JETS 30/1 (March 1987) 71–120

BOOK REVIEWS

Before Abraham Was: The Unity of Genesis 1—11. By Isaac M. Kikawada and Arthur Quinn. Nashville: Abingdon, 1985, 144 pp., $9.95 paper.

The cover gives the purpose of this book: "A provocative challenge to the documentary hypothesis." The authors argue that a rhetorical analysis of Genesis as a literary unity offers a paradigm superior to that of the documentary source analysis that since Wellhausen has dominated OT studies. The thesis, if generally accepted, would overturn more than a century of OT scholarship.

Kikawada teaches Near Eastern studies and Quinn teaches rhetoric, both at the University of California at Berkeley. The book combines the skills of each, with ancient Near Eastern mythological parallels being contributed by the former and literary analysis sharpened by the latter. One senses here a more scholarly extension of the literary approach of Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (1981), who is also at Berkeley.

After presenting as strongly as possible the case for the documentary analysis of Genesis 1—11 (chap. 1), the authors present their own alternative. They maintain that the basic structure of Genesis 1—11 is derived from the Mesopotamian Atrahasis traditions, to which it is a response (chap. 2). Whereas the Mesopotamian myth placed emphasis on urban civilization's need to limit population growth, the Bible rejects the values of Mesopotamia by its preference for pastoral/nomadic life. Hence it stresses "be fruitful and multiply" over against population control, and it attributes cities, civilized arts, and the murderous disregard of human life to the urban society of the descendants of the murderer Cain. Furthermore the tower of Babel (Babylon) story represents urban Mesopotamia's rebellion against God's command to subdue the whole earth (chap. 3). Next, the authors seek to show purpose as opposed to patchwork in Genesis by an analysis of the linchpin of the documentary hypothesis, the flood narrative. The repetitions attributed by the Wellhausen school to various sources are rather to be explained by the literary artistry of the narrator who has produced an elaborate, strict chiasm from 6:10 to 9:19. Having recognized the narrator's style, it is then possible to recognize another chiasm over Genesis 11—22 centering on the Abrahamic covenant of Genesis 17. It then becomes clear that the covenants of Genesis 15 and 18 are parallel elements of the chiastic structure emphasizing different aspects of the covenant in Genesis 17 (land and seed, respectively) rather than being doublets derived from different traditions (chap. 4). The paradigm of unity is then applied to the rest of the Bible (chap. 5). Finally, a loosely related epilogue argues that the ethical condescension to, or even rejection of, the Bible by the Wellhausen school arises from missing the literary artistry of the narrator, who intended for us to be repulsed by the sins of his characters.

Having presented the argument of the book, we can now ask two questions. What impact will this book have on mainstream critical scholarship? Second, to what extent may evangelicals accept its thesis? As for the first question, there has been for some time quite a bit of dissatisfaction with the documentary hypothesis, but criticism of that theory has come mostly from "fundamentalism," which has failed to offer to their satisfaction a convincing and detailed alternative to J, E, D and P. This book does offer such an alternative, and it has the potential of capturing the imagination of younger scholars to an approach that already has some allies in Alter, A. Berlin and H. C. Brichto. Time will tell if this newer literary approach will supplant the older critical orthodoxy, but there is no doubt that it is here to stay at least as an alternative.

For evangelicals, there is much in this proposal that can be accepted. Having in general never rejected the basic unity of the text, we can rejoice in the evidence presented from rhetorical analysis that reconfirms our position. In fact our authors have borrowed a main plank of their argument, the coherence of the flood narrative, from the British evangelical G. Wenham (cf. *VT* 28 [1978] 336–348). The primary objection theologically and historically that evangelicals will have is to the assumption of the direct dependence of Genesis 1—11 on the Atrahasis myth. To accept this is to purchase unity at the cost of historicity, for it makes Genesis 1—11 a myth retold, like C. S. Lewis' *Till We Have Faces*, which would then have nothing to say about what really happened. American evangelicals will be very reluctant to accept this.

The Atrahasis myth dependence is doubtful historically. Whereas the tale was copied over the centuries in Assyria and Babylonia and is even attested at Ugarit, it is not at all certain that this myth would have been as widely known among Hebrew-speaking people as our authors suggest. It is true that a fragment of the Gilgamesh epic was found at Megiddo, but that myth says nothing about the reason for the flood (overpopulation) so central to our author's proposal. But more importantly, neither tale was necessarily known in Palestine outside of the circle of the scribes of Sumerian and Akkadian for whom they seem to have served as classic school texts. We therefore cannot accept this thesis uncritically.

This book is certain to provoke wide discussion. The terms of that debate will make evangelicals seem somewhat less out of step with the rest of scholarship than has been the case in the past.

J. M. Sprinkle

Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, OH

Ezra, Nehemiah. By H. G. M. Williamson. Waco: Word, 1985, 417 pp., $19.95.

The editors of the Word Biblical Commentary series are to be congratulated for their selection of Williamson as author of this volume. Williamson's contributions to Ezra-Nehemiah and Chronicles studies are well known and apparent throughout this work. Thankfully we have a major contribution to this much-neglected corpus of Biblical material.

In the introduction Williamson makes manifest the fact that he does not necessarily intend to follow common scholarly views with quiescence. For instance, he argues that Ezra-Nehemiah is to be understood as completely independent from Chronicles. Indeed Williamson states that Ezra-Nehemiah is "dependent upon aspects of the Deuteronomistic history at points where Chronicles differs from it" (p. xxii).

Concerning major historical-interpretative issues in the book Williamson strives to defend his comparatively conservative views against today's prevalent ideas. He strongly maintains that the date of Ezra's arrival in Jerusalem was 458 B.C., the seventh year of Artaxerxes I (pp. xxxix-xliv), in the face of majority opinion to the contrary. Williamson is comfortable with the variant accounts of the decree of Cyrus, believing that both harmonize adequately, relieving one of the burden of positing intricate redactional activity in chap. 6 (pp. 73–74). Williamson argues for the integrity of the lists of exiles returning under Zerubbabel in Ezra 2 and Nehemiah 7. Nehemiah 7 is an authentic portion of the Nehemiah memoirs (p. 268), and Ezra 2 is dependent upon Nehemiah 7 (pp. 29–30). Differences between the two are generally to be understood as the result of textual corruption (p. 29). He rejects one solution to the Sheshbazzar-Zerubbabel problem that declares that the two names refer to one individual, believing that Zerubbabel was the executor of the mandate given to his uncle Sheshbazzar (pp. 79–80).

The format of this commentary corresponds to that of the others in the series: bibliography, the author's translation, notes, form/structure/setting, comment and explanation. Williamson's bibliography is extensive but not exhaustive. The main bibliography and the bibliography for each passage also reflect an awareness of evangelical contributions to Ezra-Nehemiah, however limited they might be. The notes for each passage, where Williamson gives his grammatical and philological insights, are one of the strengths of *Ezra, Nehemiah*. Williamson's approach is sane, giving helpful insights into the meaning of the MT while resisting many emendations and philological uncertainties. In form/structure/setting Williamson gives not only his contextual understanding of each passage but also the historical setting crucial to a proper understanding.

The Word Biblical Commentary series has been repeatedly criticized for the artificial and unclear distinction made between "comment" and "explanation." Williamson has made the most of this nebulous distinction, making "comment" a verse-by-verse treatment. "Explanation," despite its indistinct appellation, is a discussion of the contribution each passage makes to Biblical theology. Each "explanation" section concludes with at least a paragraph outlining the significance of the passage for Christians today. To find such attention to the spiritual value of the text in a work of such erudition is at once startling and refreshing.

George L. Klein

The Book of Job. By Norman C. Habel. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1985, 586 pp., $39.95.

Without question, this most recent volume in Westminster's OTL series must be considered along with von Rad's *Genesis* and Childs' *Book of Exodus* as the cream of the crop. Its author has chosen a method in line with the trend toward rhetorical criticism or structuralism. In Habel's words, "the meaning of the Book of Job is found in the interplay of literary design and theological idea." Happily, Habel treats the book as a "literary totality." He admits the possibility of various stages of oral or written development but considers these too hypothetical to use in exegesis. Habel thinks the book was clearly the work of a literary master who was exceedingly creative in his ability to interrelate various speeches and themes. He is wary of emendations *metra causa*. He says that "wherever possible, the Hebrew original is retained . . . so that . . . subtleties of poetic style and nuances of meaning may be explored within the existing literary expression of the text" (p. 23). Textual notes of a critical and philological nature have been kept to a minimum, but they are adequate. Habel often illustrates the range of options for translating a difficult passage and frequently lines up the major views but usually makes clear his own position on a given text.

Our author sees a framework of three movements in the plot structure of Job: (1) God afflicts the hero—the hidden conflict; (2) the hero challenges God—the conflict explored; (3) God challenges the hero—the conflict resolved. The plot is depicted not only in the narration but throughout the poems. His comprehensive introduction analyzes these movements showing how a series of conflicts are developed and resolved in the book within the framework of the eternal tension between the will of heaven and the happenings on earth. Habel differs with those who find the prologue and epilogue unrelated to the poetic portions of the book. He outlines the interrelationships between the prologue and the subsequent chapters (pp. 79–85). Since epic features also appear in the poetic portions of the book he rejects Sarna's idea that the prose of the prologue derives from an ancient poetic version of the story. This Habel sees as an argument for one author who was familiar with epic forms and has incorporated them throughout a unified work. He also takes issue with those who see the Elihu speeches as foreign material. He sees

them as consistent "with the style, the plot, and the thematic progression of the book." A large portion of his introduction is devoted to literary features and their significance. The author of Job uses literary forms and genres not in their ideal form but in adapted and modified forms to meet particular artistic and theological ends. Habel agrees with Whedbee (*Semeia* 7 [1977] 1–39) that the book of Job is serious comedy rather than tragedy. Habel also shows in his introduction how ignoring literary techniques like repetition, allusion and irony results in misinterpreting whole passages. He also holds that legal metaphor permeates the speeches of the book, but he disagrees with Scholnick who claims that the genre of Job is "lawsuit drama."

In his chapter-by-chapter analysis, Habel divides each passage into four parts: translation, textual notes, an explanation of design, and a presentation of the message in context. Given his interest in stylistics—i.e., the design of each poetic unit—and his wide coverage of recent and not-so-recent material on Job, it is surprising that he failed to pick up the sparkling insight of F. I. Andersen on the structure of Eliphaz's first speech (chaps. 4—5). But his stress on design enabled him to see the *inclusio* in chap. 6 (which proves it is a unit), while chap. 7 has its own thematic and structural features (p. 155). Habel is to be commended for his excellent understanding of the role cue words play in the speeches (cf. p. 142). This semantic logic is evident in other wisdom literature, such as Proverbs. His commendable attention to other linguistic details such as wordplays, polysemy, double entendre, assonance and consonance enrich Habel's ability to interpret the book.

Occasionally, however, he makes a statement that in my opinion fails to ring true to the book's overall teaching. For example in 7:21 Job says, "For soon I will lie in the dust and you will seek me, but I will not be." Habel believes here that Job is asserting that "once he dies, God will no longer be able to reach Job to harass or forgive him . . . the land of the dead, being, according to Job, a place where God has no jurisdiction" (p. 167). Certainly Job's statement is nothing more than phenomenological language—i.e., once he dies he will not be on earth anymore. God's jurisdiction over Sheol is affirmed in 26:6.

Habel agrees with those who maintain that chaps. 24—26 have been disrupted. Chapter 24 belongs to Zophar, and 26:5–14 is really a continuation of Bildad's short speech in chap. 25. There is always the possibility of some displacement. But how Zophar could possibly say "God charges no one with wrongdoing" (24:12) is incomprehensible. It seems far more advisable to say that Job could admit that murderers (v 14), adulterers (v 15) and thieves (v 16) "get their comeuppance in due time" (p. 357) than that any of the counselors would say that "God does wrong" (v 12). Similarly in chaps. 25—26 Habel assumes that Job could not have spoken 26:5–14, so along with many others he attaches this to Bildad's speech in chap. 25. But is it really in the psyche of those know-it-all counselors to stand in awe of the mystery of God's ways as expressed in 26:14? They were the ones who claimed they knew what God was doing.

In the classic passage in 13:15 where the *KJV* says, "Though he slay me, yet will I trust him," Habel looks to 32:11, 16 for the clue to the rendering of the passage. There Elihu waited for the others to speak, but Job does not plan to wait silently for God to speak; he will take the initiative even if it proves disastrous. So Habel renders the verse (cf. Gordis, *The Book of Job*): "Yes, though He slay me, I will not wait. I will now argue my case to His face." In all probability this is the correct interpretation, though Gordis' attempt to see the meaning "be silent" in *yḥl* seems questionable.

In another classic passage in 19:25–26 where Job expresses his faith in his Redeemer, *gô'ēl*, Habel argues against those who want to see the *gô'ēl* as God himself. He argues that the theology of the book permits a third-party *gô'ēl* in keeping with Job's earlier call for an arbiter in 9:33 and of his confidence in 16:19 that a heavenly witness testifies on his behalf. Habel argues that just as the Satan could arise in the divine assembly to accuse Job, so a corresponding figure could arise in the council and argue his case. He

thinks arguing that God is the *gô'ēl* reverses Job's pattern of thought, which has portrayed God as the attacker and not as the defender. Habel is not the first to see that Job's cry in 16:18, "O earth, do not cover my blood," shows that the violence done to him is seen to be murderous, and thus a *gô'ēl* is needed to bring his case before the court of heaven. Job anticipates dying before this testimony is given. It will come later (*'aḥărôn*). Job can imagine his being in Sheol from which he could return to appear in court and defend his integrity, but he refuses to give up his hope of ultimate vindication. When the *gô'ēl* arises to testify, he stands on the dust of Job's grave. The second use of the word "after" in v 26a is seen as explanatory of the first: "After, that is, my skin is peeled off. But from my flesh I would behold Eloah" (v 26). So this is a wish to see God "in the flesh" with his own eyes. Habel therefore prefers the *KJV* "in my flesh I shall see God" over the *RSV* "from (without) my flesh. . . ."

Habel's handling of the passage is commendable. He does not deal high-handedly with the text. There are, however, parts of this text that are clear and other parts that are obscure. In his zeal to make good sense of the entire passage, Habel fails to make clear how tenuous some of his interpretation is. For example, his interpretation of that most difficult line in 19:26a is very attractive taking the first word "after" as explanatory of the former use of the same root in v 25b. But despite its attractiveness, this interpretation along with many others still must be held as tentative.

Following Kubina (*Gottesreden im Buche Hiob*) and Rowold (*The Theology of Creation*), Habel lays stress on how in the divine speeches language, form and theme are integrated into a structural unity. However, in his attempt to see the balanced components of the two speeches (pp. 5, 26, 27) Habel has to ignore part of the challenge that appears in 40:8–14. This challenge forms a prologue to the two halves of the second speech. This prologue must certainly be used as a guide to any proper interpretation of the rest of the speech. It tells us that this speech is going to be about moral and spiritual forces whereas the first speech was about God's natural forces.

I like Habel's statement that Job gets no direct answer to his problem from God but is challenged to change his orientation and view his case in the light of the total cosmic design of his Creator. Because this is a world of paradoxes there is no simplistic answer, no mechanical law of reward and retribution (pp. 5, 34, 35). But I find that Habel's treatment of Behemoth and Leviathan leaves much to be desired. Behemoth is "the symbol of those chaotic and threatening forces which God created at the beginning and which need to be kept subjugated. Perhaps Job should see himself as a similar threat" (p. 559). According to Habel, the lesson is that Job cannot control Behemoth. Only God can, and since Behemoth is a creature like Job ("I made along with you," 40:15) the implication is that God can control Job's fury. This is a truly disappointing application. Leviathan is treated in a somewhat similar way. Leviathan is "Yahweh's mythic adversary," but his "real adversary is Job." So if God silenced Leviathan, he can do the same to Job. In support of this, Habel goes back to Job's complaint that God was treating him like Yamm or Tannin (7:11–12). It is my opinion that Behemoth and Leviathan are best explained and better integrated into the whole book of Job when they are taken as symbols of the wicked, mentioned in the preceding challenge or prologue to this speech (40:11–12). As such they are related to the Satan of the prologue of the book. One must understand Satan's challenge to God concerning Job as foundational to the entire purpose of the book. If Habel had followed this line of thought, his very excellent idea that form and theme are integrated into structural unity would have certainly been enhanced.

Overall, this is an excellent commentary. Habel's textual notes alone would be worth the cost of the volume.

Elmer B. Smick
Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, South Hamilton, MA

Israel Among the Nations: A Commentary on the Books of Nahum, Obadiah and Esther. By Richard J. Coggins and S. Paul Re'emi. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985, 140 pp., $7.95 paper.

To many pastors the OT must be a foreboding area to preach from, since the few commentaries available too often deliver only historical detail combined with idiosyncratic theories about a book's transmission and composition. It is thus quite refreshing to see a series with the aim of elucidating the "theological significance of the OT and, second, to emphasize the relevance of each book for the life of the church" (back cover).

Coggins has already provided the academic world with a number of helpful articles in journals and even a *Festschrift* to Peter Ackroyd. In his commentary on Nahum and Obadiah he appears to be applying some of the principles he earlier laid out in his "History and Story in Old Testament Study" (*JSOT* 11 [1979] 36–46). Re'emi was presbyter of the famous Church of Scotland in Israel and has previously written a commentary on Lamentations.

Coggins' work on Nahum is valuable for its literary contribution. It is filled with literary parallels in the prophets and the rest of Scripture. He typically avoids the wild conjectures many have advanced with regard to the history and transmission of the text. He is also, for the most part, concerned with interpreting the final form of the text, much like B. Childs' canon criticism. This has the definite advantage of treating Nahum as a unity rather than basing interpretation on questionable literary histories.

On the other hand, the prophecy of Nahum had an historical referent and was delivered to an audience in the language and culture of its day. This necessitates that we first understand the word of Nahum concerning Nineveh before we attempt to apply it for today. Whereas others have overemphasized or improperly used archaeology and historical background in their interpretations, Coggins does not make enough use of these details for us to get a feel for how the sixth-century-B.C. Judahite would have understood Nahum.

While this concern for the final form of the text is a laudable trend to most evangelicals, what Coggins has in mind is the reading of a later reinterpretation of what the Biblical authors wrote. The existence of this later editor seems to this reviewer to be not yet established. On what basis can it be said that "it is likely that already in the time of Nahum Nineveh had become a symbol, standing for the heathen enemy of God and his people. Such a development is obvious enough in the book of Jonah, and still more so, of course, in the only NT use of the term (Matt 12:41 = Luke 11:30)" (p. 17)? On the contrary, it rather appears to refer quite literally to the historical Nineveh in the two NT passages just quoted, as it does in Zeph 2:13. Coggins uses this point, however, as a reason for not being overly concerned with the historical significance of Nineveh in the sixth century. In fact he nowhere clearly posits authorship for or attempts to date the prophecy of Nahum. This lack of historical moorings makes one wonder to what audience Nahum was directed. We would rather see a concern for the original author's intent as understood in the culture of his day, while making full use of recent literary and rhetorical methods. Subsequent application may see Nineveh as a "type" of the enemy of God and his people. Such a distinction gives us clear historical boundaries beyond which our interpretations dare not go.

Nevertheless, the pastor will find Coggins' work on Nahum quite helpful for its fruitful attempt at seriously bridging the gap between the then of the text and the now of today. Unlike many other popular commentaries with a "practical" aim, this one takes seriously the exegetical task and even includes balanced text-critical evaluations that are quite helpful for the pastor who has access only to his *BHS* apparatus and several modern versions.

Coggins' work on Obadiah is in the same style as his treatment of Nahum, so many

of our comments with regard to the latter apply here as well. His refusal to date Obadiah even tentatively may have resulted in his misunderstanding of the prophet's message, as when he indicates on p. 72 that the Edomites whom Obadiah supposedly condemns for incursions into Judahite territories in reality had little choice in the matter, because they were being displaced by the Nabateans. As he puts it: "We need not agree with the viewpoint expressed in the book of Obadiah, but it is important to try and understand it if we are to come to any appreciation of the book" (p. 72).

