is why they were chosen to be the first witnesses to the resurrection" (p. 62).

The crucial passage concerning women in the ministry is 1 Tim 2:8–15. Spencer rightly emphasizes Paul's command that women learning in silence reflects his concern that women be taught God's word, in contrast to the attitude of his day. Silence or quietness is a positive quality in relation to learning.

Spencer's explanation to Paul's words in vv 12–14 is complicated and, though logically and persuasively argued, is unconvincing to this reviewer. Her discussion of the problem of false teaching at Ephesus is helpful in a general way. Yet she overstates some points in order to connect false teaching more closely with 1 Tim 2:8–15. For instance she says, "Women were clearly involved in all aspects of the problem," including teaching false doctrine. Generic terms in 1 Tim 1:6; 2 Tim 3:5, 8 do not make it clear that women taught false doctrine, though the possibility exists. In addition, what the younger widows were doing (gossiping and being busybodies) should not be equated with teaching false doctrine.

Spencer implies that the present active indicative tense of "allow" in v 12 somehow limits the application of Paul's words to circumstances in which women have not yet learned enough. This tense, though technically not a command, has the force of a command because of the meaning of the verb itself, as it would in English. The fact that it is present tense suggests continuing action. There is no end point. In the examples Spencer cites (Rom 16:17; 1 Tim 2:1, 8), except for the one addressed to particular people (Phil 4:2), one would not wish to argue that their instruction did not continue for all time.

Spencer emphasizes the adversative nature of *de* in relating v 11 and v 12. Though *de* is not a strong adversative, its use seems to undermine Spencer's theory: Though a woman should learn she should not teach, even though that might seem to be the natural result of learning, as Spencer notes. There is nothing in vv 11–12 to indicate that the prohibition to teach was contingent on women's opportunity to learn.

In v 12 Spencer accepts the meaning "to domineer" for *authentain*. In a study of the secular usages of this verb George Knight shows that this verb does not have negative connotations. It simply means "to exercise authority over." The authority forbidden to women is not a solely destructive type of authority.

According to Spencer the reference to Adam and Eve in vv 13–14 is an analogy. If the women of Ephesus do as Eve did—that is, teach false doctrine authoritatively—they will be deceived and become transgressors. This interpretation raises the question of why Adam's prior creation is mentioned. In response Spencer explains: "Although Adam was created first, Eve was deceived before Adam was" (p. 89). However, the two clauses are not grammatically related as Spencer suggests. They are joined by *kai* ("and"), and each stands in the same relationship to v 12. Verses 13 and 14 each give a reason for the prohibition in v 12.

Spencer summarizes: "Paul here is *not* prohibiting women from preaching nor praying nor having and edifying authority nor pastoring. He is simply prohibiting them from teaching and using their authority in a destructive way. The overall purpose of the letter to remedy the teaching of different doctrines, the positive connotations for 'silence,' the use of the present active indicative for 'I am not allowing,' the use of the adversative participle 'but,' and the underlying principle that learning results in teaching—all imply that Paul's injunction was temporary. A 'temporary' injunction is not solely relevant to

the first century. Rather, it is applicable whenever, but only whenever, women who have not been theologically trained are succumbing to false teachings" (p. 88).

Looking at 1 Cor 12:27; Eph 4:12, Spencer posits that if it can be shown that a woman in the Bible "was affirmed as an apostle, a prophet, an evangelist, a pastor, or a teacher, then one could—one must—conclude that women have been given gifts from God for positions to which we now ordain people and for positions considered authoritative in the first century church" (p. 99–100). It is an appealing approach, but to this reviewer it seems hermeneutically unsound to use Biblical examples to determine doctrine, though they can be used as support. In addition, Spencer's discussion shows a manipulation of the data to support her view. Though one could legitimately debate whether the Greek means that Andronicus and Junia were apostles (though this reviewer should say that the exclusiveness of the apostleship, Acts 1:21–26, the incidental reference in Rom 16:7, and 1 Tim 2:11–12 weigh against Junia's being an apostle in an official sense), it is not legitimate to suggest that the women who followed Jesus were apostles in the sense of Eph 4:12 (p. 100). Spencer successfully highlights the meaningful work of women in the early Church, although this reviewer thinks she reads too much into their activities.