Against this we would say that the most likely incident that produced Obadiah's strong oracle of judgment (cf. Obad 10—11) is the Edomite participation in the overthrow of Jerusalem by the Babylonians in 586, an event to which both Ezek 25:12 and Lam 4:21–22 seem to allude. Edom's subsequent total displacement by the Nabateans is most likely the judgment to which Obadiah is referring. Hence Edom's displacement by the Nabateans and subsequent intrusion into Judah, though already begun, is not the cause of Obadiah's oracle of doom but rather the predicted end.

Quite a different approach is taken in Re'emi's commentary on Esther. If Coggins overemphasizes the literary aspects, Re'emi overemphasizes historical description. He sometimes provides good historical background, as on p. 122 where he explains an important point about the Persian new year. But at many points his work is nothing more than a running summary of what a cursory reading of the English text would reveal. Not all of this is his fault, since one must consider the space limitations Re'emi was working with. In only thirty-five pages he covers introductory matters, the commentary proper, and provides us with a bibliography. It is unfortunate that the largest of the three books dealt with in this volume receives the smallest treatment.

In summary, this reviewer recommends Coggins' two works, if supplemented with the commentaries by G. Maier and R. Smith on Nahum and L. Allen and J. D. W. Watts on Obadiah. Sadly, Re'emi's work is too brief to be of much help in interpreting the book of Esther.

H. Eldon Clem

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

The Covenants of Promise: A Theology of the Old Testament Covenants. By Thomas Edward McComiskey. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1985, 259 pp., $10.95.

It would be difficult to select a subject of more basic import for the study of Biblical theology and hermeneutics than the nature and structure of the divine covenants. The author tells us that his main purpose is to provide a formal reclassification of the system of redemptive covenants, one that will clarify their unity and diversity (p. 10).

McComiskey distinguishes two kinds of covenants: Promise covenant "states and guarantees the elements of the promise" (p. 140). Administrative covenants firstly "set forth stipulations of obedience" and secondly "explicate the elements of the promise in terms appropriate to the economies they govern" (p. 140).

The core of his proposal is a restructuring of the Abrahamic covenant. Usually, and properly, God's dealings with Abraham (and Isaac and Jacob) are viewed as a single covenant, a particular administration of the overarching covenant of grace, containing the offer of salvation through the promise-faith principle, accompanied by the Lord's constant requirements of holiness and obedient service. This unified covenant is distinguished from other administrations of the covenant of grace before it (e.g. the Noahic covenant of Genesis 6—8) and after it (e.g. the Mosaic covenant).

In McComiskey's scheme the unity of the Abrahamic covenant is, if not obliterated, certainly obscured. For he separates the aspect of promise-faith from that of demand-

obedience, identifying them as two different covenants—the first promissory, the second administrative. He says that administrative covenant does not appear until Genesis 17. Before that, he insists, there is simple promise with no stipulations of obedience. However, to maintain this he must indulge in election fraud, counting only "precise" stipulations (like the circumcision requirement in Genesis 17) and discounting demands for a "broad ethical response" such as that in Gen 12:1 (p. 149). He is driven to such devices because the presence of just one of the two criteria for administrative covenants would suffice to get Genesis 12 ff. so classified (as in the case of the circumcision "covenant"), and if that happened he would be left with no promise covenant at all and no thesis. By the same token he must also regard Genesis 3—11 as containing no (precise) stipulations since he treats this section as of a piece with Genesis 12 ff. Presumably then he must dismiss a covenantal stipulation like that given Noah to build the ark-kingdom (Gen 6:14 ff.) as just a broad ethical obligation that does not count. Furthermore, lest Genesis 12 ff. qualify as an administrative covenant by exhibiting the second criterion for such, McComiskey must deny that the way the promises are set forth to Abraham differs from previous presentations of them: "The promise reigned from Adam to Abraham with no apparent change in its expression" (p. 195). This would mean, for example, that there was no difference between the kingdom as promised to Abraham and the kingdom in the ark as promised in the Noahic covenant (Genesis 6—8). In a word, then, McComiskey's concept of a stipulationless promissory covenant in Genesis 12 ff., the cornerstone of his entire reconstruction, is an unhistorical abstraction.

Another critical feature of McComiskey's approach is his treatment of the circumcision transaction of Genesis 17. Misunderstanding the idiom to "give" a covenant, he misconstrues as a separate, "administrative" covenant what is merely the addition of a sealing sign to an existing covenant. Precisely the same terms applied to circumcision are used for the Sabbath sign in Exodus, and McComiskey subsumes the Sabbath under the Mosaic covenant. Consistency would suggest that he treat similarly the relation of circumcision to the Abrahamic covenant.

In the case of the new covenant, contrary to his handling of the Abrahamic covenant McComiskey does not separate promise and obedience aspects into two covenants. However, the single new covenant is classified as administrative. Perhaps nothing exposes the heuristic failure of the proposed reclassification scheme more than this. How utterly incongruous that this ultimate, consummating realization of the grace-promise principle should get classified in the category in which human obligation rather than divine grace is made the distinctive feature!

Besides the more formal matter of the classification of the covenants, certain vital theological issues require attention.

Analysis of the relationship of the old and new covenants confronts one with the question of law (works) and grace. To bungle here is to obscure if not pervert the heart of the gospel. This has been the unhappy effect of several recent covenantal studies. Emanating from more or less evangelical circles, they have nevertheless challenged standard Reformational thinking about law and gospel. These revisionists deny that works has ever been an operating principle in any divine covenant. Intruding the concept of grace into the situations where the works principle is actually operative, they blur the principial distinction between grace and works. I have detailed the disastrous theological consequences of this anti-forensic position in a review article on the teachings of D. P. Fuller and N. Shepherd (cf. *Presbyterion* 9 [1983] 85–92). Unfortunately, McComiskey has bought into this teaching or at least has been influenced enough by it to become muddled in his formulations. There are some whose failure in this regard extends only to refusal to recognize the works principle operating in the typological dimension of the old covenant (cf. e.g. P. Robertson, *The Christ of the Covenants* [Grand Rapids: Baker, 1980]). But McComiskey says things that seem to reflect the more radical repudiation of

the works principle in God's covenantal relation to Adam at creation and in the covenant of the Father and Son in eternity.

With respect to the old covenant, the author does acknowledge that though Israel's kingdom-election was a gracious gift the ground of their retention of the kingdom was national obedience to the law. However, he refuses to identify this as the works principle. In so doing he throws away the key to understanding Paul's teaching on the law. Paul, perceiving that Israel's tenure in the kingdom depended on their obedience and was not under the guarantee of Christ's suretyship, concluded that the old covenant was, at this typological level, operating under a principle opposite to the grace-promise-faith principle (cf. e.g. Rom 6:14; 10:4–6; 2 Cor 3:6–9; Gal 3:11, 12, 17, 18). McComiskey devotes a chapter-length appendix to a vain exegetical effort to avoid the simple force of Paul's statements (pp. 106–137).

The confusion introduced by the rejection of the law-gospel contrast clouds the entire discussion. Often it is not clear whether the author is talking about the law as rule of conduct or principle of government. And of course the distinction between human obedience functioning as meritorious ground of blessing and as confirmatory accompaniment of saving faith does not come into its own. The result is a garbled account of the way of salvation. Thus a comment on Gal 3:6 attributes to Paul the teaching that "faithful obedience on Abraham's part was the *ground* of his participation in the benefits of the promise" (p. 36; italics mine). Concerning law defined as obedience he observes: "Dependence on that principle *alone* is insufficient. . . . The Law 'killed' those who sought life in the letter *alone* and not in the promise" (pp. 127, 128; italics mine). The Reformers were concerned to maintain the doctrine of faith alone. Here the question apparently becomes whether obedience alone will suffice or needs to be supplemented by promise-faith. At best the formulation is misleading. Pity the poor soul dependent on such an account of the "gospel" to find the way to peace with God. These formulations, more Judaizing than Reformational, are not consistent with more Biblical affirmations that come from the evangelical heart of McComiskey elsewhere. But it is just such inconsistency, obscurity and confusion that vitiate this work.

Another current error obstructing development of a soundly Biblical theology of the covenants concerns the land promise of the Abrahamic covenant. In dispensationalism the promised land is treated as an integral part of an assumed comprehensive resumption of the old Jewish kingdom in a millennial order distinct from the Church's eschatological experience. Not so consistent hermeneutically, even if proportionately a lesser misconception, is the view that isolates the land promise, positing for it a distinctly Jewish future while interpreting the other promises under the new covenant in terms of the common experience of the whole Christian Church. Though disavowing the intention of moderating between covenant theology and dispensationalism (pp. 11–12), McComiskey adopts this halfway dispensationalism as do, for example, W. C. Kaiser, Jr., and W. Van Gemeren. A version of this view adapted to thinking on the theological left is advocated by ecumenicists who would include Judaism alongside Christianity as a legitimate tradition within a multiform covenantalism.

According to the NT, after a typological-level fulfillment under the old covenant, the kingdom-promise configuration of king, land and people receives fulfillment as a coherent whole on the antitypical level under the new covenant. At this level the promised land does not remain the old symbol-territory of Canaan, nor does it turn into a spiritualized landedness in Christ. It continues to be territory but takes on the cosmic proportions of the consummated creation.

McComiskey is sympathetic with the positive part of that assessment and frankly acknowledges that the NT lacks even "one unequivocal affirmation that the promise of the land will be fulfilled for the Jewish people within the definable boundaries of Palestine" (p. 200). Nevertheless he proceeds to assign to the present Israeli occupation of

Palestine the same redemptive-covenantal significance as the birth of Isaac as a divine earnest of larger future fulfillment. Modern Israel is, he says, "an earnest of the future conquest of the world by Christ" (p. 208). He feels forced into this conclusion by his theory that the Abrahamic "promise undergoes expansion, but it never suffers observable abrogation" (p. 207). What he should do, of course, is to correct his theory since it lacks the support of the NT. Moreover he does not apply his theory consistently. For example, in the case of the promise of the king he does not think necessary the retention of the old typological version along with the royal Christ.

To follow the hermeneutic of dispensationalism only halfway is enough to get ensnared in the theological dilemma of that system: Either one must dissent from the NT teaching that in Christ there is neither Jew nor Greek and hence there cannot be a separate Jewish form of kingdom inheritance, or one must allow that the redemptive blessings offered in the covenant of promise can be enjoyed by Jews apart from faith-commitment to Jesus Christ. To allow this is to side with Judaism against the Church. It is to preach another gospel.

Courage and industry are evidenced by the author in undertaking so enormous a task. But he has become entangled in the depths. In particular, the reclassification system he recommends does not work. It does not fit the covenantal realities. Rather than explaining and clarifying it obscures and confuses.

Meredith G. Kline

Westminster Theological Seminary, Escondido, CA

Invitation to the Greek Language. By Wayne Walden. Plymouth: Livingbooks, 1985, iii + 112 pp., $12.00 paper.

This work is evidently used in the author's Biblical languages seminars in schools, churches and synagogues in the Boston area. It is intended for either self-study or classroom use on the popular level. There are thirty lessons, nine appendices, a dictionary of Greek words, and a combination list of abbreviations/glossary/index. The pages are photocopied from originals that are partially typewritten and partially handwritten. The approach is largely inductive with an emphasis on readings from the NT. Walden is also interested in modern Greek, and thus modern pronunciation and modern variations from NT grammar are stressed. The order of the lessons first stresses nouns (I-X), then the verbal system (XI-XXI), and finally reading in Mark, John and Matthew (XXII-XXX). Such matters as accents, the optative mood, a preposition chart, numbers, *eimi*, and contract verbs are relegated to the various appendices. A cassette tape on pronunciation is available from the author for six dollars, but I did not receive one with the review copy.

Several features of this work commend it to Greek teachers. Some will appreciate its inculcation of modern rather than Erasmian pronunciation. (G. G. Cohen and C. N. Sellers made a case for this in *GTJ* 5 [1984] 197–203.) All will profit from the occasional notes on modern differences from NT grammar (e.g. pp. 16, 30, 31, 35, 39). The emphasis on proper penmanship will be helpful (pp. 1–6), as will the early explanation of the use of a Greek dictionary (pp. 12–15). Perhaps the greatest strength of the work is its inductive approach and its emphasis on contextual readings from the NT and other Greek literature. Such an approach is superior to the contrived, unrelated sentences found in the exercises of some grammars.

For all of these strengths, however, I still cannot enthusiastically recommend this work. Its production is quite amateurish. On several pages the handwritten Greek sections are poorly aligned with uneven margins and entirely too much material crammed

onto the page (e.g. pp. 24, 25, 43, 45, 63, 74). If the work is revised the Greek should be typed. Besides these production problems there are some instances where the simple treatment on a popular level becomes misleadingly simplistic. Such statements as "Tense refers to time" (p. 34 but cf. p. 48), "The middle form is identical with the passive" (p. 37), "The infinitive . . . is usually translated by 'to' plus the verb meaning" (p. 39), "The infinitive has only the single form" (p. 43), and "The optative is a weaker condition than the subjunctive" (p. 73) can give the wrong impression to beginning students. Also, the equation of the genitive case with possession and the dative with indirect object (pp. 12, 16) does not do justice to the complex use of these two cases even on the popular level. Finally, the treatment of liquid verbs is only four sentences long (p. 47).

Amateurish production and simplistic treatment of some key points seriously hinder the effectiveness of this work. Yet it is well conceived and its goal is commendable. Those who choose to use it will want to augment its discussion, especially where the above points are concerned. Those who teach Greek know that this is necessary whatever text is chosen. Walden's book should be consulted by those who attempt a goal similar to his. Those who teach Hebrew may be interested to know that Walden has written a companion volume, *Invitation to the Hebrew Language.* It is available from the same publisher.

David L. Turner

Grace Theological Seminary, Winona Lake, IN

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, Abridged in One Volume. Abridged by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids/Exeter: Eerdmans/Paternoster, 1985, 1356 pp., $44.95.

Without doubt this volume will from henceforth bear the nickname "little Kittel," given to it by its abridger. After lifting the four-pound volume repeatedly during an afternoon of study, however, the student may smile wryly at the designation "little." Although it is an abridgement of nine original volumes of 8,420 pages, it is by no means light or superficial in substance. Nor is it in any sense incomplete. The "little Kittel" contains an abridgement of every one of the 2,300 theologically significant words treated in the original Kittel.

The volume is particularly valuable because of a number of significant features: (1) The emphasis in each entry is on the NT usage of the word. Although careful attention is given to the use of many of the terms in such areas as the Greek world and the OT, the main purpose is always to point up the NT usage. Invariably the NT treatment is longer. Other treatments such as the OT or the LXX are written to lead up to the NT treatment. (2) For the benefit of those who do not know Greek or Hebrew, words from those languages are all transliterated into English. (3) All footnotes are omitted in order to slant the work more toward the average student of the Bible. (4) The only abbreviations used are those that are generally familiar to Bible readers. Otherwise the words are written out in full. (5) Tables of contents that appeared at the beginning of longer articles of the original are omitted from the abridgement. (6) The name of the author and the location of the original article are appended to each article of the abridgement. (7) The outlines that appear in most articles of the original are retained, making it easy to refer quickly from the abridgement back to the original.

One method of abridgement that Bromiley might have used would have been to include entire sentences and paragraphs and by the same token to have omitted large blocks of material in their entirety. This would have been an easier approach than that apparent in the present abridgement. The result, however, would then have been a scissors-and-paste kind of product that would have been superficial in its unity, if indeed it

possessed any real unity. The style of such an abridgement could not have been anything but rough and disjointed.

Instead, Bromiley has chosen a much more difficult approach. He has seldom if ever lifted a complete sentence out of the original and transferred it to the abridgement. Paragraphs are never transferred *in toto* from the original to the abridgement. The two procedures in which Bromiley is constantly engaged are reduction and paraphrase. He identifies the essential content of a paragraph, sets aside all other materials, and then restates the essential material in concise and often simpler form. In so doing he lifts out phrases and clauses and weaves them skillfully into the abridgement. The end product is an extensive rewrite and abridgement of the paragraph.

In the process of rewriting, Bromiley often clarifies a more difficult original. For example, an original sentence of the discussion of *kairos* in the NT (3. 459) reads: "It does not occur in the spatial sense in the NT, and the material is found only at Heb. 11:15." Instead of "the material" the abridgement has substituted "the situational use," which is considerably clearer than the original.

A good example of a passage needing abbreviation and simplification is found in the article on *agapaō*. The original (1. 27) reads: "From what we have seen already of the nearness to life of the concept of love it is surely obvious that it must have high theological value once it comes to be used in the language of religion." The abridgement is a fine improvement in both length and simplicity. Bromiley paraphrases as follows: "In the light of secular usage, love obviously will have high theological value in the religious realm." The abridgement of the passage is less than one-half the length of the original, and it has been relieved of the complex terminology that characterizes the original passage.

Occasionally, though rarely, Bromiley's paraphrase weakens the original rather than adequately representing it. Such is the case in two paragraphs dealing with love in Judaism. In the original of Kittel (1. 38–39) under C, 1, Kittel includes two significant statements that are omitted from the abridgement (p. 7, C, 1). The original Kittel (1. 38) reads: "The love of God for Israel (Dt. 7:13) is not impulse but will; the love for God and the neighbor demanded of the Israelite (Dt. 6:5; Lv. 19:18) is not intoxication but act." Although it is but one sentence, so central is it in its characterization of *agapaō* that it could not rightly be omitted.

Another significant statement that should have been included in the abridged edition appears on p. 39 of vol. 1. Here Kittel declares: "The harmless *agapan* carries the day, mainly because by reason of its prior history it is best adapted to express thoughts of selection, of willed address and of readiness for action." Here too the abridged Kittel is weakened by omission of a statement that is crucial in the characterization of the word *agapaō*.

However, in a volume of this size and character several omissions of limited length can hardly detract from the value of such a significant work. It is apparent that Bromiley repeatedly succeeds in abbreviating the original without eviscerating it, a commendable accomplishment in a work as technical in nature as this one is.

Since the volume is by design an abridgement, it is limited by the nature of the original set and thus could be criticized for the same reasons that the original has been criticized. This review has assumed, however, that the criticisms of the original have served their purpose and need only to be mentioned in passing.

We may recognize briefly a criticism or two that have been aimed at the original Kittel and allow these comments to serve as warnings about the possible misuse of the abridged Kittel.

One danger of which the users of the abridgement should be aware is that of assuming that the length and thoroughness of the work indicates that the study of any particular word, such as *agapaō*, is a complete study of the subject of love as set forth in the NT.

Nor does the study of the NT teaching on love necessarily mean that the word *agapaō* carries all of the theological freight that may have become associated with the word in a work like Kittel. It should be pointed out that these dangers are not necessarily created by Kittel. They are simply possible misuses of Kittel whether in the original form or the abridged.

All NT Greek scholars are already extensively indebted to Bromiley for the translation of the preceding nine volumes of Kittel. Now to that host of debtors is added another host—namely, those who do not know NT Greek. What a treasure house of knowledge is now opened to them! And those who are reasonably proficient in the use of the *koine* now find themselves still more grateful because of the birth of "little Kittel."

Donald W. Burdick

Denver Seminary

The MacArthur New Testament Commentary: Matthew 1—7. By John MacArthur, Jr. Moody, 1985, 489 pp.

In the preface to the first volume of his commentary series MacArthur characterizes his commentaries as expository. He says that his objective is to explain and apply Scripture and in that way "help make God's living Word alive to His people" (p. vii).

The author seeks to reach this goal by dealing with the content of Matthew 1—7 in forty-four chapters. These are expository units of relatively equal length. Each is self-contained and appears to be the text of an expository message. Each is well organized and manifests a logical flow of thought. The *NASB* text of the Scripture portion to be expounded is printed at the beginning of the chapter and parts of it are repeated throughout. MacArthur's exposition includes attention to historical background, theological theme study, theological issues, and practical application. Modern-day illustrations and quotations are often present. The commentary also contains a brief introduction and bibliography. The volume is helpfully indexed in terms of Hebrew/Aramaic words, Greek words, Scripture references, and subjects.

Before describing the merits of the volume some weaknesses must be pointed out. There is an unevenness in the proportion of space devoted to various aspects of exposition. Sometimes there is an extended description of the historical background of a given feature of the text. These descriptions often include information largely irrelevant for understanding the feature's function within the passage. For example, extensive background on the book of Hosea introduces MacArthur's discussion (p. 42) of the Hos 11:1 quote (Matt 2:15). Often little room is left for illustration or application.

MacArthur's strength, the ability to bring the whole counsel of God in view when discussing a passage, also involves a decided weakness. The reader is rarely aware that Matthew is being explained in terms of his own thought. MacArthur's presentation evokes such questions as whether his exposition of the beatitudes (e.g. Matt 5:6) or of the teaching concerning giving (6:1–4) really comes from an analysis of Matthew's thought.

There is an unevenness in the precision with which he documents both ancient and modern sources. The reader is often unable to check out MacArthur's contentions or pursue the matter further.

In terms of tone the author at points presents his interpretive conclusions on issues so dogmatically that one is led to believe that no true Christian could hold to any other position (e.g. MacArthur's discussion of immersion as the Biblical mode, p. 79; Sabbath observance as not required for NT saints, p. 256). On the other hand, this reviewer wonders whether MacArthur is radical enough in his understanding and application of

the sermon on the mount's message, especially in the area of possession (cf. chap. 38).

There are a number of positive values to this commentary. The author shows an ability to classify Biblical content into meaningful and memorable headings. He has a keen ear for the pithy, memorable turn of phrase as well as the apt contemporary quotation. For example in his discussion of 6:25–34 he states: "Worry is the sin of distrusting the promise and providence of God" (p. 419).

MacArthur provides the richness of historical and Biblical background for each passage. He displays a thoroughness in drawing out the practical spiritual implications of a passage's teaching. In his work one will find six characteristics of a soul-winner (4:18–22; pp. 118–119), five implications of the permanence of Scripture (5:18; p. 265), and seven principles to guide the Christian in giving (6:1–4; pp. 358–359). The twenty-five pages devoted to the exposition of the "Disciples' Prayer," as MacArthur terms it, are especially helpful.

This commentary will be an aid to preachers who use it in conjunction with standard exegetical commentaries on Matthew. The commentary's wealth of historical background material, as well as its expository form, make it a beneficial resource for the preacher who desires that the Word come alive for and in his people.

William J. Larkin

Luke: Artist and Theologian. Luke's Passion Account as Literature. By Robert J. Karris. New York: Paulist, 1985, 130 pp.

Karris' monograph on Luke 23 sets out to understand how Luke's artistry was a vehicle for his theology, particularly his Christology and soteriology. He attacks the *crux interpretum* of Lukan soteriology, the lack of explicit reference in the gospel to vicarious atonement, by tracing a number of motifs that he views as giving a satisfactory explanation of Luke's approach to the salvific import of Christ's death. He begins by helpfully defining the literary phenomenon, theological motif, and how it may be identified. He also characterizes for us the nature of Luke's gospel. It is a kerygmatic story that is "meant to preach to the reader in narrative form and to elicit from the reader an act of Christian faith" (p. 8).

Karris devotes the next three chapters to a description of three key theological motifs, foundational to Luke 23, as they occur throughout Luke's gospel. He presents Lukan Christology in terms of Jesus as God's righteous one and as the rejected prophet in order to show how Jesus got to the cross. He uses Wis 2:10–20; 4:20—5:8 as the proper background for the former title. The author details the theme of justice in Luke and concludes concerning its salvific significance: "In Jesus the kingly justice of this God was being revealed to a needy and battered creation" (p. 37). The third key theme is food. In the gospel "Jesus is the revealer of this God, the faithful God who feeds his hungry creation, rectifies the ills that plague it, and rejoices to sup with sinners" (p. 70). Each of these themes explains how Jesus "got himself crucified" as he did his "justice work" in preaching the gospel to the poor and provided food to the hungry and outcast and was rejected by the religious leaders who rejected his methods and message. But they are also descriptive of the salvation Christ's death brings. They are present in the portrayal of that death.

Next, proceeding section by section in Luke 23, Karris describes via these themes Luke's Christology and soteriology. He shows how Jesus is consistently presented as the innocent righteous sufferer. He argues for the promise to the thief (". . . today. . . with me in Paradise," 23:43) as an example of the "food" theme. The author also brings to the fore "seeing" as a theological motif for saving faith. Karris concludes that Luke's soter-

iology centers in a faithful and righteous God. "By granting the life of the resurrection to the innocently crucified righteous one, Jesus, who typifies God's creation held in the power of sin and death, God shows that he, and not the powers of chaos, is righteous king. . . . God saves." Jesus' role is both as model, "the righteous one, whose journey to God was traversed along the road of justice," and as an opener of the way to God. His invitation to men and women is "to journey to God along his way of justice confident that God has conquered the powers which might undermine that journey and prevent union with him" (p. 115).

There are a number of positive values in Karris' work. Though a brief volume and written with a minimum of technical language, it is heavily footnoted. The footnotes both manifest acquaintance with the current state of Lukan scholarship, especially in Roman Catholic circles, and deal with interpretational questions at many points. Karris' passion Christology and soteriology is a model of integrated and comprehensive presentation of a Biblical writer's theological themes. He can deal both carefully with details and make summary statements that bring together the various aspects of the discussion in their proper relationship. His conclusions are usually based on a judicious handling of the evidence.

There are, however, a number of questions that this reviewer has about the methodological approach and major theses of the work. In line with the current practice of literary criticism of a gospel, Karris sets aside the question of history and focuses primarily on Luke's literary artistry. The gospel is characterized as kerygmatic story or narrative. Though Karris does call it "salvation history" he does not comment on the gospel's historical reliability or keep in view the historical factor throughout his analysis. Since it is apparent that Luke is claiming to be writing history (1:1–4), any literary analysis should take that factor into account. At the beginning of his chapter on Luke 23 he declines, for lack of space, to deal with questions of historicity and sources (p. 80). A simple statement of his views would have helped.

Karris' understanding of Luke's Christology omits one significant element. In neither his description of Jesus as innocent righteous sufferer or as rejected prophet does he bring in the messianic significance of these titles and roles. Certainly the messianic rather than the exemplary significance was more central to Luke's thought (e.g. 4:16–30; 22:35–37; Acts 3:11–26). His use of Wisdom 2 and 4 rather than Isaiah 53 as the background for Luke's Christology and soteriology ignores the key role that Isaiah 53 plays as setting the theme for Luke's passion narrative (cf. *JETS* 20 [1977] 325–336). Karris' characterization of salvation around the justice theme opens the way to a works-righteousness, "doing justice" approach that is out of line with Luke's emphasis on grace and repentance (Luke 15; 19:1–10). The food theme tends to blur the distinction between spiritual need and physical need. Though Karris has rightly pointed out Luke's holistic gospel, which includes economic repentance, he has not dealt adequately with Luke's understanding of the relationship between sinful oppressive deeds and the resultant human suffering.

Karris presents the unresolved question of Luke's passion narrative plot as "Will God be faithful to his innocent righteous sufferer?" Luke through his promise-and-fulfillment motif has already provided his readers with the answer to that question before the passion begins (9:22; 18:32). The question rather that Luke leaves in his readers' minds during his passion narrative is: Why is this innocent righteous one suffering? The answer, though not explicitly given, may be inferred from the larger context of Isa 53:12, to which Luke 22:35–38 points. The innocent righteous one is suffering a vicarious atoning death for the guilty.

William J. Larkin

The First Day of the Week: The Mystery and Message of the Empty Tomb of Jesus. By Robert A. McKenzie. New York: Paulist, 1985, 87 pp., $4.95.

McKenzie, a Presbyterian clergyman, wrote this work as a series of meditations in connection with lectionary preaching at Easter. His goal was to present the distinctive message of each evangelist with respect to the resurrection narratives. For McKenzie the differences between the gospel accounts are a positive rather than negative factor, and the preacher should stress the individual accounts rather than harmonize or conflate them into a common story. Therefore the goal is to elucidate each resurrection narrative in turn (with the exception of John 21, which McKenzie calls "an addendum to an otherwise completed document," p. 6).

On one level McKenzie accomplishes his purpose. Each story is elucidated in turn, and the discussion spends much time first studying the resurrection chapter in light of the rest of the individual gospel and then describing the events behind the surface context of each story. For instance, Mark's coverage begins: "And when the Sabbath was past," tracing Jesus' Sabbath confrontations with the authorities and the demonic realm (pp. 8–11) and then turning to the events of that final Sabbath: "The guardians of the sabbath had had their way. For a brief moment Jesus had brought life and hope to the people oppressed by sabbath holiness." The story is told simply. The crucifixion is related (pp. 12–14) and then the resurrection narrative (from 16:1–8, with both endings considered late additions). As McKenzie himself says, the approach is sermonic, "a narrative style which reads like an elaboration of the text itself" (p. 6).

Each concludes with a critical postscript that briefly discusses the "problems." Mark's postscript discusses why the story should end on a negative note, with the women failing to obey their commission to proclaim the good news. Amazingly, McKenzie never really answers, saying simply, "In any case, that's how Mark ends his account." He believes the promise to meet the disciples in Galilee (14:28 = 16:7) is a promise that in "Galilee of the nations" (Isaiah 9) the Church will find its fulfillment. The critical note on Matthew discusses the dramatic detail of his narrative and the issue of authority.

The first two chapters are quite disappointing. The theological themes, especially Mark's stress on discipleship failure and the overcoming of the messianic secret in the resurrection (cf. 9:9), are not noted. There is more cognizance of some Matthean themes, but the narrative flow dealing with attempts to thwart the divine plan (27:62–66; 28:11–15) and the frustration of these via God's supernatural power (28:2–4) and the authority of the Risen One (28:16–20) are not developed. The irony of the priests paying the guards to propound the very lie (28:11–15) that they had sealed the tomb in order to prevent (27:62–66) is not mentioned.

The chapters on Luke and John are better but still slim. It is obvious that McKenzie has not consulted the major monographs or commentaries on any of the resurrection narratives. The exegetical depth and Biblical theology of the respective evangelists are never quite probed, and the reader is given a surface glimpse of the marvelous truths and themes. The basic idea is carried, to allow each evangelist to speak for himself. However, the narrative flow and the richness of the theological depths of each chapter are missing. I commend the concept but cannot recommend the book.

Grant R. Osborne

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

Mary: The Faithful Disciple. By Bertrand Buby. New York: Paulist, 1985, vi + 139 pp., $6.95 paper.

According to the author, the purpose of this book is "to lay the foundation for a

scriptural understanding of who the mother of Jesus is" (p. 123). The ideas in the book arose from a workshop on Mary's presence in the Scriptures presented in the United States, Canada, Australia and Africa (p. 125). Serving as the provincial of the Cincinnati province of Marianists, the writer believes that a Marian spirituality is an essential part of an integrated revitalization of the Church (p. 5).

The book contains eight chapters in which explicit and implicit references to Mary in the four gospels, Paul, Revelation, Ignatius, Justin Martyr and Irenaeus are explored. An epilogue, seven-page bibliography, and two appendices on "Pondering Over in One's Heart the Sacred Word of God" and "References to Mary, Mother of Jesus" conclude the work.

The author assumes Markan priority and relies heavily on redaction criticism for the various perspectives found in the gospels on Mary. He constantly acknowledges his indebtedness to other Catholic scholars, especially R. Brown and J. Fitzmyer.

Buby follows a popular trend in post-Vatican-II Roman Catholic Biblical scholarship of presenting Mary as the model disciple. Such an approach allows Mary to be emulated by Christians on a much deeper human level than was possible on the earlier view of Mary as outside the Church or on a pedestal within the Church (p. 4).

Buby admits that there is not a uniform picture of Mary in the NT. He sees growth and development in the theology of Mary from Paul through John. In Paul there is a "whisper, shadow, or a dream image" of Mary. In Mark there is a "silhouette." Matthew presents a "pencil sketch." Luke paints a "portrait," whereas John presents her in "sculpture" (pp. 12–13).

It is interesting to observe that a highly Protestant Mary emerges from Buby's discussion of the NT texts. A similar picture was produced by a prior volume, *Mary in the New Testament* (Fortress, 1978), which Buby cites frequently. The traditional Catholic position on Mary certainly is not reinforced by this type of study. Buby's statement concerning Mary in the Pauline writings is symptomatic of the dearth of Biblical texts to be used in support of traditional Mariology: "Thus the echo of Mary is reduced to nine lines within Paul's Epistles, and all of these references are faint and implicit at best" (p. 27).

Even the presentation of Mary in Luke and Acts yields the somewhat vanilla conclusion that Mary is the only disciple of Jesus who has bridged every stage of his life from conception to birth, infancy, adolescence, active ministry, and birth of the Church (p. 84). The strongest paradigm in Luke-Acts is Mary as a disciple who prays.

The closest one gets to traditional Mariology is Buby's exegesis of John 19. Building on the work of G. Montague, Buby views the presentation of Mary to the beloved disciple by Jesus as an ecclesiological *leitmotiv* for the birth of the Christian community: the Mother of the Church and the beloved disciple united in the Spirit sharing the same sacraments (blood and water; pp. 104–105).

The reviewer, frankly, did not find anything new or startling in this book. In his opinion one would find the volume *Mary in the New Testament* much more substantial in its treatment of the Biblical material. The chief value of Buby's work is the insight it provides into post-Vatican-II Roman Catholic Biblical scholarship.

Carl B. Hoch, Jr.

Grand Rapids Baptist Seminary

Jesus the Pharisee: A New Look at the Jewishness of Jesus. By Harvey Falk. New York/Mahwah: Paulist, 1985, viii + 177 pp., $8.95.

Falk sets himself at least two central aims. The first can certainly only be lauded.

He stresses that "the main goal of this book is to promote the concept that Jews and Christians will be more true and loyal to their respective faiths when they exhibit love and respect for one another's beliefs and traditions" (p. 33). The second raises many questions. Falk wants to demonstrate at least the following: (1) "that Jesus' debates with the Pharisees were actually disputes recorded in the Talmud between Bet Shammai and Bet Hillel, with Jesus adopting the views of Bet Hillel"; (2) "that Bet Shammai were in control of Jewish life and institutions during most of the first century, and that the murderous Zealots, often represented in the priesthood in Jerusalem, were followers of Bet Shammai"; and (3) "that the Shammaites were responsible for handing Jesus over to the Romans for the crucifixion, and that their decision was in violation of Jewish law" (p. 8).

What we find here, then, is "a new scenario of the times of Jesus, Paul and the Apostles" (ibid.). Falk's inspiration is not so much the ancient sources, however, but a little-known letter to Polish rabbis by the eighteenth-century German Talmudist and mystic J. Emden (1697–1776). Emden, besides being the avowed enemy of his contemporary J. Eyebeschütz, was friendly with M. Mendelssohn (1729–1786) and may be regarded as a forerunner of the *Haskalah*, the Enlightenment movement in European Jewry whose inception is normally placed in the 1770s.

This letter is helpfully translated from the Hebrew by Falk (pp. 17–23). Emden argued that neither Jesus nor Paul intended to make any fundamental changes in the Judaism of their time, at least not of the Beth Hillel variety of Pharisaism (which, significantly, furnishes the paradigm for most strands of the Jewish tradition to the present hour). Jesus came in fact only "to establish a religion for the Gentiles from that time onward. Nor was it new, but actually ancient; they being the Seven Commandments of the Sons of Noah, which were forgotten. The Apostles of the Nazarene then established them anew" (p. 19). Emden is progressive for his time in that he, unlike most Jews of the day, could make positive statements about Jesus. He concludes that, just as Jews are saved by obedience to the Torah, Gentiles are taught by Jesus to seek redemption by observing the "Seven Noahide Commandments, as commanded upon them through the Halakha from Moses at Sinai" (p. 20). Jesus and Paul "knew that it would be too difficult for the Gentiles to observe the Torah of Moses" (ibid.), so they set about propagating a subsidiary version of Judaism through which the Gentiles too could walk in God's favor.

Falk's positive contribution is the wealth of rabbinic lore he digs up to substantiate his arguments. We are told that he spent eight years in researching for this book, and his diligence and own rabbinic training serve him well in locating quotations that at points may reinforce portions of his thesis. Especially provocative are his insights into the dynamics of the Beth Shammai-Beth Hillel controversy (see e.g. p. 80 n. 14). A number of his discussions will repay careful examination by scholars competent in rabbinics. It is doubtful that many of Falk's major arguments will find wide acceptance, but some of his minor ones will provide discussion.

Falk's presentation is open to criticism at two major points. First, just on the face of it, it seems far-fetched to attempt the *tour de force* his book clearly affects to be when the primary impetus is from a fairly obscure rabbi of two centuries ago. This argument smacks of the "no one ever understood this until I came along" variety. There is of course no a priori reason why Emden could not be right. But to defend Emden and further his views Falk must build upon a string of dubious premises or conclusions: Hillel was an Essene (p. 44); Moses actually did give the Noahide Laws at Sinai, although there is no proof of this from even Jewish sources till after the third century A.D. (p. 47); the Acts 15 prohibitions "are an early Tannaitic variant of the Noahide laws" (p. 48); Jesus' ministry lasted only one year (p. 76); Paul "taught that each should adhere to the faith in which he was called," meaning that Jews should remain in their Judaism while Gentiles stay true to the Church (p. 77); Paul "didn't bother the Jews, and instead devoted

all his energies to bringing Christian teachings to the Gentiles" (p. 78); "Jesus and Paul were well acquainted with the writings of the Essenes" (p. 84). Perhaps some of these contentions carry a certain plausibility. Taken together, however, in such a short book where little space is devoted to such controversial positions (and I cite only some of them), they seriously vitiate any persuasiveness that Falk's observations may possess elsewhere. If one adds to this the curious fact that the names of, e.g., Sandmel and Neusner do not even appear in the footnotes, one is led to fear that Falk in his zeal to promote Emden's insights has fallen prey to an unhealthy disdain for what could have been the very secondary literature that would have exposed some probable blind spots.

While the above criticism relates to the merely distracting, however, a second deals with the definitely disturbing. Falk, as mentioned, champions the ideal that "Jews and Christians will be more true and loyal to their respective faiths when they exhibit love and respect for one another's beliefs and traditions" (p. 33). One fails to see how Falk himself carries out this commendable aim. Not that a modern Christian need feel slighted or intimidated by Falk's arguments, since they are usually cautiously constructed and irenically stated. But many scholars with a sense of the basic integrity of ancient documents will marvel at the picture of Jesus that emerges from (ostensibly) the gospels. What about "love and respect" for the "beliefs and traditions" of the (Jewish) Christians whose writings mediate Jesus to us? Jesus, we are told, was aided by the Essenes, who were Christianity's co-founders (p. 60). John 14 is not addressed to Jews at all but exclusively to Gentiles, since Jesus states: "In my Father's house are many mansions" (p. 86). Jesus "was actually a follower of the School of Hillel and the Essene Hasidim" (ibid.). At these and not a few other points Falk virtually dissolves Jesus into the milieu of his age, making him a mere casuist—a gracious and sensitive one, but a casuist none the less—among casuists, a (secondary) rabbi among rabbis, a man among men. Of course he was a man, and to some extent a rabbi. Yet it is not the Jesus of modern Christendom (against whom, justifiably, Falk registers some telling criticisms) but the Jesus of the NT who hardly admits of such a summary dissolution (unless Falk wants to argue that the NT sources that deal with Jesus are categorically the product of an early non-Jewish Church, mere *Gemeindetheologie*—but then he would have no historical grounds for his own reconstruction either).