On language describing God, Spencer states: "The feminine metaphor is as appropriate to describe God as is the masculine" (p. 129). This view is tied to her belief that both male and female are needed to reflect God's image. Her conclusion is that "if the Bible uses feminine imagery to mirror certain aspects of God, should not the church allow women leaders to reflect God similarly?" (p. 131). While making the opposite point, David Spencer actually reveals the critical flaw in his wife's discussion of feminine imagery with the words "ferret out the actual images" (p. 142). Feminine imagery related to God is scarce and of a decidedly secondary nature. It compares God's action to the action of women; it does not give information concerning his gender or how we are to address him. In trying to make a case for the feminine side of God's nature, Spencer misses the true import of the feminine imagery in the Bible—that is, women's experience is significant in God's sight, and he is concerned with relating to them.

Spencer makes a strange statement in her conclusion, one that seems to contradict Mark 9:35, which she quotes in the same paragraph. "The more women have power, the more meaningful will be their service" (p. 137). Service and power do not go hand in hand in the Christian way of life.

Whenever one disagrees with another's conclusion concerning what Scripture says on a subject, one tends to suspect that the other's preconceived ideas determine Scripture's meaning rather than the reverse. However, in spite of my opposite position I cannot doubt Spencer's deep respect for the authority of Scripture. Her work is readable and logically and zealously argued, and it offers some interesting insights. It deserves careful attention and response.

Aída's husband David writes a most enlightening afterword, in which he generously shares personal insights into their life as co-ministers in an egalitarian marriage. Their commitment to serving Christ in their careers and family life and their love for each other is apparent and admirable.

Beyond the Curse concludes with a study guide sure to produce lively discussion.

Susan T. Foh

Ft. Wood, MO

The NIV Interlinear Hebrew-English Old Testament. Vol. 4 / Isaiah-Malachi. By John R. Kohlenberger III. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1985, 591 pp., \$24.95.

The fourth and final volume of *NIVIHEOT* has now appeared, containing Isaiah

through Malachi. This volume preserves the features already well-known in the other three: the Hebrew text of *BHS* spaced out across the page, with a grammatically literal word-for-word translation fitted underneath and the *NIV* placed in a large margin. The word-for-word translation is based primarily on the vocabulary of the *NIV*, but it departs from this pattern in rendering the tetragrammaton and the cognate accusative. Many beginning students of Hebrew will be grateful for this aid.

D. A. Carson

The Hebrew Bible and Its Modern Interpreters. By Douglas A. Knight and Gene M. Tucker, editors. Philadelphia/Chico: Fortress/Scholars, 1985.

This volume is part of a three-part series sponsored by the Society of Biblical Literature on the occasion of the centennial of its founding. The companion volumes will deal with the NT and early Judaism. The purpose of the book is to critically appraise developments in the various areas of OT research since 1945.

The essays that comprise the volume are immensely valuable to serve as guides to the modern history of research and to the present state of affairs of the study of the OT. In brief compass the reader may become generally acquainted with the whole scope of research. This will serve the beginning student who wants orientation to the discipline as a whole and to more advanced scholars who are interested in areas other than their own area of specialty.

For the most part, the division of the field into fifteen areas is adequate. The first seven chapters may be described as "method" and include studies of history (J. M. Miller), archaeology (W. Dever), Near Eastern background (J. J. M. Roberts), traditional critical methods (R. Knierim), new methods (like structuralism; R. Culley), religion (P. D. Miller) and theology (G. Coats). The next seven chapters divide the OT into sections: Pentateuch (D. A. Knight), historical literature (P. Ackroyd), prophecy (G. Tucker), wisdom literature (J. Crenshaw), lyrical literature (E. Gerstenberger), legends of wise heroes and heroines (S. Niditch) and apocalyptic literature (P. Hanson). The last chapter is on the relationship between the Hebrew Bible and modern culture (W. Harrelson).

As one can tell from the preceding list, the authors for each chapter are well chosen in that they are all experts in their respected specialties and are well aware of the research done since 1945. Since they are going beyond a mere description of research to provide a critical review, one must keep in mind their idiosyncrasies. Sometimes the personal opinion of the scholar comes across as if it were universally held. One small example is Crenshaw's statement about the integrity of the book of Ecclesiastes in which he comments on Kidner's work: "The inconsistency that stands out within the book does not necessarily indicate multiple authorship. The element of contradiction has been exaggerated, *although attempts to deny it altogether (Kidner) have proved unsuccessful*" (p. 378; italics mine).