We leave aside here the notorious problematic, to which Falk seems somewhat oblivious, of trying to reconstruct first-century history solely from (demonstrably later) rabbinic sources, which is Falk's method. Our observation here is that Falk calls for deference for the views of other confessions while he seems to treat the confessions of the NT documents with great selectivity and considerable lack of understanding. How else is one to interpret the assumption that Paul (and other early Jewish Christians) did not try to convince Jews of their need for Messiah Jesus, or the steadfastly one-dimensional reading of Jesus as merely an ethicist for the Gentiles? Perhaps he was, but the NT documents—primarily of Jewish provenance, if we know anything about them at all—certainly insist otherwise. And if he was not just an ethicist, however visionary and charismatic he may have been, Falk's whole case is academic at best. For he seeks to enhance our understanding of an historical figure who in fact never existed: a somewhat pedestrian Jesus sandwiched between Hillel and Shammai and now first clearly perceived with the help of Emden and Falk.

D. Hagner's *The Jewish Reclamation of Jesus* is helpful for a deeper understanding of many of the issues this book raises. No one disputes the salutary impact of Jewish studies for a balanced comprehension of the NT. It may be time, however, to suggest that the NT may have something of worth to say about first-century Judaism.

Robert W. Yarbrough

Liberty University, Lynchburg, VA

The Jesus Debate: A Survey and Synthesis. By William M. Thompson. New York/Mahwah: Paulist, 1985, 437 pp., $12.95 paper.

From the title one would have hoped for a study in the vein of Schweitzer's *Quest.* For all of us concerned to keep up with developments in life-of-Jesus research, that would have been a worthwhile contribution. What Thompson has given us is much more ambitious. I am not sure that it is as helpful.

The book is an extended (sometimes wearisomely so) unpacking of the thesis that Jesus is "one who mediates a new vision and praxis of our human relationship to God, to ourselves, to our social relations, and to our bodies and nature." It divides into three major sections.

Part 1 is styled "an overview of contemporary approaches to Jesus." Out of some 100 pages, about ten are devoted to classic life-of-Jesus study. Christology is rather the focus. Thompson's real goal seems to be the laying of a foundation for the explication of his own "centrist" Christology. To the left of this position stand the likes of Reimarus and P. van Buren. To the right are "fundamentalists," whom Thompson sees as dating back to the turn of the present century. Many *JETS* readers would find themselves in this slot. Unfortunately Thompson reflects neither sympathy for nor knowledge of his subject here (and not only here). It is fair to surmise that he caricatures both "leftist" and "rightist" outlooks to enhance the appearance of his own views.

Thompson's own position is rooted in the enterprise associated with names like Schleiermacher, Harnack, Troeltsch, Schweitzer, G. Tyrrell, von Hügel, and M. Blondel (p. 60). In fairness to Thompson, he does draw from many more than these figures. Yet in the end he makes it clear that centrist Christology is resigned to—or rather welcomes as liberating—theological pluralism. Thompson plumps for Christologies, then, that "often agree neither in their starting points nor in their conclusions" (p. 71). He claims that the resulting "confusion and complexity" is the only alternative to "narrow theological totalitarianism"—apparently fundamentalism—or on the other hand "crippling relativism"—which this reader at least cannot see how Thompson himself avoids.

Part 2 moves on to "leading interpretations of New Testament Christology." Thompson advocates and tries to synthesize the literary-critical approaches of P. Ricoeur and D. Tracy. He claims to give a summary of "Jesus research to date" (p. 148; cf. chap. 7/B), but this summary is neither comprehensive nor very insightful. He concludes part 2 with his own summary of what contemporary approaches to NT Christology have to offer.

It is here in part 2 that we see some of Thompson's basic views, which in turn shape his perspective throughout the book. Concerning miracles, "historically they are dubious" (p. 195). Thompson draws heavily from W. Kasper's *Jesus the Christ* (New York: Paulist, 1976). While on the one hand Thompson seems to deny us the reasonable possibility that the NT miracles really took place, on the other he assures us that "the really deep lesson of the miracles" is that "the inner transformation and new physical and social being given through the miracles originates in the Divine" (p. 197). On what grounds can we accept that NT figures underwent inner transformation if we allow that the "miracles," which the sources say are the basis for the transformation, are "dubious"? Such legerdemain unfortunately does not stop here.

Thompson goes on, for example, to speak of Jesus' passion. He concedes that NT writers viewed Jesus' death as an expression of the divine will. But then we learn that "to read this as the appeasement of a wrathful God contradicts Jesus' belief in the intimate and loving Abba" (p. 205). If we are to believe the writers' testimony regarding God's intent in sending his Son to his death, on what grounds may we then refuse to believe the accompanying witness that this death was propitiatory?

We suggest that the die for Thompson's Christology is cast when he states that he, following many others today, interprets "the resurrection encounters on the model of our

own religious experiences" (p. 234). This fateful decision leads to repeated flogging of "crudely physicalist" views of the resurrection, which he admits are also to be found on the pages of the NT. This would be to fall prey to "a crude form of theological magic" that denies the "human origins" of the reported "extraordinary phenomena" of the NT and likewise denies "our ability to explain them experientially" (p. 235). I wish to be fair to Thompson, who disavows an approach to Jesus that is too uncritical about taking secular modernity as starting point and arbiter in constructing a Christology. But his disclaimers notwithstanding, I do not see that he avoids the trap he rightly identifies. It is futile to go on talking about NT Christology when in best dualist fashion the "resurrection kerygmata" are pitted against "the more elaborate resurrection stories of the Gospels" (p. 221). Is the old Jesus-of-history/Christ-of-faith dichotomy about to experience yet another resurrection? It is pointless to speak of trust in and personal relationship with a Jesus who is said to "live"—the quotation marks are surely significant—in terms of the "symbolism" (a word used in various forms something like twenty times in discussion of the resurrection) that the NT sources comprise. Did Jesus rise and was he seen, heard and touched as the sources indicate, or was he not? But we can hear Thompson chiding us that such a question stems from "an unjustified and arrogant forgetfulness of the partial and extrapolatory 'faith knowledge' that we are permitted in this realm" (p. 228). Fair enough—but one can only lament that Thompson, for all his breadth of reading and even erudition in some areas, has not reached the point of being more self-aware of just how much spin modern thought is putting on his observation of the NT sources.

Part 3 takes up "Jesus in thought and practice after the New Testament." Parts 1 and 2, some 300 pages of sometimes repetitious and often tortuous discussion, form no more than the basis for the banal conclusion: "As we have seen reason to believe, the Jesus event is an enormous [?] one, entailing profound consequences for our vision and praxis of human life" (p. 299). From this inauspicious starting point the study goes on to rehearse classical Greek conceptions of God and the early-Church Christological debates, to which are subjoined feminist and mystical insights into Jesus' divinity. We learn of the "perverse" soteriological implications of Nicea and glean the spiritual wisdom of e.g. H. Suso, Meister Eckhart, Teresa of Avila, and even Martin Luther. All of these afford insight into what Thompson wants to stress over against the classic Christological formulations, which is the kenotic element. We are encouraged to see beyond the "Christian imperialism" fostered in the wake of the Nicene-Constantinian tradition and take up a Christological model that will bring us "closer to the suffering Jesus of the Gospels" (p. 320). Thus from the Jesus event flows a "new model of the self"; Jesus, who "embodies the lifestyle of repentance and faith," and who moves from "egocentricity to other-centeredness and the values of the Kingdom," "summons us to make the same movement" (p. 324). Thompson defends a form of panentheism as the most promising context for modern Christology. He delineates R. Ruether's contribution to Christological thinking and follows her in asserting that "any future Christology" must be able "to confront the hidden and destructive misogynism at the center of our Christian symbol system" (p. 382). The book ends with the assertion that "*Divine* nature is the holy womb from which all creatures come and to which they return. It is our final link with one another and with the Divine. As we pass through it and 'fertilize' it, it in turn fertilizes us, moving us into our final destiny. We end where we begin: with the Divine" (p. 426). This seems to betray a pronounced universalism, and this suspicion is confirmed by other sections of the book.

Thompson's work is worthwhile reading as a window into the broad world of modern Christologies that seek to articulate NT spiritual insights without much of what the NT writers claimed to be the source of their insights: the literal incarnation, substitutionary death, and bodily resurrection of the unique Son of God. It is nice to hear Thompson proclaim that Jesus is a "breakthrough mediator who makes a unique and decisive con-

tribution to our common human existence" and that "without him, the liberation of our human potential would be decidedly lessened" (p. 6). But if I am allowed only "partial and extrapolatory 'faith knowledge' " with reference to the NT, I can hardly be blamed for being even less sure of Thompson's finally somewhat broad, bland and prolix formulations about Jesus—whoever he was, and whatever he did—himself.

Thompson does, as mentioned above, try to come to terms with "fundamentalism" at points. Unfortunately he never cites Warfield. This is a loss for the clarity of his presentation, for it would be helpful to see his response to Warfield's "Christless Christianity." Of Jesus we hear plenty from Thompson. It is a tragic distinctive of the book that "Christ" as the definitive identifying complement to "Jesus" is left almost totally off the printed page. This is, in the end, Christology from below at its best—and worst.

Robert W. Yarbrough

Liberty University, Lynchburg, VA

"The 'Son of Man' " as the Son of God. By Seyoon Kim. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985, 118 pp., $12.95 paper.

Anyone who reads this book hoping to find out what is the significance of the peculiar use of quotation marks in the title will be disappointed, but the contents of the book more than make up for that minor eccentricity. Kim's thoroughness in canvassing and assessing scholarly literature is already well known through his published doctoral dissertation, *The Origin of Paul's Gospel.* The author tells us in his preface to the present work that he had hoped to write a major work on the Son-of-Man debate, "with a comprehensive history of research and a detailed discussion with the multitude of scholars who had written on the subject." The project was not manageable within the short period of time available to him (a seventeen-month research period at Tübingen), so he decided to write an outline based on his studies. Upon the recommendation of the theological faculty at Tübingen, he proceeded to revise the material and prepare it for publication.

Not a few students will sigh with relief that the result is a brief but meaty survey of a difficult subject. Moreover, the reader will not find here a mere rehash of prior work but a well-defined and clearly-stated thesis with fairly adequate argumentation. The thesis is that Jesus used the title of Son of Man "to reveal himself as the Son of God who creates the new people of God . . . at the eschaton, so that they may call God the Creator 'our Father' and live in his love and wealth" (p. 98).

Since the author is concerned to address the scholarly world, his first order of business is to establish the authenticity of the Son-of-Man sayings. Unfortunately his approach consists of taking H. E. Tödt's well-known work as representative of the skeptical viewpoint and devoting a mere six pages (pp. 8–14) to refuting it. Kim's arguments, in my judgment, are valid and persuasive, but those who are not already favorably disposed may dismiss them as much too superficial.

One also comes across a few items that reflect less than adequate research, such as his decision to reject J. Ziegler's text in LXX Dan 7:13–14 on the apparent grounds that it was reconstructed "in a complicated way" (p. 23 n.). Actually, Ziegler knows perfectly well what he is doing. Given his command of this difficult subject, most of us should be wary of setting aside his judgment unless we have very persuasive evidence against it (as a matter of fact, Ziegler's reading in this passage has been confirmed by the researches of S. Pace). It would probably be unfair to expect a NT scholar to master the very intricate textual history of the LXX; indeed, the matter may appear too trivial to be brought up at all. The problem is that Kim uses the suspect reading *hōs palaios hēmerōn* (probably a scribal corruption of *heōs palaiou hēmerōn*) as an important piece of evidence for his

thesis that the heavenly figure of Dan 7:13–14 could have been interpreted by some readers in pre-Christian Judaism as Son of God and Messiah.

If this monograph lacks scholarly definitiveness, it nevertheless remains a useful and fairly up-to-date summary of the discussion (a few important recent contributions, especially the latest work by B. Lindars, could not be taken into account). Moreover, Kim's arguments include some insightful exegetical work, such as his emphasis on the connection between the eucharistic sayings and the Mark 10:45 logion. These ideas deserve airing and students will benefit from them, though not many readers are likely to think that the price of the book can be justified.

Moisés Silva

Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, PA

Jesus and Divorce. By William A. Heth and Gordon J. Wenham. Nashville: Nelson, 1985, 288 pp., $7.95.

Divorce and remarriage remains one of the most hotly debated issues in evangelical circles today. Heth and Wenham have made an outstanding scholarly contribution to this discussion in their book.

The stated purpose of the authors is to (1) set forth and critically examine the current interpretations of Jesus' divorce sayings, (2) demonstrate that popular exegesis of the exception clauses originating with Erasmus in the sixteenth century is beset with numerous difficulties, and (3) present what they believe to be a proper understanding of the NT teaching on divorce. They accomplish their objectives splendidly.

The book begins with an overview of the teachings of the early Church on divorce and remarriage. The views of the Church fathers are considered, including such figures as Hermas, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, and many others. The authors demonstrate by their research that "in the first five centuries all Greek writers and all Latin writers except one agree that remarriage following divorce for any reason is adulterous" (p. 22).

In chap. 2 the authors present exposition by modern scholars of the early Church's view on divorce. NT texts dealing with divorce and remarriage are discussed. The discussion of the "eunuch-saying" (Matt 19:10–12) is very helpful (pp. 53–68). The authors demonstrate exegetically that the passage is best understood to refer to the situation of one who is divorced for *porneia* and for whom remarriage is not an option. Jesus is arguing from the greater to the lesser in response to the disciples' objection to his stringent teaching on divorce and remarriage. "If God enables some individuals to live continently apart from marriage, He can enable those married to stay married; and He can enable the separated partner to live continently in spite of a broken marriage" (p. 68). The disciples are given the grace to live singly, avoiding an adulterous second marriage, if they face a divorce they cannot prevent.

In chaps. 3–6 the authors discuss the "Erasmian interpretation," which allows for remarriage after divorce. It is shown that Erasmus' views on marriage as a sacrament led to his arguing the legitimacy of remarriage after divorce. Since there was no hope for salvation outside the doors and sacraments of the Church, Erasmus argued that the priority of salvific concerns should give the innocent party freedom to remarry. While Luther rejected Erasmus' views on marriage as a sacrament, he accepted his conclusions on remarriage, as did Calvin. This viewpoint eventually became a part of the Westminster Confession. Modern defenses of the Erasmian interpretation are presented in chap. 4. Here Heth and Wenham interact extensively with J. Murray's book, *Divorce.*

In chaps. 5 and 6 the authors critique the Erasmian viewpoint, first from an OT and

then from a NT perspective. Here the authors present very thorough exegesis of the crucial passages relating to divorce and remarriage. One of the most helpful contributions is the discussion of the syntax of Matt 19:9 in which it is pointed out that the exception permits divorce for *porneia* but not also remarriage. Murray's arguments to the contrary are carefully refuted. Heth and Wenham understand Jesus to be saying, "It is always wrong to divorce what God has joined together: what is more, divorce, *except for unchastity*, is tantamount to committing adultery; and remarriage after divorce is always so" (p. 120).

In chaps. 7–10 the authors critique the competing viewpoints regarding the Matthean exception clause. The view that the exception refers to the unlawful marriages of Lev 18:6–18 is refuted as being too narrow an interpretation of *porneia*. The view that regards *porneia* as a reference to betrothal unchastity is refuted on similar grounds. The preteritive view holds that the exception clause is really a parenthesis in which Jesus refuses to comment on the debated issue of the grounds for divorce. The authors show that Greek grammar disallows this position. Finally there is a discussion of the traditio–historical view that regards the exception clause as a later adaptation of Jesus' teaching for the needs of the Church. This viewpoint is rejected as making Matthew a very shabby editor of Jesus' divorce sayings.

The critiques presented by the authors are very challenging and helpful. Their work is carefully documented, giving the reader many references to crucial journal articles and scholarly discussion. In the conclusion, the authors favor a modified form of the patristic viewpoint. While the fathers allowed divorce in the case of adultery, the authors understand that the Matthean clauses neither sanction divorce for immorality nor permit remarriage should this kind of separation occur (p. 125). It is argued that in the time of Jesus Jews, Romans and Greeks would have required the wife or husband of an adulterer to divorce the partner. Jesus' prohibition of divorce and remarriage are absolute. But should a divorce be required because of one of the partner's sexual unfaithfulness, any remarriage would be regarded as adulterous. The believer's only option would be to remain single.

In evaluating this very fine book, I would highlight three significant contributions. First, the book provides a gold mine of journal references for further study and research. The bibliography alone is worth the price of the book. Second, the authors have done an excellent job of dealing with the syntax of Matt 19:9, demonstrating that while divorce was permitted for *porneia*, remarriage after divorce—for any cause—is prohibited. Third, the discussion of the eunuch passage (19:10–12), showing how it correlates with Jesus' teaching on divorce, is most helpful.

The one issue that, in my opinion, needs further attention is the discussion addressed to those couples who have already remarried after divorce. How is the present tense "commits adultery" to be understood? If it is just a one-time act (and not continuous), why the present tense? Although I would agree with the author's conclusion that those already remarried after divorce should stay married, further discussion of this issue would be helpful.

While I have interpreted the exception clause differently than the authors, their fine work provides opportunity to rethink the issues. I would highly recommend this monumental study. It represents the exegesis of both the early Church and modern expositors on one of the most debated issues of our day. Heth and Wenham have provided the scholarly community a solid basis for further research on the subject of divorce and remarriage for many years to come.

J. Carl Laney

Western Conservative Baptist Seminary, Portland, OR

The Example of Jesus. By Michael Griffiths. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1985, 204 pp., $6.95 paper. *The Counselling of Jesus*. By Duncan Buchanan. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1985, 174 pp., $6.95 paper.

The Example of Jesus is a solid work, and all who read it will benefit. It challenges the reader afresh to imitate the Jesus of the gospels, not one remade in a twentieth-century image. Part 1, "The Basis for Imitating Jesus," grounds imitating Jesus in Jesus himself: Jesus wished to be imitated; he made disciples. However, Griffiths compares Jesus' style of disciple-making with Greek philosophers, Zen masters, Jewish rabbis, *et al.*, and, although there were similarities, "Jesus was concerned that Christian leadership should be different from Jewish religious leadership as it would be also from Gentile leadership." Jesus' distinctiveness is visible in his emphasis upon the "practical rather then intellectual, concerned more with first the kingdom and righteousness than arguments about the law" (p. 49). Griffiths concludes part 1 by demonstrating that imitating Jesus continues as a twentieth-century imperative.

Part 2, "The Ways of Jesus," examines three spheres wherein the imitation of Jesus is demanded: character, lifestyle and ministry. With regard to character Griffiths argues that a servant's heart, patient endurance, suffering, gentleness, humility, obedience and love are qualities in Jesus that Scripture commands believers to imitate. With regard to lifestyle and ministry Griffiths examines Jesus' attitude toward family, work, rest, humor, creation, religion, politics, wealth, minorities and women; he also probes Jesus' methods as teacher, trainer, evangelist, community founder and missionary. He argues that "even though we are never told specifically to imitate his life in the home, or attitude toward work, or way of relating to people, or his attitude to politics or poverty . . . disciples would scrutinize their master's life even in small details, as a living Torah and prescription for a holy life" (p. 105). An obvious weakness surfaces here: Criteria are needed to determine what in Jesus' life is worthy of imitation today and what is not. Should Christians be carpenters? Should Christians publicly challenge hypocritical religious leaders? Should they use force to purge churches' sacrilegious practices? Does the fact that Jesus frequently touched others really mean, as Griffiths implies (p. 134), that Christians also should be physically demonstrative? In short, is example precept? If so, it needs defense; if not, Griffiths must explain why not. Moreover, if the answer is yes and no, as the author's conclusions seem to indicate, Griffiths must explicate the criteria for deciding. Part 3, "How Can We Be Like Jesus?", focuses upon two essentials for imitating Jesus: prayer and the Holy Spirit. Unfortunately, in 36 pages these could only be handled superficially.