The major drawback of the book is something over which the contributors had absolutely no control. The book was published in 1985, but the articles were all written before 1980. Thus the "state of the art" is already substantially dated. For instance, Knierim is unable to take into account the paradigm-shifting work of Kugel, O'Connor, Geller, Berlin and others in the reading of Hebrew poetry. Particularly striking is his statement that the insights of Lowth are still accepted by one and all (p. 412). The new literary approach to the text (particularly as represented in the work of Alter, Gunn, Berlin, Clines and others), which logically would be included in the chapter by Culley, is hardly discussed at all, being primarily a phenomenon of the 1980s. All of the essays are more

or less affected by the late publication of the volume. On the positive side, the fact that the work of five years has produced such new insights demonstrates the vitality of research into the OT.

The work of evangelicals rarely surfaces in the volume. Of course, this reflects the lack of evangelical participation in the work of mainstream Biblical scholarship over the past forty years. This is a trend that is changing rapidly with more and more evangelical participation in the SBL, a development noted by the editors in their preface when they write that "evangelical scholars have often sought to make their work a part of the larger critical debate" (p. xiv).

In closing, one other valuable asset of the volume should be mentioned: the rather extensive bibliographies that conclude each of the fifteen chapters.

Tremper Longman, III

Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia

The Dynamics of Biblical Parallelism. By Adele Berlin. Bloomington: Indiana University, 1985, xii + 179 pp., \$27.50.

In this exciting and challenging discussion, Berlin presents "an overarching, integrated, and linguistically based description of biblical parallelism" (p. 29), potentially the most productive treatment to date, with helpful insights on almost every page.

In chaps. 1 and 2, Berlin succinctly evaluates major predecessors, including R. Lowth, J. Kugel and R. Jakobson, and critiques various recent models of Biblical poetry. One of the few significant failings of this book is dependence upon transformational grammar (TG). This is not the place to criticize American linguistics for its largely uncritical acceptance of TG, but Berlin evidences the results, believing that TG "penetrates deeper into the underlying grammatical structure of [poetic] lines" (p. 21). The status of these underlying structures is suspect, but thankfully Berlin usually analyzes surface structures, although her tree diagram (p. 24) contains difficulties. Perhaps most telling is TG's confusion regarding semantics. Consequently, Berlin subsumes semantics under lexis—i.e., lexis at the level of line or clause rather than word. Throughout the book Berlin makes semantic choices (defining semantics broadly) whenever she notes instances of parallelism, and the book would have benefitted from restructuring with semantics as a broader category.

Chapters 3 through 5 contain Berlin's analysis of parallelism. In chap. 3 she treats "the grammatical aspect," including morphologic and syntactic parallelism. "Morphologic" may be the wrong term here, since she is discussing various elements that can fill paradigmatic choices of subject, predicate, adjunct and complement. For example, in Cant 3:1 "the one I love" fills a complement slot filled by "him" in the parallel line (p. 33). More convincing is Berlin's treatment of morphologic pairs from the same word class, showing that contrasting tenses (e.g. Gen 1:5) do not necessarily entail contrasting temporal reference (cf. later treatment of Ps 26:4, where her time-based rendering is called "stronger," p. 137). Treatments of alternating conjugations, person, gender, number and case are also informative, although several examples warrant further consideration. Ps 38:3 is probably not past (p. 36); Lev 13:20 is better rendered "shall see" (p. 39); Ps 92:13–14 with the Hiphil perhaps should be rendered "flourish" as in BDB (pp. 39, 47); Ps 51:19 should read *lb*, "heart," not *ln* (p. 43; correct p. 123); and Prov 14:12 = 16:25 requires explanation (p. 45). Regarding definiteness, it is terminologically suspect to call the article "definite" (p. 50) without a contrasting indefinite article. Certain noun pairs may have one articular and one inarticular noun, but whether there is a semantic difference is problematic if the article is distributive, as apparently in Pss 108:3; 114:6. Job 3:3

could be translated “the day,” made definite by the following relative clause with understood *šr* (p. 51).