In sum, Griffiths' book is helpful. Its major strength lies in its ability to motivate the reader to clear the debris, receive a fresh view of Jesus and then focus upon imitating him. I join the author's prayer that "this book may help some doubters who read it to put their trust in the Lord Jesus, and thus to begin imitating His example."

In *The Counselling of Jesus* the author, convinced of an eclectic approach to counseling, discusses a number of basic issues *vis-à-vis* the relational pattern of Jesus presented in the gospels. The lack of technical discussion insures that the layperson can easily follow. The author's *raison d'être* for "yet another book on counselling" is that "no book has been written which pays attention specifically to the way Jesus counselled" (p. 9). This book does not fill that gap. It is not an exegetically based analysis of Jesus' counseling theory, skills or methods, and it is therefore unrelated to its title.

Chapter 1, describing Jesus' "Abba" relationship with the Father, though at times insightful, explicates how Jesus coped, not how he counseled. The chapters on listening, fear, anxiety, anger and self-acceptance deal mostly with the author's experiences and his understanding of Biblical applications, and when he does deal with Jesus' counseling technique he consistently overinterprets the texts. For instance, Buchanan concludes

that Zacchaeus' size (small) and ignoble occupation (tax collector) are certain clues of low self-esteem. Perhaps, but Zacchaeus was notably successful (chief tax collector) and conspicuously wealthy; these data undermine the author's diagnosis. More pointedly, though it is possible that Zacchaeus' malady was low self-esteem, it is never demonstrated exegetically. Moreover Buchanan avers that in looking up, Jesus does not see Zacchaeus "as a sinner, a tax collector . . . a midget . . . (rather) . . . Jesus sees *him*, a human being, unloved, unloving, bruised and hurt by the circumstances of life, unsuited to his wealth" (p. 81). Again, this is possible, but it has not been derived exegetically. Regretfully this kind of "exegesis" permeates the book.

Viewing the work from a counseling perspective, the author's discussion is at times dangerously simplistic. For example, in discussing depression he does not delimit the type, oversimplifies the cause, and offers a platitude as a cure: "With one possible exception, every depressed person with which I have had anything to do has become depressed because of an anger somewhere in their lives . . . (the solution lies) . . . not so much to find the anger, (but) . . . to 'abide' in the Lord. . ." (p. 74). This conclusion (reached in three paragraphs) is surely a gross oversimplification of an extremely complex phenomenon.

The chapter discussing repentance and forgiveness is balanced and reminds the reader of important fundamental truths. Nevertheless, full concordance is given to Buchanan's self-assessment: "I have somewhat labored the obvious" (p. 99). The chapters on dependencies and God's love probably also fall into the same category. In the next chapter, which analyzes Jesus' interviews, Buchanan notes that Jesus' purpose was always personal salvation. He therefore controversially concludes: "There can be no other purpose in counselling" (p. 138). The final chapter is a critique of J. Adams' nouthetic counseling theory (what book on counseling would be complete without one?). Adams, says Buchanan, is right and wrong: Jesus was both directive and nondirective.

In spite of the above criticisms there are Biblical insights in *The Counselling of Jesus*, especially in the chapter on fear. This book could be a helpful primer for the layperson, but even here there lies the danger that the reader will believe that what is presented actually describes the "counselling of Jesus" and, worse, the reader will imitate the exegetical method used therein.

Warren Heard

Acts. A Good News Commentary. By David John Williams. San Francisco: Harper, 1985, xxx + 478 pp., $12.95 paper.

The book of Acts is a current focus of scholarly debate, and it is valuable to have this substantial contribution to the Good News Commentary series. The commentary prints the *GNB/TEV* text in eighty-two numbered sections, each with full and careful exposition and brief additional notes on more technical details.

It is some measure of the character of the work that the name of M. Dibelius does not appear in the index, and those of H. Conzelmann and E. Haenchen only in scattered references, not all indexed. Williams is clearly aware of the importance of these writers on the academic front, but they have not the same significance for the Bible reader who wants more positive scholarly help. The author has not chosen to be drawn into a running debate with these influential purveyors of historical skepticism, a task recently undertaken more extensively by I. H. Marshall. The present work is scholarly without majoring on the preoccupations of technical scholarship. It focuses on the thorough exposition of the text, frequently giving reasons for differing from the *GNB* rendering, and shirking few difficulties while touching but sparingly on manuscript and redactional issues.

The introduction sets out the author's views on the essential critical problems of Acts. He accepts traditional Lukan authorship and suggests one or more Aramaic sources for the first half of the book and Luke's own diaries for the latter chapters, together with personal information from Paul and other persons present. He accepts Luke's work as historically reliable, though occasionally apt to rearrange or consolidate events. The speeches give us, "in the Thucydidean 'general sense'," a trustworthy guide to what was actually said (p. xxiv), summaries giving the gist. (I agree—though it may be questioned what exactly Thucydides meant, and Polybius was more rigorous in his standards for speeches anyhow. Whether Luke may rightly be compared with either is a separate question.) Williams dates Acts around 75 and sees a central purpose as to present Paul as the "paradigmatic witness," a phrase from Hengel (p. xxvii), though other themes—Church and state, and the Jewish question—are also apparent. I sense in places the impact of his fellow Australian, the late R. Maddox, in points like the very questionable background in the Jewish prayer against the Nazarenes. This is in any case usually placed significantly later than the date Williams chooses for Acts. His strongest objection to an earlier date is that the Lukan writings follow Mark, but the prospects of dating Mark (and Luke) through Acts seem more promising than the reverse argument. An early date for Acts may actually push the others back. It is however surely overly optimistic today to suggest that there are few who would defend the view that Acts is a late composition full of historical blunders (p. xx). There are certainly such opinions in some circles. The Dibelius school exercises a continuing influence, and there is a strong tendency elsewhere to despise Acts as a "secondary" source, as in J. Knox and his followers. One may justifiably argue strongly against these positions, but one can scarcely discount their prominence.

Williams' actual treatment of the text gives much material for reflection. He is generally very careful and accurate in his background details and discussions, often citing classical literature though not always mentioning significant sources where we might like to know them. I should have liked, for instance, to see reference to E. A. Judge on Thessalonica on p. 288, to H. J. Cadbury on Erastus on p. 309, to R. M. Ogilvie on Phoenix on p. 432, or in the additional notes attached. Allusion to inscriptions in particular is left unspecific (e.g. p. 83). The occasional questionable statement should be open to checking. It seems innocuous to say that the Jews of Thyatira were specially involved in dyeing (pp. 273–274), but none of the actual texts on which we depend for knowledge of this local specialty is identifiably Jewish. Williams draws attention to minor discrepancies, variant OT citations, and the like. He generally deals well with such difficulties. He is refreshingly ready to harmonize where appropriate and to justify doing so. Thus he is bold to suggest the possibility of two risings by two men called Theudas, the name being not uncommon as a familiar abbreviation (pp. 99–100). Yet beside his robust handling of some difficulties he seems diffident elsewhere. While fully accepting the factor of miracles and stressing its occurrence in places where Luke himself is reserved in language, as in the case of Eutychus (p. 342), he seems elsewhere to offer unnecessary rationalizations. When Luke mentions an angel at the ascension, "perhaps all he wanted to say was that there was an overwhelming sense of the divine in what happened" (p. 9; cf. pp. 91–92, 172). But is that all? Perhaps Williams' desire to do full justice to modern literary and theological approaches occasionally exercises a debatable influence on his treatment of the narrative. It is a valid matter to inquire whether Luke has adapted his arrangement or presentation to a theological purpose, or has stressed a parallel between Jesus and Paul (cf. pp. 131, 360). But the limits of adaptation and assimilation in these matters are hard to specify, and I am disposed to treat them with a yet greater caution.

These are mostly nuances, to be set off against the dominant impression that this is a very sound, all-round treatment of Acts at its chosen level. The reviewer repeatedly finds himself in warm agreement. Williams usually offers good discussion of the speeches,

reinforcing the judgments in his introduction (e.g. pp. 116, 179, 347, 421). There seems however to be little or nothing in the commentary to interlock with or reinforce the questionable argument for dating. This is not the case with another place where I would differ significantly, the placing of Paul's Jerusalem visits and their bearing on the Galatian question, which is ably argued within the commentary (e.g. pp. 163, 190–191, 195, 250, 263). But I suggest that Paul's case in Galatians depends more than Williams would allow (p. 247) on his frankness about all his contacts with the Jerusalem church. I should equate Galatians 2 with Acts 11, not Acts 15. While Acts is not rigidly chronological, Williams may be a shade too free with unforced rearrangements (e.g. pp. 198, 203).

It is a pity that the 500-odd pages of this book have been allowed to bulge far beyond their binding. The thickness of my copy measured more than twice that of its spine. While the (well-packed) parcel arrived as a mysteriously soggy mess on an unwontedly dry English morning, this does not suffice to explain its deeply concave spine and fan-like spread of undulating pages. I want to make good use of this fine commentary, and I do not want it to disintegrate on me.

Colin J. Hemer

Tyndale House, Cambridge, England

The Apostolic Church. By Everett F. Harrison. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985, 251 pp., $12.95 paper.

Harrison is best known to students of the Bible for his *Introduction to the New Testament* (1964) as well as *A Short Life of Christ* (1968). His experience in teaching on the subject of the apostolic Church has provided the impetus for the present work "in the hope that those who are looking for a text that deals comprehensively . . . with developments in the early years of the life of the Christian Church will find in it at least a modicum of help" (p. vii).

As an introductory text for the study of the early Christian Church, this book is a great help. Each page is a mine of information, and careful reading shows that this is much more than a shallow survey of the subject. The introduction sets the stage with a discussion of the causal relationship between gospel history and apostolic history.

In any historical enquiry, background investigation is of crucial importance. In this regard Harrison has neither neglected his task nor failed the reader. Chapter 1 gives a thorough review of the political and cultural setting from which the early Church emerged. From Alexander the Great to the Roman procurators, Harrison surveys the political climate of Judaism as well as the influences of the Greek and Roman religions.

Harrison's reconstruction of apostolic history rests squarely on the narrative of the book of Acts. But in order to make his case he must initially establish Acts' reliability in light of much recent historical criticism (e.g. the commentary of Haenchen). Harrison therefore devotes chap. 2 to a critical analysis of Acts. Beginning with a general overview of the history of Acts criticism and then looking at the reliability of the "speeches" in Acts, Harrison ends by exploring the overall historical veracity of the book.

Chapter 3 addresses the external history of the apostolic Church. Here Harrison surveys the events (beginning with Pentecost) that characterized the emergence of the Church, its mission, and its relation to Judaism. No survey of the history of the Church would be complete without a look at the Church's relation to the state. Harrison begins this by first looking at OT Israel as a theocracy. Israel's conviction concerning the sovereignty of God in religious as well as political matters directly influenced the early Church's attitude toward Rome. Therefore there is room to "be subject" to the state, as Paul said, but also to remember that ultimate obedience is owed to God alone.

Chapter 4 is devoted to a look at the internal development of the early Church. This includes its initial conception and organization; its theology, including the doctrine of God, Christ, the Holy Spirit, Scripture, and salvation; the creedal overtones; baptism; ministry; worship; and teaching. Harrison concludes by surveying the events and features of the various NT churches. Included in this is a look at the possible connections among the churches as well as historical information gleaned from Paul's letters.

As with previous works by Harrison, the reader will find in the present contribution a thorough grasp of the material that is both lucid and scholarly. The author has placed us very much in his debt by producing a volume filled with serviceable information and good reasoning. One will hardly have to go any further in search of supplemental material on the subject. Indeed, every serious student of the NT will quickly find this to be an indispensable aid in his study and research.

Gary M. Frazier

Princeton Theological Seminary, NJ

Beyond Sex Roles: A Guide for the Study of Female Roles in the Bible. By Gilbert Bilezikian. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1985, 291 pp., $9.95.

Books on the role of women in the Scriptures continue to appear at an astonishing pace. Bilezikian invites nonspecialists "to evaluate arguments, to consider alternative views, and to arrive at independent conclusions" (p. 12). Most technical matters are discussed in extensive notes at the end of the book. Even though the author wants his readers to come to their own conclusions, he is an ardent supporter of women's ordination. Throughout the work he subjects James Hurley's arguments (*Man and Woman in Biblical Perspective* [Zondervan, 1981]) to critical examination, usually concluding that Hurley's exegesis is faulty and unconvincing. Bilezikian says that the correct interpretive approach must distinguish between creation, the fall, and redemption. God's intentions for the relationship between the sexes must be gleaned from creation and redemption, not from the fall. In both creation and redemption, he argues, there is no evidence of male rule or dominance. Instead the relationship between men and women is one of equality and mutuality. The subjection of women to men is the result of the fall, a Satanic distortion of God's ideal of mutuality and equality.

A sampling of Bilezikian's exegetical conclusions is instructive. Both men and women are made in God's image, proving their essential equality. The word "helper" (Gen 2:18) cannot be used to defend female subservience to men because God is often described as "helper" in the Bible. The creation of Adam before Eve does not indicate male headship. Indeed such a theory is absurd, because the same logic would require that animals have authority over human beings since they were created first. Adam's naming of Eve (2:23) does not support the hierarchical view (pp. 220–223), for the naming of the animals was not an indication of Adam's authority. The purpose of the naming was to discover if Adam could find a partner, not to exercise dominion. Furthermore Adam does not really name Eve since the prior verses in Genesis indicate that God had already assigned the name "woman" to the female sex. Adam only acknowledges and agrees with what God had already done. Many of the OT texts on women reflect the results of the fall, showing male exploitation of women. But Jesus in his ministry unveils the newness of the gospel, consistently affirming that women and men are equal. The two programmatic texts in the rest of the NT are found in Acts 2:15–21; Gal 3:28. The inauguration of the new age includes a promise that both men and women will exercise prophetic gifts (Acts 2:17). And Gal 3:28 makes it clear that men and women are fundamentally equal. Any role distinctions would cancel out this grand affirmation.

What about the "problem passages" in Paul? 1 Cor 11:2–16 does not teach a difference in roles, for there is absolutely no evidence that the word *kephalē* means "authority." The word, as in the rest of the NT, means "source." (The author uses the same argument, of course, in Ephesians 5.) The passage is not on "gender roles but worship protocol" (p. 142). In fact vv 11–12 reveal that Paul believed that women should be full participants in worship. The command that women should be silent in 1 Cor 14:33b–35 is not a problem because Paul is quoting his opponents here, and he refutes their position in the subsequent verses. Eph 5:22 ff. is often used to support a hierarchical model, but in fact the passage is a beautiful description of mutual submission. 1 Tim 2:12 is not an absolute prohibition against women teachers. The passage forbids women from teaching because they lack education. False teaching was a serious problem in 1 Timothy, and Paul did not want uneducated women (Eve was unprepared in the same way—cf. v 14) to add to an already serious problem.

Although I applaud Bilezikian's sincerity, I have serious reservations about the quality of this book. I am not saying that a good argument cannot be made for women's ordination (see e.g. M. J. Evans, *Woman in the Bible* [InterVarsity, 1983]). I am saying that this book does not adequately provide such logical argumentation. Obviously only a few things can be said in a such a short review. The author has a penchant for making sweeping statements, insisting for example that the word *kephalē* never means "authority" in the NT (pp. 137–138, 157–162, 239–240). It seems to me that he is forcing the text into a predetermined mold when he denies that "authority" is the meaning for *kephalē* in Eph 1:22, for the context clearly stresses Christ's enthronement over all of creation (see vv 20–21). The question of whether *kephalē* means "source" or "authority" in other passages also deserves much more careful treatment.

The greatest weakness of the book, in my opinion, is the unmitigated confidence of the author. I consistently got the impression that any "objective" reader would easily see that the hierarchical view is wrong. I never sensed that Bilezikian really struggled with the opposing point of view, and the work lacked the reserve and balance characteristic of the book by Evans cited above. Indeed the work has a tone suggesting that if one believes in role differentiation, then one agrees with the oppression of women. But most scholars who believe in some kind of hierarchy also assert that men and women are fundamentally equal because both are made in the image of God. Differences in role do not necessarily imply differences in worth, or that men are more important than women.

Sometimes Bilezikian's statements are shockingly simplistic. He suggests that rape and prostitution (p. 36) are due to a theory of male headship. Clearly, such evils are more complex than this. Is it really true that most rapists are motivated or even influenced by a doctrine of male headship? His comment on Luke 11:27–28 is anachronistic to an extreme. A woman says that the one who nursed and bore Jesus was blessed. Bilezikian suggests that Jesus rebuked the woman because she did not give thanks for Mary as a "person." She may have even thought that "women are only baby machines" (p. 94). Many feminists today may have responded that way, but I doubt that a Palestinian woman of the first century harbored such thoughts. We tend to forget that children were considered to be a blessing and the lack thereof a reproach (Luke 1:25). And Jesus rebuked the woman because she was exalting sentimentality over obedience, not because of her view of women. I fear that these two examples pinpoint the real problem of the book. It is not grounded on historical exegesis but on modern presuppositions. These presuppositions and experiences cause the author to read his theology into the text (pp. 8–13). The question of how women should function in ministry today is complex and difficult, but this book fails to tackle the exegetical issues with enough depth to qualify as an effective study.

Thomas R. Schreiner

Bethel Theological Seminary, St. Paul, MN

Beyond Sex Roles: A Guide for the Study of Female Roles in the Bible. By Gilbert Bilezikian. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1985. *The Role Relationship of Men and Women: New Testament Teaching.* By George W. Knight III. Chicago: Moody, 1977.

Books on "the question about women" continue to pour forth from evangelical presses at a flood pace, and common ground between what have been called the "traditionalist" and the "egalitarian" positions does not seem to be surfacing. These two books are no exception. Bilezikian writes from an unabashedly egalitarian position, calling for "deliberate programs of depatriarchalization" (p. 211) in our religious institutions and "a systematic effort of deprogramming" in our thinking so that we do away with "regard[ing] the opposite sex as *opposite*" (p. 210; italics his). Knight, on the other hand, attempts to present "the biblical evidence first for submission and headship in marriage, and then for submission and headship in the church, as well as answers to the major objections raised against these arguments" (p. 6). Neither seeks a middle road, both are evangelical, and each firmly believes the Bible supports his position.

Bilezikian has written a book that purports to be in a "study-guide format . . . designed for either individual investigation or group work" (p. 12). It is difficult, however, to see how there is much of the nature of a study guide in the book. In the second chapter he does introduce a good number of the paragraphs with "Lesson:", but nowhere is the significance of this practice explained, and it is dropped in succeeding chapters. At the end of many sections there is the curious phrase "To summarize in plain language" followed by a brief summary of the previous arguments (which are not always very plain, stylistically speaking). There is no workbook provided, and no study questions are offered in the text. In fact the book has no helps of any kind other than a very full 20-page bibliography (which promises to indicate with an asterisk works of "a more or less [minimal, moderate, radical] nontraditional position" [p. 271] but neglects to do so in its historical section) and an "Introductory Reading List" that curiously lists S. Clark's massive *Man and Woman in Christ* but fails to list more basic works like *Women and the Word of God* by S. Foh and *Woman the Bible* by M. Evans (these are found in the bibliography). Indices, particularly a Scripture index, would be a help in later editions if the book really is intended as a study tool.

The book sees the outline of Biblical history in terms of creation—fall—redemption as crucial to the interpretation of the Bible's teaching about women (pp. 15–19). Everything in Scripture should be read with this framework in mind. The book is divided roughly according to this scheme, looking at passages in Genesis 1—3 first and moving to the NT teaching on the subject last. One problem with Bilezikian's presentation of this framework for his study is that he seems to imply that his use of it is unique. Though he sees the pattern as supportive of an egalitarian position of present-day roles for women, others have used exactly the same pattern to substantiate the more traditional position.