Discussing syntactic parallelism Berlin wisely avoids TG but treats transformations of surface structure in parallel lines. Perhaps nominal and verbal clause opposition (is this a surface transformation?) would have been enhanced by glosses without verbal components. For example, in Lam 5:19 temporal reference is probably identical (p. 54; cf. p. 96); Ps 97:9 need not be rendered as past (p. 55); and references to “Heb.” in Gen 42:31; 1 Sam 3:1; Job 29:15 are misleading and inconsistent (p. 56). Berlin also treats positive-negative and subject-object oppositions, where her use of TG regarding the “transformation of passivization” (p. 57; cf. pp. 60–61, and problematic renderings of Hos 5:3, pp. 58, 19) reveals a heavy semantic component. Berlin concludes that the tension of parallelism is perhaps best seen in lines that are not exact duplicates. Particularly instructive is Ps 105:6 (p. 62), where the appositional noun in the first line modifies “Abraham” but the appositional noun in the second line modifies the noun in construct (the difficulty is overdrawn by Berlin’s rendering “his chosen” instead of “his chosen ones”).

In chap. 4 Berlin treats “lexical and semantic aspects,” asserting that “it is, after all, the words and what they signify that give meaning to a verse or phrase” (p. 64). Many linguists would find this an inadequate defense of lexical study. Berlin focuses first upon word pairs, “the products of normal word associations that are made by all competent speakers” (p. 67). She establishes the independence of lexical pairs, although in Ps 15:1 “tent”/“dwell” is not as convincing as other semantic and grammatical equivalents, and in 111:6 “people” and “nations” may be subordinate/superordinate semantic equivalents (p. 81). Berlin then categorizes several types of lexical, grammatical and semantic patterning (in Joel 1:2, *b* may not be a true parallel, and in Prov 23:15–16, *a* is only loosely parallel [p. 87]).

Berlin defines semantic aspect as the “relationship between the meanings of parallel lines” (p. 88; cf. p. 90). Claiming that “the parallelism itself does not always make the relationship between its lines explicit” (p. 91) she turns to the beneficial concepts of topic and discourse, but reversion to the “notion of paraphrase” (p. 93) from generative semantics is problematic. To search for the deep structure that can be expressed in several different surface structures seems to be at variance with the author’s purpose of describing the various elements in given utterances. Fortunately Berlin continues to focus upon the text, stressing that “one of the main semantic functions of parallelism” is “disambiguation and ambiguity” (p. 96), as in Isa 1:3 and the relation of ox, ass and Israel. She also notes the “metaphoric function of parallelism” (p. 99), although failing to define metaphor. (What does it mean that Ps 125:2 is “not quite a metaphor, in the conventional sense, for God is not identified with the mountains, and Jerusalem is not a metaphor for the people, although it may symbolize them” [p. 101]?)

In chap. 5, Berlin treats the “phonologic aspect.” She defines a sound pair as “*the repetition in parallel words or lines of the same or similar consonants in any order within close proximity*” (p. 104), although her statement that “because there are only twenty-two consonants, some amount of repetition is inevitable, even within a space of two lines, and may therefore not appear to be linguistically or stylistically significant” (p. 104) is an unnecessary caveat. Berlin concludes with lists of sound pair patterns, multiple sound pairs, and several *ad hoc* combinations. Berlin’s examples are suggestive, although subjective—as she notes—and occasionally tenuous.

In the concluding chapter Berlin cites several passages from Psalms about “God’s hearing the psalmist’s prayer” (p. 127). Although nonidentical parallelism is present, Berlin claims it is difficult to find a single formula that accounts for all instances. This leads to insightful comments about the “perceptibility and interestingness” [*sic*] of parallelism. On its effects, Berlin claims that “to perceive parallelism is not necessarily to

understand the effect it has in a text. . . . Parallelism in itself does not have meaning" (p. 135). This probably draws too firm a line between form and function or linguistics and hermeneutics, since Berlin seems to imply that one must be able to translate the parallelism into a suitable metalanguage before it can be grasped.

This is a very interesting book. It is inevitable that in discussing many examples disagreements will arise. Perhaps use of a text-based linguistic model and a greater sensitivity to issues of form and function, including problems of classification and labeling, would have made the treatment more precise. In any case this effort is to be welcomed warmly as a significant step forward in understanding Biblical parallelism, especially in Hebrew poetry.

The book has endnotes, glossary, bibliography, and several indexes. The pagination seems to have gone wrong, so that both the index of Biblical passages and general index err concerning the endnotes. The general index is incomplete.

Stanley E. Porter

Sheffield, England

The History of Israel and Judah in Old Testament Times. By François Castel. New York: Paulist, 1985, 267 pp., \$8.95 paper.

This book is a translation of the French work, *L'Histoire d'Israel et de Juda*, published in 1983. The author is a pastor in the Reformed Church in France. After a brief introduction including geography and chronology, the subject matter is arranged chronologically and proceeds to survey the periods of history beginning with a study of "prehistory" that includes a survey from the Paleolithic through the Chalcolithic periods. The "history" section begins with Sumerian civilization and works through to the period of Hammurapi before moving into the patriarchal narratives. Biblical history then provides the framework through the OT with sections devoted to the various judges, kings and prophets. The reigns of the appropriate kings of Assyria, Babylon and Persia are likewise treated. Two sections are used to treat the intertestamental literature, one on the Hellenistic period and the other on the Maccabean resistance. The Roman period is divided by emperors. The survey comes to a close with a treatment of the revolt of Bar Kokhba in the second century A.D. The title is thus somewhat misleading, since OT and NT periods are covered.

The book is part of a series of guides for leaders of Bible study groups. As expected, then, we are not provided with a comprehensive presentation of history. The primary concern of this book is introduction to the material in the text of Scripture, not a study of secondary literature. Even though scholarly theories are not usually discussed for their pros and cons, however, most of the tenets of critical scholarship have been accepted by the author and are presented as unassailable fact. Occasional paragraphs such as one rejecting Noth's amphictyony theory (pp. 70-71) are the exception rather than the rule.

Among the critical theories accepted by Castel we find many of the standard ones that we would expect. The documentary hypothesis in its traditional Wellhausenian form is presented without apology, defense or updating. The Yahwist's theologizing is drawn out to the extreme in statements such as this: "The story of the two brothers Esau and Jacob embodies a theologian's vision of the antagonistic relationship between the agricultural kingdom of Solomon and the nomad kingdom of Edom" (p. 25). Likewise a two-exodus theory is maintained, and it is even suggested that the Bible supports such an idea (p. 43). The late date of Deuteronomy is assumed and is even used as a basis for rejecting the possibility that Deuteronomy could be related to the vassal treaties (p. 49). Second and Third Isaiah, late authorship of Daniel, nonhistorical treatment of Esther,

and placement of Ezra in the reign of Artaxerxes II all are maintained.

There are frequent references to confused editing by the compilers (e.g. p. 45, the itinerary of the exodus; p. 51, the book of Joshua) and redactors, who made full use of their imagination (cf. the comment that Othniel was added by the redactor so that there would be a judge from the tribe of Judah, p. 75). Even less subtle are the outright statements that Biblical accounts are myths; e.g., concerning Genesis 22: "In all likelihood this was not a real event but a myth celebrated at Beersheba to explain why El Olam had come to forbid the sacrifice of human children and replaced it by an animal sacrifice" (p. 29). The treatment of the origins of the twelve tribes also follows typical critical lines. The tribe of Gad was not in Egypt (p. 58) and the tribe of Dan was part of the sea peoples (Danaeans, p. 65). According to Castel, the northern group of tribes left Egypt with Moses, the southern group came from Edom and the slave-girl tribes were indigenous to Canaan. This very brief listing will demonstrate what a pervasive role critical scholarship plays in the book.

While the above positions would be expected given the predispositions of the author, we are a bit more surprised at some of the controversial, outdated or erroneous positions that are adopted by the author and presented as factual. In the category of the controversial, Castel insists that the story of the birth of Sargon I served as a model to the redactor telling the story of the birth of Moses (pp. 22, 44). Outdated is his acceptance of Sargon's empire as the result of a Semitic invasion of the Sumerians (p. 22), the Amorite wave theory (p. 26) and the Hyksos occupation as the result of invasion (p. 28). Each of these has been largely abandoned in the wake of recent scholarship. Also in this category is his suggestion, now known to be incorrect, that the term *dauidum* from the Mari texts offers an explanation of David's name (p. 23). Given the date of the French work, it is not unusual that Castel states that "the name Ya has been discovered at Ebla" (p. 29), though we now know that that judgment was premature.