It is in its exegesis that the book demonstrates its greatest problems. Its avowed aim "is for the nonspecialized reader to be able to follow the discussion step by step, to evaluate arguments,to consider alternative views, and to arrive at independent conclusions" (p. 12). The book, however, rarely seems to do any of these things itself, and so one must ask how it can expect the reader to do them. It almost never discusses varying interpretations of the text and often pushes to the point of absurdity insignificant details of a story in order to force the egalitarian position. One example among many is the portrayal the book gives of Jesus' dialogue with Martha about the resurrection (John 11:23–27). According to Bilezikian, Martha "becomes the recipient of the most emphatic, the most explicit, and the most comprehensive teaching on the subject of resurrection." She also "becomes the first person in history to be given an understanding of the correlation between the person of Jesus . . . and the final resurrection" (p. 101). How does Bilezikian

know any of this? The passage nowhere states that Martha enjoyed such privileges, and yet the confidence with which Bilezikian asserts that she has seems to allow for no discussion of the matter. In fact the story could (and I believe should) be read in such a way that it shows Martha either deeply misunderstanding Jesus' teaching or deeply disbelieving it (cf. 11:39–40). The more important point, however, is that the story really has very little to say about women and Jesus at all. The disciples also misunderstood or disbelieved Jesus' teaching about many things, including the resurrection (cf. e.g. Matt 16:21–23).

Bilezikian, in his zeal to show that his position is thoroughly Biblical, has actually damaged the egalitarian position by sometimes directly and sometimes indirectly misleading the reader. Thus he states that the Syrophoenician woman (Matt 15:21–28 = Mark 7:24–30) is the "first Gentile convert" (p. 100). How does he know she even became a convert, much less the first one? And, if one grants that she is a believer, why is the centurion of Matt 8:5–13 = Luke 7:1–10 not the first one? Because he is a man? Again, the woman who cries out how blessed Jesus' mother was (Luke 11:27–28) was perhaps "saying with a tinge of envy, 'Your mother is fortunate. Having had a child like you gives significance to her life. I wish I could have been your mother. My life might have amounted to something. We women are only baby machines. Once in a while, one of us will luck out and produce a winner. Your mother has something to be proud of' " (p. 94). According to Bilezikian: "The woman's statement reveals something of the feminine mind-set at the time" (p. 95). But all that is being revealed in this kind of fanciful speculation is an inability on the part of the author to separate fact from fantasy. He claims that "the fact that she could only relate the ministry of Jesus to the significance it had for His mother bespeaks of a benighted view of women's role in life. In His answer and with one sentence, Jesus catapulted women along with men, both shoulder to shoulder, to the cutting edge of God's program for the redemption of the world" (p. 95). This sort of hyperbole is masquerading as exegesis. Example after example abounds in the book of speculation presented as fact (cf. e.g. the supposition that the Queen of Sheba "will be given judgment over a whole generation of men and condemn them for their spiritual obduracy" [p. 86]. Were no women obdurate enough to reject Jesus?), avoidance of problem passages (reference to the fact that Jesus chose only males for apostles and that he himself was male is relegated to a footnote) and clouded interpretation of others (the assumed headship of the husband over the "perfect woman" of Proverbs 31 is completely reversed into an "implication . . . that he is well respected in the community because of his wife's industry and competency" [p. 77]).

Though allowance can be made for Bilezikian's desire to be popular in his style and method, there really is no excuse to make the exegetical decisions he often makes. Inexcusable, too, is the scorn he often heaps upon the traditionalist position in place of solid argument against it. This is especially evident in the footnotes, where Bilezikian has chosen to dialogue with only one book—J. B. Hurley's *Man and Woman in Biblical Perspective*—as "one of the more representative" of the books teaching a traditionalist position. He accuses Hurley of "contrived exegesis" (p. 241) and "deviant interpretations" (p. 231). In one extraordinary statement referring to Hurley he says, "When the Scriptures do not conform to their prejudices, some people prefer to rewrite the Bible rather than revising their presuppositions" (p. 240). He accuses Hurley of sentimentality when the latter says that woman was created to end the loneliness of man (p. 216). But presumably it is not sentimental to say that the "discreet development of the theme [of women involved in redemption] suggests the restrained hand of a woman" and the "nurturing, humane, compassionate tone of Hebrews" points to female authorship of that epistle (pp. 266–267).

All in all, this book is badly in need of revision whether intended for a scholarly or for a popular audience. At the very least the implication should be removed that anyone

who has doubts about the ordination of women or the role of women in the authority structures of the family is foolish or thoroughly blinded by his own prejudices. At best the book should be rewritten, taking into account more arguments than Hurley's and refuting them directly.

In comparison, the slim book by Knight is much more irenic in tone. It was published originally in 1977 and is now reissued in a slightly revised form. The major difference between the two editions is the addition of an appendix by W. Grudem on the word *kephalē*. A second appendix by Knight himself on the idea of office in the NT and its relationship to the ministry of women remains largely unchanged, as does the text of the book. Knight has an introductory chapter, two chapters on submission and headship in marriage and the Church respectively, and a final chapter of conclusions. His thesis is not new (he spends some time defending his contention that it is the historic Christian position), but it is usually clearly stated. He believes that the NT teaches an equality between men and women of essence and standing before God but that their "role relationship" requires a hierarchy of authority with man placed over woman. He stresses that "the momentous words of Gal 3:28 provide us with the framework within which any and all differences or role relationships must be seen and considered" (p. 7) and that this is reiterated in Col 3:10–11, which demonstrates that "image [of God] quality is equally present in male and female. Thus both by creation and now also by the redemption that renews that created image quality, the unity and equality of male and female are most fundamentally affirmed" (p. 8).

Knight then goes on, however, to spend the majority of his time answering objections to the thesis he presents concerning the role relationship of men and women in the NT. One of the strengths of the book is that it at least touches on almost all the major objections to the traditionalist position whether textual or philosophical. Objections from the analogy of slavery to the obvious gifts women have are discussed, though sometimes with little more than a brief paragraph in answer. In fact the chief objection to the book is probably its brevity. Assumptions are made and passing comments are offered that cry out for much more detailed treatment. For instance, the very crucial fact that *'ezer* means "helper" but more often than not is used of God helping man is passed over by Knight with the rhetorical question: "Cannot a word have a different nuance when applied to God from what it has when applied to human beings?" (p. 31). The answer to this is of course "Yes," but the question is really "Does it have this different nuance?", and this question is not addressed. Again, Knight makes the comment that "prophesying, an activity in which the one prophesying is essentially a passive instrument through which God communicates, does not necessarily imply or involve an authority or headship of the one prophesying over others" (p. 34). Such a division between the instrument of God's using and that instrument's authority is very difficult to make and, again, begs for clarification. He does not discuss the role of men and women in society (the workplace, secular government, etc.), and his discussion of woman's role in the Church is brief and somewhat unclear, given the importance of that question and its difficulty in the NT (cf. p. 37 where Knight concludes that women are not to hold the office of deacon but, as wives [only?], are to be involved "in the diaconal area"). These few negatives, however, should not outweigh the positives of this book. It is easily the best brief treatment of the classical conservative position on the question.

Grudem's appendix (one-third of the entire book) is more valuable than may at first appear because it is so comprehensive on its topic. He has surveyed the classical literature in depth in order to determine whether the commonly held assumption that *kephalē* ("head") sometimes means "source" is in fact true and his conclusion is that it does not (at least in the 2,336 examples surveyed). Grudem's work is worth the price of the book, even if one owns the first edition. It is a good piece of exegesis and will demand a hearing

from those who too glibly translate "source" in the 1 Corinthians 11 and Ephesians 5 passages.

In fact there is actually only one place where fault can be found with his essay. Near the end of his piece Grudem acknowledges the possible raising of "one final objection. Someone might agree that our survey is correct in demonstrating that the sense 'source' never occurred in Greek literature outside the Bible, but this person might still argue that 'source' seems to 'make sense' or 'fit the context well' in certain New Testament passages. Therefore (it might be argued), we can still take *kephalē* to mean 'source' in certain New Testament passages where that meaning seems to fit the context" (p. 78). He then goes on to deny this possibility because it assumes a situation in which Paul "would use a common word in a sense never before known in the Greek-speaking world and expect his readers to understand it, even though he gave them no explicit explanation that he was using the word in a new way" (p. 78). But what is so hard to believe about this? Though the number of coined words in the NT grows fewer and fewer all the time because of new discoveries, there is still good evidence that Paul did this from time to time. Why not metaphors, since the "creative" aspect of making metaphors is even more recognized than that of making new words? Context is the major means of determining the nuance of a metaphor anyway—and has not Paul done something very different in having a body grow out of a head in the first place in Eph 4:16 and Col 2:19? There is no reason why one could not see at least in these two passages a similarly strange, new metaphor of nourishment and even "source." That of course is not to say that one *should* see such a metaphor there. Even more unlikely is the application of this idea to the passage in Eph 5:23 where the idea of *hypotassein* ("to submit") seems to settle the interpretation of that passage in favor of *kephalē* as "ruler" or, better, "person in authority over."

All these authors share one belief in common: There is no real middle ground on the issue of female authority over men in the Church. In spite of all the work that has been done so far, more needs to be done to reconcile God's apparent use of women in positions of authority over men (e.g. Huldah the prophetess in 2 Kings 22, Deborah the judge in Judges 4—5, and Priscilla the deaconess [?] in Romans 16) with his apparent injunctions against their holding such positions (e.g. 1 Corinthians 11; 1 Timothy 2). The two books reviewed here contribute to the debate in some significant ways but do not by any means solve all the problems.

Drew Trotter

Elmbrook Christian Study Center, Waukesha, WI

Genesis: An Expositional Commentary, Vol. 2: Genesis 12:1—36:43. By James Montgomery Boice. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1985, 383 pp., $16.95.

This volume continues the series of commentaries adapted by Boice from his sermons delivered at Tenth Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia. The work is not intended to be an exegetical commentary. It is expositional, containing applications as well as explanations of the Biblical text.

The method for bridging exegesis and homiletics is currently in debate. The concept of "one interpretation but many applications" is overly simplistic, and expositors wrestle with what limitations the authors of Scripture would place on the scope of the message taught by a given text. The Biblical writer had a primary message he was communicating, but how many principles would he recognize as implicit in his message? Should an expositor neglect to expound the primary message of a text to which all implicit principles

are only secondary? One's appreciation for this commentary may depend on his view of these issues.

Full exegetical development and support is not possible in a commentary of this kind. However, Boice displays sensitive insight in a number of places. For example, he sets aside the common etymological explanation of Israel's name ("fights with God") in favor of the more probable meaning ("God fights"), which is consistent with the usual, subjective use of the theophoric element (Yahweh or God) in compound names (p. 335). Helpful correlations to passages outside of Genesis abound, particularly in discussion of NT uses of Genesis. Many comments on archeological background help bridge the historical-cultural gap. But there are numerous times where greater exegetical caution was needed. For example, in discussing the change of Abram's name, Boice writes: "When God added the *h* to Abram's name, God really added the sound of a breath" (p. 135). He then explains the connection between the concepts of "breath" and "spirit," concluding that "what He was really doing was adding His mighty breath or Spirit to Abram's name" (p. 136). Again, while Boice carefully explains the passages dealing specifically with the Abrahamic covenant, many narrative units are inadequately correlated to the covenant theme of blessing and curse that Moses' narrative theology primarily develops.

The homiletical approach of Boice's exposition is topical. The narrative of Genesis serves as an illustration of a Biblical principle that he develops homiletically, sometimes more from another section of Scripture than from Genesis. Since the exegetical support used in exposition depends on the homiletical idea being presented, explanation of the actual text of Genesis is sometimes sparse. Also, when principles that are only possible implications of a text become the central, homiletical idea, objective validation is difficult. For example, does the covenant between Abimelech and Abraham really contain a lesson on Church-state relations (pp. 206–211)? Does the meeting of Jacob and Rachel at the well teach about love at first sight (pp. 301–302)? Can principles for employer/employee relations be derived from the relationship between Jacob and Laban (pp. 312–317)? These narrative units may illustrate principles found elsewhere in Scripture, but they do no necessarily teach these principles. The authority for many of the applications of this commentary actually lies outside the book of Genesis.

Nevertheless it is fair to say that Boice's topical applications are relevant, specific, challenging, and sometimes boldly uncompromising. Any reader of this commentary will find it edifying.

John W. Hilber

Isaiah. Bible Student's Commentary series. By J. Ridderbos. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1985, 580 pp., $24.95.

The Bible Student's Commentary is an English translation of the *Korte Verklaring der Heilige Schrift*, a conservative evangelical commentary series originally written by Dutch scholars and designed for the lay reader who does not have a knowledge of Hebrew and Greek. The text of the *NIV* has been incorporated into the commentary format and discussion and, "where appropriate, the original contributor's discussion has been edited to reflect the wording of the NIV and translation issues among the other English versions" (p. vii). The translator of *Isaiah*, J. Vriend, has provided helpful explanatory footnotes where needed. Ridderbos originally published this commentary in Dutch in 1950–51.

In the first 38 pages Ridderbos discusses some matters of introduction in a nontechnical but informative, interesting and clear manner. His treatment consists of the following: Isaiah the prophet; Isaiah's activity in his own time; the book of Isaiah; Isaiah

40–66; and an outline of Isaiah. The bulk of his attention is given to the issue of authorship and composition (pp. 8–33). It is unfortunate that so much of his introduction is devoted to this one critical area to the omission of other relevant areas such as purpose, occasion, message, theology, special features of Isaiah, etc. (though what he says and how he says it is good). Will a lay reader come to understand the book of Isaiah better with such a limited treatment of introductory matters primarily concerned with the classical problem of authorship and composition?

Ridderbos holds to the divine inspiration and historical trustworthiness of Scripture (p. 8) but asserts that "this viewpoint does not a priori exclude the possibility that some parts of the book do not derive directly from Isaiah" (pp. 8–9), though the entire book was composed under the leading and inspiration of the Spirit (p. 9). He believes that the superscription of 1:1 "demands as a minimum . . . that what follows derives in the main from Isaiah himself" (p. 9).

What he cautiously maintains is that "in the main" the eighth-century Isaiah is responsible for the entire prophecy, though there could be parts he did not compose. He cites 38:9 as an example of non-Isaian material (p. 9). But it seems to me that Ridderbos confuses the authorial and compiling work of the prophet by equating them. He does suggest that Isaiah himself wrote or dictated and compiled many of his prophecies but that a final compilation of different bundles into one volume was the work of a devoted circle of Isaiah's disciples who handed down the prophecy to later generations (pp. 11, 14). However, one may ask the question: Could not Isaiah have been both the author and compiler (and editor) of the entire prophecy over a process of time? Could not the whole book come from the "hand" of Isaiah? Ridderbos does offer an interesting discussion of the possible manner in which the book was compiled (pp. 12 ff.), though there may be disagreement as to who did the compiling and when.

In the commentary proper, Ridderbos follows his outline of Isaiah, gives a helpful summary discussion of the material to follow in each major section, and in most cases presents a fine balance between exegetical and theological comments on the text. Without getting sidetracked on critical problems (though he does discuss important ones where needed) the author has produced a rich and invigorating commentary, full of engaging language and insightfulness.

Ridderbos writes from the perspective of continental Reformed (and therefore amillennial) scholarship. He offers an interesting description of his understanding of the meaning and intent of prophecy while discussing 11:15–16 (pp. 130–132). He perceives, with keen insight, the typological or double-fulfillment aspect of many prophecies in Isaiah, and he is judicious in his use of the principle of *analogia fidei*—especially in his correlations of Isaiah with the NT.

With regard to some of the classical passages in Isaiah, the following represents the view of Ridderbos: 2:2–4 is original in Micah 4:1–3 and used by Isaiah (p. 53); chap. 6 "originally appeared at the head of a collection of materials that was later made one with the preceding chapters, while the sequence was left intact" (p. 76); 7:14 is to be viewed in a double-fulfillment sense where the prophecy is provisional in Isaiah's time and final in Jesus Christ (though Ridderbos does not suggest who the child is in Isaiah's time), and *'almâ* does not stress the virginal state (pp. 85–87); 14:1–23 refers to "the King of Babylon" in the grandeur of Nebuchadnezzar and the fall of Belshazzar (p. 144) wherein the Babylonian king "is the imitator of the devil and the type of the Antichrist. . . . Therefore his humiliation also is an example of Satan's fall from the position of power that he has usurped" (p. 142); chaps. 36—39 are probably original to Isaiah (from which the writer or compiler of 2 Kings 18—20 has borrowed), and the report of Sennacherib's death (37:38) is no proof against Isaian authorship of this section (p. 288); 41:2–7 refers to the campaign of Cyrus and its effects (pp. 352–354); the servant of the Lord prophecies of 42:1–7; 49:1–9a; 50:4–9; 52:13—53:12 are directly Messianic, finding fulfillment in

Christ (pp. 369–373), and they were originally separate prophecies that were later combined with the other surrounding ones (p. 371) and composed by Isaiah (p. 372).

In my opinion this commentary on Isaiah is outstanding. Ridderbos interprets and explains the meaning of the text concisely, and he usually specifies what he understands the historical and prophetic referents and fulfillments of each passage to be. The design of the commentary is for the lay reader, but the depth and breadth of material that the author has meticulously compacted into these pages will ably serve advanced students, pastors, teachers and scholars alike.

The only place, other than in the introduction, where I would criticize Ridderbos is in his sometime uneven treatment of passages. For example, he devotes nine sentences of commentary to 25:9–12; a half page to 2:10–19; two pages to 32:12–14; and three pages to 40:3. The work as a whole, however, is superb.

Roger Helland

Okanagan Bible College, Kelowna, BC

The Expositor's Bible Commentary. Vol. 7: Daniel-Malachi. Ed. by Frank E. Gaebelein. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1985, xvi + 725 pp., $24.95.

The appearance of this volume marks a major step toward the completion of the EBC project. Thirteen OT books are ably exegeted by nine different scholars in a volume "written primarily by expositors for expositors" (p. vii).

According to the preface the book's stance is that of a "scholarly evangelicalism committed to the divine inspiration, complete trustworthiness, and full authority of the Bible" (p. vii), and I found nothing that would suggest otherwise. Though the contributors naturally reflect varying convictions, the book's policy is to allow a clear statement of the author's own views accompanied by fair presentation of other views (p. viii). The book's treatment of eschatological prophecies is consistent with a general premillennial position, "though not all contributors are necessarily premillennial" (p. viii).

The format of each commentary in the book is fairly standard. First, an introduction section deals with such issues as purpose, authorship, date, canonicity, theological values, special problems, and outline. Each author also includes a current bibliography to guide the reader to further study. Then a section-by-section analysis of the text follows. The *NIV* translation of the passage is given, followed by the author's exegesis. Each author also includes scholarly notes on each passage to assist the more advanced reader.

Overall the volume provides the seminary student or scholar with solid and well-documented information designed to "make clear the meaning of the text at the time and in the circumstances of its writing" (p. viii). Since the grammatico-historical approach is followed, readers desiring modern applications may be somewhat disappointed, though some application is included.

G. Archer begins the volume with his 150-page exposition on Daniel. (The portion of the book allotted to Daniel is not inappropriate when one considers the book's length in relation to the entire corpus.) Archer ably defends the book's sixth-century origin and admirably deals with the critical problems that have surfaced in relationship to the book. In the text and exposition section, however, his tone tends to be somewhat more dogmatic than that of the other contributors. Archer identifies the view that the fourth kingdom in Daniel's visions is Greece as strictly a liberal view (pp. 24–26), apparently ignoring the fact that some conservatives also arrive at the same conclusion on different methodological grounds. Thus this view tends to be ignored in the rest of the commentary. Further, the "spiritual kingdom" interpretation of Daniel's fifth kingdom (Daniel 2) is not even considered, and the seventy weeks of Daniel 9 are understood according to the

"gap" interpretation without any real defense of such interpretation. While I agree with many of Archer's conclusions, it would seem that more hermeneutical justification and openness would be in order.

L. Wood contributed the section on Hosea. Wood considers the basic views of Hosea's marriage and opts for the traditional view: Gomer was chaste before marriage and became immoral afterwards (p. 166). Wood's exposition is very thorough and the critical notes quite helpful and relevant. Although again the historico-grammatical method is followed, some NT application would have enhanced the work—especially in regard to 1:10 (Hebrew 2:1) and 11:1, two verses of special NT significance (cf. Rom 8:25–26 and Matt 2:13–15 respectively).

R. Patterson wrote the section on Joel. He dates Joel's ministry to the reign of Uzziah (792–740 B.C.) and argues from internal evidence that Joel lived in Judah (pp. 230–233). Patterson does a good job of wrestling with 2:28–32 (Hebrew 3:1–5a) and its relationship to Pentecost, and he interrelates eighth-century and eschatological fulfillment very well. He closes his work with a solid piece of NT application.

The commentary sections on Amos and Micah are the work of T. McComiskey, who dates the ministry of Amos to c. 760 B.C. and includes a solid discussion of the historical setting. His exposition of Amos offers many insights with good cross-referencing in the notes. The work is a good blending of scholarship and readability presented in a humble spirit. McComiskey's discussion of Micah is also solid. Seeing Micah against a backdrop of social injustice he reinforces Micah's work by comparison with parallel Biblical material and supplements other areas with parallel extra-Biblical sources where relevant.

C. Armerding contributed the sections on Obadiah, Nahum and Habakkuk. Two key issues he seeks to resolve in his discussion of Obadiah are (1) the reason behind the strong anti-Edom hostility expressed in vv 10–14 and (2) the time when Obadiah's words were fulfilled. He concludes that the circumstances surrounding the fall of Jerusalem were the main reason and dates the fulfillment of Obadiah's prophecy to the latter sixth century, perhaps by the time of Nabonidus (556–539). The author presents a balanced interpretation with a good discussion of historical and geographical points that add meaning to the text. Armerding begins his work on Nahum with a good introductory section on Assyria and also includes an interesting discussion of the literary affinities between Nahum and Isaiah. He supplements his exegesis with references to the Babylonian Chronicle and other extra-Biblical sources. His presentation on Habakkuk also has a solid introduction, and the notes in his exposition tend to favor text-critical concerns. One small note at this point: There seems to be little justification for understanding *nēhārîm* in 3:8 as anything but "rivers" (cf. Armerding's "sea," pp. 527–528).

H. L. Ellison contributed the section on Jonah. He defends the book's historicity, understanding it as simple historical narrative. Ellison's discussion is quite thorough, with good use of extra-Biblical sources in the many places they are pertinent. His occasional speculation is refreshing, though sometimes perhaps a bit bold (cf. his treatment of 2:1).

Zephaniah is presented by L. Walker. After ably presenting the evidence he leaves open the question of whether Hezekiah of Judah is intended in Zephaniah's genealogical reference in 1:1, and he also avoids a precise dating of the prophet's ministry other than simply during the reign of Josiah (640–609 B.C.). Walker's "special problems" section is somewhat weak. Some fairly big names in Biblical scholarship are quoted as holding liberal views, and then their arguments are simply dismissed without comment. More interaction with the issues would have been helpful. A minor note on Walker's notes to 1:17 (p. 551): *gĕlālîm* is not the "common Hebrew term for 'dung.' " It only occurs twice, and other words are just as common or more so.

R. Alden contributed the sections on Haggai and Malachi. Both contain good introduction and background sections, and although each commentary is under twenty-five

pages in length both Haggai and Malachi are well covered. Alden also includes many modern applications, a feature not essential in light of the primary purpose of the commentary (see above) but helpful nonetheless.

K. Barker's work on Zechariah is quite thorough. He strongly defends the unity of the book and Zechariah's authorship, and he includes a valuable bibliography. His discussion of the term "branch" in Zechariah and the OT is also commendable. Barker's notes tend to be grammatical and lexical rather than explanatory or textual. Many seem fairly incidental except perhaps for the beginning Hebrew student. Moreover Barker's quote from C. Feinberg (p. 617) seems rather unfair when he refers to a spiritual interpretation of Zech 2:4 as "baseless and unfounded hermeneutical alchemy." Such an attitude seems out of place in a commentary such as this one, and fortunately it does not surface again in Barker's exposition.

Overall the contributors have succeeded in blending theological conservatism, serious scholarship, and good readability—a goal for which we may all strive.

Bryan E. Beyer

Columbia Bible College, Columbia, SC

A History of Israel from Alexander the Great to Bar Kochba. By Henk Jagersma. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985, 224 pp., $12.95 paper.

Jagersma is known for a previous work, *A History of Israel in the Old Testament Period* (Fortress, 1983). The present volume provides us with an excellently summarized survey of an extremely important period in the history of Israel. The book is divided into eighteen concise chapters dealing with the periods of Israel's history at the time indicated. The main text is followed by some 35 pages of extensive footnotes, and the book concludes with helpful chronological tables, indices and maps.

The strengths of this work lie in several areas. First, Jagersma has succeeded in summarizing large quantities of material in a clear and concise manner. He not only presents the bare facts of the political development but also ably takes into consideration the social, economic and religious developments that contribute so much to the events of this period.

A second strength lies in the obviously extensive research that has gone into the volume. The works consulted are extensive, including not only ancient sources but also modern authors up through 1985. He is well aware of recent archeological contributions to this period as well as various scholarly opinions in areas of uncertainty.

Certain weaknesses or flaws, however, should be pointed out. Although not a major criticism, it would have been helpful if the many works referred to could have been brought together in a bibliography.

In addition, even though the works referred to are quite extensive, there is inevitably the omission of this or that work that could have been included. For example, there is no reference to E. Bevan (*A History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty*, 1927; *The House of Seleucus,* 1902), S. Hoenig (*The Great Sanhedrin*, 1953) or A. Oppenheimer (*The 'Am Ha-Aretz*, 1977). Other books that could have been mentioned are M. Stone, ed., *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (1984); W. D. Davies and L. Finkelstein, eds., *The Cambridge History of Judaism* (1984); and *CAH* (2d ed.; Cambridge, 1984), 7. part 1.

There are also a few typographical errors, and some confusion in the index of modern authors is evident.

It seems, however, that the major deficit of this work lies in the acceptance of critical opinions regarding Scripture with no indication of alternate viewpoints and no references

to conservative scholars who hold a different opinion. Such an "uncritical" critical view of the Scriptures characterizes Jagersma's previous work as well and is clearly seen in this work in his late date of Daniel and Ecclesiastes. The view also underlies his treatment of the NT, the ministry of Jesus, and the development of the Christian Church.

But in spite of these deficiencies the book can be profitably used as a concise survey of a period of Israel's history that is important for Biblical backgrounds.

Cleon Rogers

Freie Theologische Akademie, Giessen, West Germany

The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament: Prolegomena for the Study of Christian Origins. By James Hamilton Charlesworth. SNTSMS 54. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1985, xxiv + 213 pp., $34.50.

Having a deep and long-lasting interest in pseudepigraphic literature but considering myself no expert in this difficult field, I took up Charlesworth's new book with very high expectations. No one deserves more credit than he for the current revival of interest in the Pseudepigrapha, and his work as editor for the Doubleday edition of these materials puts him in a unique position to instruct those of us who are eager to learn.

It is with genuine regret that I must register my disappointment. The 93 pages of text are virtually from beginning to end an exercise in axe-grinding. The author—not altogether without reason, to be sure—is indignant that many scholars regard the pseudepigraphic writings as inferior literature, use them only to shed light on the Bible, and thus fail to understand them in their own right. This assessment is basically accurate, and one can hardly object to being reminded that a different perspective is needed.

The question is whether any book, and especially a scholarly monograph, should devote so much space to make this point. More important, however, is the way Charlesworth goes about his task: His highly personal style and condescending tone are almost guaranteed to turn readers off instead of winning them to his side. And as if the text were not bad enough, he tells us in a footnote: "I have had second thoughts on the way I have written this monograph. Perhaps my points should have been more cutting, and my approach to New Testament scholars polemical. Perhaps I should boldly have written that most 'of you' were trained incorrectly. Perhaps I should have stated that 'you' were taught to think that the New Testament is a sacred canon of books (and not, as 'you' should have seen it, as a portion of the literature of Early Judaism or Christianity)" (pp. 148–149).

As the quotation suggests, Charlesworth's problem with Biblical scholars is not merely one of method but one of theology. On p. 50, for example, the author lists five views about which he says, "Some theologians may still be able to survive while subscribing to one or two of these positions. But no critical historian—and therefore no New Testament scholar interested in Christian Origins—will advocate any of them." Heading the list is a belief in the unique inspiration and the canonicity of OT books. (Charlesworth does not explain how it is possible for him, throughout the book, to cite and build on the work of a variety of scholars who would most certainly advocate those views.)

The book is divided into three chapters, the first of which reviews the modern revival in pseudepigraphic studies with its accompanying opportunities and challenges. Charlesworth's historical narrative is rather eccentric. One does not know what to make, for example, of his description of the years 1914–49 as "the period of dark clouds over 'intertestamental' Judaism"—and that on the grounds that communism was established in Russia, there was a worldwide depression, and the Nazi scourge led to World War II (p. 10). He does comment that "orthodox bias rampant" in academic institutions made

people think of the Pseudepigrapha as writings, "to put it perhaps too harshly, not to be loved but to be used as Dinah was by Shechem" (pp. 10–11). Apart from that, however, nothing concrete is said about pseudepigraphic research during the period. As for the decades that followed we are given the information that they saw "the establishment of apartheid in South Africa, the creation of Israel, and the appearance of Pakistan"; somehow "these heterogeneous forces effectively mark a new period in the modern study of the Pseudepigrapha" (p. 12). Beginning with p. 13 we are given more useful data, but it is far too sketchy to be of independent value.

Chapter 2 is entitled "The Pseudepigrapha, Early Judaism and Christian Origins," and on pp. 31–46 ("Dating the Evidence") we are given a taste of what Charlesworth could have done with the book as a whole—namely, sort out and synthesize the massive amount of research that has been going on during the past two or three decades. In this section the author groups the pseudepigraphic writings according to whether they may be regarded as pre-Christian. A full chapter should have been devoted to this issue, with fuller argumentation and bibliographic data. The rest of the chapter discusses various theological and related themes in early Judaism. It includes a critique of E. P. Sanders and occasional points of interest.

The last chapter is devoted to the relationship between Pseudepigrapha and NT. It begins with a peculiar classification based on levels of dependency between one document and another: *primus* (NT dependence on the OT), *secundus* (Jude's use of 1 Enoch), etc. Then follows a brief discussion of the significance of the Pseudepigrapha for the dating of NT books and an even briefer treatment of "Messianism and Christology."

An appendix summarizes the papers delivered at the SNTS Pseudepigrapha Seminars from 1976 to 1983 (pp. 94–141). The rest of the volume contains notes, a glossary, bibliographies and indices. The glossary in particular reveals a lack of focus on the character of the volume. The author apparently views this book in some ways as a popularization that could be used by nonscholars, and so he glosses such terms as *editio princeps, inter alia*, papyri, Shema and *Yahweh*. It is frankly surprising that the present work was included in one of the most prestigious monograph series in the Biblical field. Whatever its value, this book is not a scholarly monograph.

In conclusion, I learned very little from this work. I am still convinced, however, that Charlesworth can teach me a great deal. One can only hope that, having published the present volume, he will now feel released to produce the kind of work that he is certainly capable of writing.

Moisés Silva

Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia

Paul and His Interpreters. An Annotated Bibliography. TSF-IBR Bibliographic Study Guides. By Gerald L. Borchert. Madison: Theological Students Fellowship, 1985, vi + 123 pp., $3.50. *The Intertestamental Period: A Study Guide.* TSF-IBR Bibliographic Study Guides. By Stephen Noll. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1985, vii + 92 pp., $3.50.

Through the combined efforts of the Theological Students Fellowship and the Institute for Biblical Research a series of bibliographic study guides is being produced primarily to assist students in their introduction to specific areas of Biblical and theological studies. Each guide provides a major survey of the literature in a given field of study, suggesting helpful introductory material, along with comments and sometimes a limited critique, for each book listed. Because the target audience is primarily English-speaking theology students, foreign language publications have been omitted by agreement. General editors D. Aune and M. Branson suggest that these guides will be helpful for schol-

arly research, sermon preparation and personal study.

Borchert's annotated bibliography on Pauline studies contains about one thousand items under the following main headings: histories of Pauline interpretation; historical, psychological and sociological studies related to the life and work of Paul; matters of introduction and studies in Pauline relationships; commentaries and special studies on the epistles; Pauline theology. Each main heading in turn is followed by a number of subdivisions. Each section, as well as subsection, usually begins with a short paragraph emphasizing some of the key issues in Pauline studies that the particular entries consider. Publications considered to be good introductions to specific aspects of Pauline studies for the beginning student are marked with an asterisk. Those containing useful additional bibliography are indicated by "Bib." following the entry. An index of authors and miscellaneous items concludes the bibliography. Each entry in the index is listed according to the entry number and the page on which it is found.

One possible criticism of Borchert's volume concerns his use of terms such as "conservative," "evangelical," "critical," or "moderately critical" in statements that summarize and evaluate the entries. Nowhere is there any attempt to offer definitions that would guide the user. Consider section 4:1, "General New Testament Introductions": In the space of two pages we read of a "British critical approach," "conservative introduction," "critical introduction," "moderately critical introduction," "critical analysis," "conservative European scholarship" and "German critical studies." The information the compiler is trying to convey is confusing in the absence of any explanation as to what he means by these terms, particularly since the bibliography is intended for the beginning student.

Typographical errors are few (e.g. "Zeitschriff," # 293a; omission of space between # 514 and # 515). The section on abstracts (1.1.4) could have included *Religious and Theological Abstracts* as an additional source of bibliographical information. In general, however, each section and subsection is very representative of the best research available in English.

Noll's bibliography includes about five hundred entries. A similar pattern is followed with five major sections, each having numerous subdivisions: introduction; history; institutions; language and literature; distinctive theological motifs. Each major section and subsection is prefaced with several paragraphs of information, guiding the reader into the specific subject area. The length and detail of these initial paragraphs is apparently the reason why Noll's publication is a "study guide" and Borchert's is an "annotated bibliography." A major omission in section 4.2.3, "Greek Texts," is *A Classified Bibliography of the Septuagint* by S. Brock, C. Fritsch and S. Jellicoe. Noll concludes his study guide with an author index.

Some typographical distinctions do exist between the two publications (e.g. Noll has italicized titles whereas Borchert underlines them). Noll uses the siglum "+" to indicate specialized studies for advanced students, but does not use "Bib." to indicate further sources of bibliography. Noll tells us the date up to which entries were made (August 1984), but Borchert gives no indication of this. Whether future additions to this series will be either annotated bibliographies or study guides is uncertain, and perhaps the intention of the general editors is to allow some flexibility for the compilers.

The Theological Students Fellowship and the Institute for Biblical Research deserve our thanks for providing a series of such useful tools for students and professionals.

Larry Perkins

Northwest Baptist Theological Seminary, Vancouver, BC

Paul's Two-Age Construction and Apologetics. By William D. Dennison. London/Lanham: University Press of America, 1985, 116 pp.

This work is a wide-ranging study within the area of Pauline theology. Chapter 1 dispenses with Plato and Jewish apocalyptic as fundamental backgrounds for Paul's eschatology. Chapter 2 explains what is meant by "Paul's two-age construction." The author follows Cullmann generally, differing from him by arguing for a tension of the ages based on the believer's existence in an evil aeon and questioning Cullmann's existential tendencies. Chapter 3 is entitled "1 Corinthians 1–3: Antithetical Wisdom." Arguing against *sophia* as a rhetorical reference in 1 Cor 1:17; 2:1, 4, the author holds that *sophia* is determined to be worldly by dependence on moral capacities and to be spiritual by properly responding to God's work through Christ. The division in the church at Corinth is seen to arise from a lack of differentiation between these two wisdoms. Chapter 4 is entitled "The Apologetic Significance of the Two Ages." Because of the place Paul gives eschatology in his writings, the author faults those theologians (he mentions C. Hodge and L. Berkhof) who leave eschatology to the last part of their systems. Of course this sort of judgment can only be made by one who assumes that systematics must follow Biblical theology, and he does go on to argue for this later on in the chapter. The classical formulation of the *ordo salutis*, even as used by C. Van Til, is found wanting by the author, again because of the insignificance it gives to eschatology in its sequence.

The book closes with a summary of the importance that the two-age construction has for apologetics. The transition to apologetics here is not smooth, and one is not convinced how it is related integrally to the rest of the book. The author contends that the two-age construction roots apologetics properly within the domains of theology and redemptive history and highlights the "antithetical structure of Christianity" in relation to other faiths, allowing for an apologetic within a Christian framework that is able to analyze and criticize non-Christian systems.

The genesis of the book out of a master's thesis accounts for both its weaknesses and its strengths. The author is a bit ambitious, trying to dispose of both Plato and Jewish apocalyptic as backgrounds to Paul in the space of twenty pages. Eliminating these two is considered adequate to show that Paul's eschatology is unique. No mention is made of the Dead Sea scrolls. Apocalyptic is treated as a single body of literature, and no mention is made of the apocalyptic material in the NT. The last chapter's presentation lapses at points into a forum among Van Til, Murray and Gaffin. The concluding arguments are ambitious, e.g.: "Any apologetic system which does not begin, therefore, with the eschatological structure of Paul's thought, is carnal apologetics" (p. 106). The accompanying paragraph argues for this statement out of Paul's dealings with the Corinthian church as reflected in 1 Corinthians 1–3, but it did not convince me that one is obligated to build apologetic systems today as Paul built them in response to one of his churches.

Yet the questions the book raises are signs of health within the Church. The notion of a distinctly Christian epistemology is useful, both for the exegete and the theologian. It is refreshing to read an author so devoted to following the Biblical pattern as closely as possible. His attack on the traditional place of eschatology in systematic theology is stimulating. The alternative he offers by placing eschatology at the forefront of the theologian's agenda is worthy of consideration.

Mark Reasoner

Paul: Portrait of a Revolutionary. By Donald Coggan. New York: Crossroad, 1985, 256 pp., $9.95 paper.

Coggan, archbishop of Canterbury from 1974 to 1980, marks fifty years of ministry

in the Anglican Church with the publication of this book. Its purpose is to introduce readers to Paul as a man, a Christian who is "one of us" in his spiritual pilgrimage (pp. 9–10). The style is popular, with scholarly details generally avoided. Excerpts from a variety of modern writers pervade the material. This feature calls for further comment later. The book contains twelve chapters, with endnotes and indexes of names and Scripture references. Overall it is well conceived and produced. However, the use of endnotes for all documentation, even Scripture references, is inconvenient. The Scripture references would have been more helpful if they had been placed parenthetically in the text.

The strongest chapters in the book discuss Paul's youth (pp. 17–30), prayer life (pp.121–131) and relation to Jesus (pp. 195–217). In these chapters Coggan's popularizing approach is most successful. The cultural influence of both Tarsus and Jerusalem upon Paul is handled in a balanced manner. The reader is challenged to experience the dynamic prayer ministry exhibited by Paul. A surprisingly convincing case is made for the doctrinal unity of Jesus and Paul. In making it Coggan seems to take a high view of the historical reliability of the gospels. The result of these three chapters ought to be that which Coggan intends: Readers will empathetically understand Paul better as a fellow disciple of Jesus Christ.