That Castel accepts the Kenite hypothesis, which is now generally rejected, is not unusual, but what is unexpected is his repeated insistence that the Kenites considered themselves the descendants of Cain (pp. 3, 44, 77). Other problems with accuracy are also disturbing and raise questions about the author's credibility. Hammurapi's Amorite dynasty, the first dynasty of Babylon, is given the dates 2300–2200, at least half a millennium too early (p. 22). Erroneous also is the identification of Nuzi as the capital of Mitanni (p. 36).

The reader should also be aware of the fact that there are occasional errors in the translating, printing or assigning of captions. For example, on p. 49 the caption reads: "Hammurabi of Babylon receives the law from the sun-god Shamash." It is clear from Hammurapi's prologue, however, that the law is not being received from Shamash but being presented to him. On p. 50, parallel laws are cited from the Syrians. This should be Assyrians. On p. 56 the inscription is inverted and the pharaoh's name is misspelled. On p. 141 in the caption it should be Sagila rather than Bagila. Other minor misprints and inconsistencies in spelling exist throughout but will not be detailed here.

It should be noted that the author does succeed in giving us a very readable account of the history as he interprets it. The clear text is further aided by frequent boxes that give translations of some of the most pertinent of the ancient texts and by line drawings of appropriate artifacts. As will be noticed, most of the perceived difficulties that I have cited occur in the early portions of the book. Once we reach the period of David and Solomon there is much less to take exception to. Castel's presentation from here on is generally a summary of the Biblical material combined with the information gleaned from ancient texts. There is little in the way of reconstruction.

Nevertheless, the evangelical reader will not find much use for this book. Its radical, critical presuppositions make it unusable as a survey, and it cannot be used as a resource for the present state of critical scholarship, for it does not adequately reflect that. The

limited scope of the book and its footnotes and bibliography likewise disqualify it as a reference book.

John H. Walton

Moody Bible Institute, Chicago

The Greek New Testament According to the Majority Text. Second edition. Edited by Zane C. Hodges and Arthur L. Farstad. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1985, 810 pp., \$14.95.

The first edition appeared in 1982. This second edition has a few changes consisting mostly of the correction of typographical errors and the addition of a helpful preface that summarizes and simplifies the rather complex introduction to the book.

The majority text, as its name suggests, is a text of the Greek NT produced by utilizing the readings found in the majority of the Greek manuscripts. It is to be distinguished from the two most widely used critical texts: Nestle-Aland's 26th edition, and the United Bible Societies' third edition, both of which are based on relatively fewer but more ancient manuscripts than the majority text.

The introduction presents the arguments against the traditional Westcott and Hort textual theory and in favor of the majority text. Whether one agrees with the viewpoint of the editors, anyone interested in the continuing debate in the area of textual criticism will applaud the publication of this text since it makes readily available the majority readings.

One of its interesting features is the dual apparatus found at the bottom of each page. The first lists the support for the majority text. The system of sigla used to indicate the degree of support will be strange to most students schooled in traditional textual criticism. The second apparatus cites the witness against the majority text. Here more widely known sigla are used.

The text departs from the traditional punctuation in Greek texts by using the English question mark instead of the semicolon. Exclamation points are added and English titles are given to paragraphs. Cross-references are provided, especially in the gospels, below the titles. In conversations between two or more people quotation marks are supplied, and French quotation marks are used to indicate OT citations. Unlike most printed Greek New Testaments the first letter of the first word of each sentence is capitalized (as in English), as are the names of the Trinity and most of the titles of our Lord.

All in all this is an attractive, easy-to-read text and a basic contribution to the science of textual criticism. However, it is highly improbable that "serious open-minded consideration of the data" will convince many NT textual critics of the "validity of the majority approach to resolving the textual issues of the New Testament," in spite of the editors' enthusiasm.

Walter W. Wessel

Bethel Theological Seminary West, San Diego, CA