Other chapters, however, are not as successful. The popularization of Paul's Arabian desert experience is highly imaginative (pp. 49–57). Speaking of Paul as a "freedom-fighter" (pp. 135–166; cf. the book's subtitle) seems to be a weak and superficial effort to contemporize his thought. The attempt to explain Paul in terms of Teilhard de Chardin's thought (p. 148; cf. pp. 186, 190) is doomed from the beginning. The prominent and sacerdotal view of baptism that Coggan assigns to Paul is doubtful (pp. 77–78, 117, 121, 176, 179, 209, 212). He views Paul's OT interpretation as sometimes allegorical, perverse, and foreign to modern methods (pp. 116–117; cf. p. 197). Evidently he does not accept a distinction between typological and allegorical exegesis. Coggan is disappointed that Paul did not denounce social evils (p. 154), though he does attempt to get Paul out of this jam. When he does become involved in such areas as exegesis (p. 163), textual criticism (p. 205) and word studies (pp. 124, 139–141), the results are not always reliable. He assumes an evolutionary worldview (pp. 109, 148).

Despite the above shortcomings, which obviously reflect my own prejudices, Coggan has painted a positive and sympathetic portrait of Paul the man. Whether readers will tend to view Paul as "one of us" as a result of reading the book will depend to a great extent upon whether they identify with the modern writers who are frequently cited in the effort to contemporize Paul. Among those most prominently cited are G. K. Chesterton, Dante, T. Merton, J. H. Newman, H. Nouwen, D. Sayers, and Teilhard de Chardin. Perhaps the British audience for which Coggan evidently intended the book is familiar with such writers. My guess, however, is that few American evangelicals will be helped in their understanding of Paul by having his thought compared and contrasted with such authors. Neither will many evangelicals appreciate the idea of having a drink with Paul (p. 61). The question, then: Who are the "us" with whom Paul is to be "one"? Coggan's purpose is laudable, and his ability to communicate is unquestionable. But the book will not accomplish its purpose with many American evangelicals due to its doctrinal weaknesses and its emphasis upon modern authors who are obscure to many lay people.

David L. Turner

Grand Rapids Baptist Seminary, Grand Rapids, MI

Slaves, Citizens, Sons: Legal Metaphors in the Epistles. By Francis Lyall. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984, 288 pp., n.p. paper.

Competent study of the cultural setting of Paul's thought is an important aid to the

understanding of it. Lyall is a distinguished authority on Roman law. There can be a special value in the contributions to NT backgrounds made by scholars from a different but relevant discipline, and Lyall has provided a very helpful application of his expertise to Pauline interpretation. His discussion does not in fact cover all the ground that might qualify for inclusion under "legal metaphors." There is nothing on the forensic or criminal aspects of law, or on such concepts as witness, guilt or judgment.

A central difficulty confronting this undertaking is the legal pluralism of the NT world. Lyall rightly declines to oversimplify this great cultural complexity and considers whether individual usages are best explained from Jewish or from Roman law, or from one of the many imperfectly known Greek systems in the cities of the eastern Mediterranean. After seeking to do justice to alternative possibilities, it is Lyall's main contention that in most cases Paul the Roman citizen draws upon Roman law in writing to churches for whom also Roman law was ultimately important. In some areas, like the status of slaves and freedmen, the concepts of Roman law are seen to give a unique force and richness to Paul's language. Only the ideas relating to redemption have a richer background in Biblical and Jewish law.

The focus of this study is on matters of social status and relationship, and in his handling of overlapping legal concepts Lyall builds up a distinctive and illuminating picture of the legal basis of Roman society. This is the more valuable in view of the widespread current interest in the sociology of the NT and the questions of method raised by some examples of this trend. The thematic plan of the book, and the interrelationship of topics, lead to much repetition (e.g. pp. 72–73, 160–161). While this is a lawyer's book rather than a work of technical Biblical scholarship, the author is well read in Biblical criticism, often choosing his authorities among older (and less transient) scholars.

Further consideration prompts in me some more radical questions and cautions than I felt on a previous reading, at least on the topics of inheritance and adoption. Those cautions only serve to stress afresh the complexity of the matter. While accepting readily the significance of Roman law in most other areas, I suspect there is at least more to be said on the Greco-Anatolian kind of option here, and the difficulty of the case does not dispose of a possible claim, as indeed Lyall would recognize. His account of "Greek law" derives, *faute de mieux*, from classical Athens, which may be a far cry from Paul anyhow, with centuries of Seleucid rule and ancient Anatolian social structures intervening. At least the fact of adoption was very prevalent in Asia Minor (*contra* the implied doubt about its vitality, p. 89), as is evident from the inscriptions, though the texts give little detail of its social and legal content. Such gleanings as those of W. M. Calder in *JTS* 31 (1930) 372–374 (cf. Lyall, pp. 81, 261 n. 28) need to be looked at more closely with a feeling for their place in a larger if fragmentary context. W. M. Ramsay argued strongly for a (south) Galatian background for the legal references in Galatians 3–4 and stressed the essential irrevocability of the (Seleucid) Greek law of wills and inheritance in terms that come near to a reverse of Lyall's account (*Historical Commentary on Galatians*, esp. pp. 349–356, 370–375, 391–393). And what of the evidence from Egypt in the papyri (e.g. *Oxy.* 489–495, wills, all of second century A.D.; 1201, A.D. 258, intestate inheritance; 1206, A.D. 335, adoption)? How in detail was the situation affected by chronological change, influence and interpenetration of legal systems? None of these questions are raised in facile criticism. Indeed I am quite unclear where such complicating factors might lead. It is a plea for further study along the lines Lyall has advanced. And that accords with the tone of his own conclusions (pp. 177–179).

A large part of the book is devoted to extensive appendices that tackle underlying critical questions, some of them giving occasion for further repetition in a new setting of central points already well made. These appendices deal successively with the nature of metaphor and analogy, with the ancient systems of law, with law in the Roman provinces, with the epistles, and with Paul himself. I found the first two especially interesting,

the second for its illuminating account of the history of Roman legislative institutions. The discussion of the nature and application of metaphorical language is of central interest. Such language is important in communication, where the presentation of theological truth must necessarily use analogy, though analogical language also has its dangers, against which Lyall is careful to caution. He argues convincingly that a pointed and explicit explanation in terms of a background shared by writer and reader is the more likely to be correct, though metaphor may sometimes be allusive and admit of more than one explanation.

In the appendices on the epistles and on Paul, Lyall's grasp occasionally seems a little less sure. Perhaps he smooths the evidence in these sections a little too easily to suit the strengths of his case. While his own views of the critical problems of Pauline authenticity are sensibly traditional, he may be a little optimistic in his estimate of current trends (p. 224). Yet trends of opinion do not necessarily concur with strength of argument, and the weight of the point could be grounded on solid reasons apart from the uncertain appeal to the balance of critical opinion. On Paul's upbringing, Lyall inclines to accept van Unnik's view that he owed his education more to Jerusalem than to Tarsus and explains his familiarity with different systems of law from a perspective that allows for this likely reading of Acts 22:3.

This book can be read with interest and profit by the nonspecialist Bible student. There is rich contextual material to give point and focus to Paul's thought. Latin terms are used freely but are usually explained at their first occurrence.

It has also much to offer the scholar. Its attempt to wrestle with the evidence to discriminate between different backgrounds is a healthy corrective to some overly theoretical sociological approaches. If sometimes to be used with caution, that is because of the obscurities of the subject and the admittedly provisional nature of some of the conclusions. It is a stimulus to fruitful interaction. Lyall's keen historical sense for the fascinatingly different structures of ancient societies raises further questions of interpretation and application, how to transpose Paul's thought into terms that communicate to modern man.

The endnotes include bibliographical data on the sources for each chapter, and there are indices of subjects and of passages.

Colin Hemer

Tyndale House, Cambridge, England

Romans. By Paul J. Achtemeier. Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching. Atlanta: John Knox, 1985, viii + 244 pp., $17.95.

"Of the making of commentaries there is no end"—or at least so it seems. As a book review editor for another journal, I often find my desk flooded with new commentaries. Are they all needed? Is there really a market for so many series of commentaries? Apparently the answer to both questions is "yes" (although maybe the last question is too often the only one for which a positive answer is needed). Whatever the reason and whatever the need, the person now looking around for a good commentary on a particular NT book is confronted with a wide choice indeed: critical commentaries, popular commentaries, commentaries that aim somewhere in between.

The series of which Achtemeier's *Romans* is a part belongs to this last class—and within this class, it is at the more "popular" end of the scale. The style is very readable, illustrations appear frequently, references to secondary materials are few (and segregated mainly at the ends of sections) and few Greek words appear. Distinctive to the series are the notes to teachers and preachers at the end of each commentary section.

These suggest appropriate teaching and preaching approaches to the material, provide useful cross-references with both OT and NT passages and reflect on the way the theme of the text could be fit into the liturgical calendar. The notes are frequently insightful and will prove of real help to those specifically concerned with applying the text of Romans, although in a couple of instances the suggested approach seemed more a means of explaining away a text that might prove offensive to a modern audience.

For all the popular trimmings, this commentary is written by a seasoned scholar who is obviously very well acquainted with the current state of Romans studies. Indeed one of the values of the commentary is the skill with which Achtemeier has boiled down into nontechnical language the often esoteric and complex modern scholarly contributions to our understanding of Romans. He accepts the common view that Paul has adapted the Jewish apocalyptic "two aeon" framework as a vehicle for his theologizing in Romans. He adopts the Käsemann-Stuhlmacher interpretation of the "righteousness of God," although in contrast to Käsemann he does not think this is the central theme of the letter. "God's righteousness," in fact, is simply one way in which Paul states what is his central theme: God's gracious lordship. Attacked in the past through sin, especially idolatry (1:14–4:23), God's lordship is now in the present being revealed as it overcomes the threat of the law and of sin, thereby giving to the believer a solid hope for the future (4:23–8:39), which will witness the culmination of God's gracious lordship as his faithfulness to the promises given to his people Israel is exhibited (9:1–11:36). In the present age the believer is to bring the lordship of God into all the structures of his or her life (12:1–16:27).

The development of the theme of God's lordship in Romans follows, as this summary of Achtemeier's outline shows, an historical rather than doctrinal logic. This is not to say that doctrine has no place in Romans. It is simply that it is not the structuring key.

The value of this commentary lies in the sharply focused bird's-eye view that Achtemeier's brief, well-written exposition provides. One reviewing a commentary written in such a format probably responds much as I did: satisfaction when a view I also held was clearly argued and stated, frustration when a view I do not hold was presented without fair consideration of other views. My frustration reached its peak as I read that Romans 9 has no relevance to individuals or to soteriology. This view is of course widely held, but the format of the commentary absolved Achtemeier from having to deal with the specifics of the text that I think stand in the way of his interpretation or to interact with the arguments of scholars such as J. Piper (*The Justification of God*) who come to the opposite conclusion. My doubts about Achtemeier's conclusions were reinforced when I read that double predestination, the view he was rejecting, involves the notion that "God saves some and condemns others and that neither group has anything to do with its own fate" (p. 162). If he thus misunderstands the position he is rejecting, questions about just how he would handle counter-arguments loom even larger.

I had similar reactions to his acceptance of the Bultmannian view that the law failed because it induced people to seek salvation through it (what would he say to Räisänen and others?) and to his adoption of a semi-Pelagian interpretation of Rom 5:12. But these are frustrations about the format, not criticisms of Achtemeier's scholarship. Had he had room to develop his views on these issues he undoubtedly could have done so with considerable skill and persuasion.

Douglas Moo

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

A Translator's Handbook on Paul's First Letter to the Corinthians. By Paul Ellingworth and Howard Halton. New York: United Bible Societies, 1985, 352 pp., $4.20 paper.

In this volume the authors give special attention to the structure of the discourse in

order that the translator will be able to understand the logical progression of the sections of 1 Corinthians and how they contribute to the message of the whole. The concept of translation used throughout the volume is "dynamic equivalence." Thus the *Handbook* reflects a concern for helping translators understand the meaning of the Biblical text as a necessary condition for translating it. In harmony with this aim the *Handbook* is based on the third corrected edition (1983) of *UBSGNT* and the 26th edition of Nestle-Aland's *Novum Testamentum Graece* (1981). However, efforts have been made to explain the text in a way that can be understood by translators who know little or no Greek. Occasionally footnotes include technical information requiring a knowledge of Greek.

At the beginning of each section the text under consideration is given in two English translations: *RSV* and *Today's English Version* (*TEV*). Each differs considerably from the other since each is based on different principles of translation and is intended to serve different purposes. The *RSV* follows closely the form and structure of sentences of the Greek and Hebrew, whereas the *TEV* attempts to reproduce not the grammatical form of the original but rather its meaning. Reference is also frequently made to other translations of 1 Corinthians in various European languages in order to illustrate how different interpretations of the Greek text affect the translation and to provide examples of how the meaning of the text has been expressed in particular translations.

The *Handbook* offers a variety of translation alternatives for different grammatical constructions in order to aid those translating into receptor languages other than English. For example, in 12:29–30 the original contains a series of rhetorical questions that assume a negative response. It is suggested, however, that the questions may be translated as negative declarative statements if the receptor language demands it. Thus the phrase "All are not apostles, are they?" becomes "All are not apostles." But in seeking a dynamic equivalent one must be careful that the sense of the original is not changed. For example, the translation "supreme" for *kephalē* in 11:3 (*TEV*) comes dangerously close to changing the meaning since "supreme" may imply more than functional authority.

The reader will benefit from several features of the volume such as charts on the structure of difficult passages (2:6–16; 7:25–40; 11:2–16), excursuses on key words like "knowledge" and "wisdom" (pp. 10–12), and a table of translation possibilities for 7:36–38. Also alternative interpretations of difficult words or phrases are occasionally quite helpful (e.g. "the unmarried" may refer to widowers rather than both men and women in 7:8).

The volume is very readable since the text under discussion is placed in bold print. The authors also recognize legitimate textual possibilities. An example is found in 13:3, in which the authors prefer the reading "burn" instead of the *UBSGNT* and Nestle reading "boast" but acknowledge the possibility of the reading "boast" in a footnote. The *Handbook* also includes a limited bibliography and a helpful glossary of technical terms. The work on the whole is a good resource for anyone working with the text of 1 Corinthians.

Tracy L. Howard

Grace Theological Seminary, Winona Lake, IN

The Message of 1 Corinthians: Life in the Local Church. By David Prior. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1985, 285 pp., $7.95. *The Message of James: The Tests of Faith.* By Alec Motyer. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1985, 214 pp., $6.95.

Although I have not read all the volumes in The Bible Speaks Today series, those I have used in weekly sermon preparation fill an important gap. They are expressly de-

signed to bridge the chasm of the centuries and help the reader apply the ancient yet living text to life today. The style is that of exposition rather than commentary, and the publisher has blessed us with footnotes. The two studies that are the subject of this review fulfill the purpose of the series admirably.

The exposition of James by Motyer (his third contribution to the series) comes to us at an interesting time in the history of the interpretation of this epistle. The commentary by S. Laws was published in 1980 and that of P. Davids in 1982. For the pastor who uses exegetical commentaries, Motyer provides the first lengthy synthesis and critique of these two important scholarly works. He often seems to agree with Laws in matters of meaning and offers balance to a few of the positions taken by Davids (e.g. 5:1–6). In a short introduction he discusses the structure and themes of the epistle, which he says was written by the brother of the Lord. Throughout the book he includes summarizing paragraphs that deal with structure. This is especially helpful in a letter that has often been characterized as having no logical flow of thought. There is also a deft use of the Greek text that a mature layperson could understand.

The author's Calvinistic approach to regeneration (with which I agree) comes out very clearly in the discussion of the new birth in 1:12–19. But when I came to the major crux in 2:14–26, I was pleased to find that the emphasis was on the certainty of faith rather than on the need for works (as some Calvinists seem to imply; cf. Davids' title to this section: "Generosity Is Necessary"). James is not telling us that our faith must produce works (for works can be counterfeited as easily as faith) but that I can recognize living faith by the fact that it produces works. Is James perhaps talking more about assurance than forensic justification? The most helpful feature of Motyer's exposition is the homiletical seeds it will plant in the minds of preachers and teachers as they prepare messages on James.

The exposition of 1 Corinthians by Prior is different. In seventy more pages he discusses a letter three times as long, and hence he deals with paragraphs and not details. The most recent commentary he uses is Conzelmann (1975), while his favorites are Morris (1958), Barrett (1968) and Bruce (1971). The lack of reference to recent journal articles may somewhat hinder the acceptance of this exposition.

In an eight-page introduction the author sets forth his understanding of the Corinthian correspondence. Paul is the author, and 2 Corinthians 10–13 was written independently and prior to chaps. 1–9. Prior includes many excellent ideas for homileticians and lay teachers. In earlier portions of his exposition he includes a few illustrations derived from his pastorates in South Africa and England. Many of these are especially interesting in light of current news from the former.

First Corinthians is a letter that deals with a series of problems faced by this first-century church. Not surprisingly those same problems in some way confront the Church at the end of the twentieth century. Prior does an excellent job of bridging the gap. He deals with divisions between "rigorists" and "libertines." He discusses the problems of homosexuality, divorce and remarriage, and the role of women in the Church. Readers may differ with his conclusions, but at least the modern problems are not ignored. This review is no place for a full-scale critique of each problem. I would, however, like to mention Prior's interpretation of spiritual gifts and especially speaking in tongues.

The author notes (correctly, I think) that gifts given by the Spirit are to be used primarily in the context of the local church. Itinerant use of gifts, while possible, does not have the authoritative review and support of the local body. With regard to the discussion on speaking in tongues I must admit that it is one of the best and most balanced treatments I have read. Tongues is not a special sign of spirituality, nor is the author setting forth tongues as the solution to the ills of the Church. The discussion is especially valuable since it occurs in the context of a commendable exposition of the whole epistle. Having said this I must also say that I remain unconvinced that glossolalia as usually

practiced today is the same phenomenon to which Paul referred. It seems to me that *glossai* refers to actual earthly languages. *Glossai* and *dialektos* are synonyms in Acts 2 (Luke's paradigm for the other occurrences of tongues in Acts). To depart from this meaning is to adopt the meaning "ecstatic utterances," referring to the similar phenomenon that occurred in some mystery religions. Then the question that presents itself is this: Why would God include this pagan and somewhat dervish-like gift among those designed to edify the Church? But if a tongue is a language, then it can serve the understanding unbeliever as a sign that God has wrought mighty deeds (Acts 2:11) and it can also function among believers when it is interpreted (translated). This may be a solution to Paul's seeming contradiction in 14:20–25. The problem in modern glossolalia is that usually it is not much different than ecstatic utterances of pagans. Could Paul have been writing to correct the same situation in Corinth that exists in the Church today?

All in all, Prior has given us some good food for ecclesiastical and homiletical thought. I would encourage both my charismatic and noncharismatic friends to read and use his exposition.

David H. Johnson

Call to Commitment: Responding to the Message of Hebrews. By William L. Lane. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1985, 184 pp., $8.95 paper.

Lane has here provided a book that should be helpful to the Church of Jesus Christ. Because of the great amount of OT background in the epistle, Hebrews is often a neglected book. This volume provides a helpful commentary that attempts to enable the Christian to respond with obedient living.

Lane argues that the book of Hebrews is a written sermon. He supports this with the words of 13:22: What the author has written are "words of exhortation." This explanation of the origin of the book perhaps answers some of the questions that have surfaced through the years concerning the nature of the writing and the well-developed Greek of the book.

The volume is exceedingly practical. Especially helpful is the discussion of the word *archēgos*. Lane argues that the word should be translated "champion" and that the author seeks to develop a picture of Jesus as a representative champion who comes to fight the battle in the place of the people. The comments on the difficult passage in 6:4–6 are also very helpful with an extended citation from *Martyrdom of Polycarp*. Lane also provides some good thoughts on the "heroes of the faith" section in chap. 11.

The commentary is faithful in taking the reader back to the OT to make sure the reader understands the book of Hebrews. Lane also provides information on the cultural situation of the original recipients, including the difficult political situation that perhaps was one of the major reasons for the letter being written. This book will prove useful for Sunday-school classes and group Bible studies as well as for individuals.

Lee Ferguson III