

BOOK REVIEWS

Exploring God's Word: A Guide to Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians. By Donald Guthrie. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985, 222 pp., \$6.95.

This book is the latest in Guthrie's long career. Students of the Bible on both sides of the Atlantic have benefited from his literary work over the years (e.g. *Jesus the Messiah*; commentaries on Galatians, the pastoral epistles, Hebrews) and his work as one of the editors of the *New Bible Commentary*.

Guthrie's stated purpose for writing the present volume is "to provide a tool for the expositional study of the biblical text." He goes on to say that "although the aim is exegetical, that is, to discover what the text actually says, the need to see how the text can be personally applied to daily life has been a major factor in the production of the outlines" (p. 13).

His book is chiefly directed towards laypersons—that is, those who may not have studied Biblical languages or backgrounds. The book is not designed to be a commentary. In fact its format is rather stark, including a table of contents, a brief preface and general introduction, and a short introduction for each of the three epistles.

The content of the book consists of a series of outlines that follow the sequence of the Biblical texts. Guthrie affirms that "only those outlines which arise naturally out of the text itself have been included." Some outlines are very short, while others are perhaps a page in length. Each outline is headed by a chapter-and-verse identification and a title. Occasionally an outline will include several verses and be followed by other outlines constructed from among those same verses. For example, Eph 4:25-32 ("Things to Avoid") is followed by 4:26-27 ("Anger"), 4:29 ("Speech"), 4:30 ("Grieving the Spirit") and 4:31-32 ("Wrong and Right Attitudes").

The outlines are not primarily sermonic. Although each has a text and title, there are no introductions, illustrations or conclusions. Instead each outline begins with a key statement, continues with several statements that seem obvious from the Biblical text, and concludes with another key statement.

This reviewer appreciates the writer's emphasis on Christian praxis. Certainly the necessity for applied Christianity cannot be overstated. Also, something can be said for the desire to stick to the text. However, neither Christian action nor the writing and study of the sacred texts occurs in a vacuum. I came away from the book with the conviction that Guthrie's commitment to only an exegetical aim has resulted in an unintentional diminishing of the richness of the prison epistles. They cry out for contexts, backgrounds, hermeneutical probing, theological analysis, etc.

In closing, this review does not take issue, except on occasion, with what was said in the outlines. The book can make a contribution as a starter for groups unfamiliar with the NT as they move into the study of the prison letters under the guidance of an experienced and knowledgeable teacher who will develop the seed thoughts presented.

James E. Priest

Pepperdine University, Malibu, CA

Philippians. By Fred B. Craddock. Atlanta: John Knox, 1985, xii + 84 pp., \$12.95.

This volume, one of a new series entitled *Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for*

Teaching and Preaching, is intended to provide help for preachers and teachers in their homiletic and educative tasks. The approach is not verse-by-verse but section-by-section. Analysis of fine points is not given in these volumes, but the editors promise that the results of such study have been incorporated into the expository essay. Each author attempts to place the Biblical text in its historical and literary context and also to comment upon its liturgical use in the lectionaries. The latter feature provides some interesting insights into early theological thinking, at least as interpreted by the author.

In the series preface the editors make it clear that these volumes will not replace the more exhaustive historical-critical commentaries. At the same time the reader will quickly recognize that Craddock is fully aware of the pertinent issues concerning Philippians. For instance, the author's preface acknowledges the two highly-debated matters of the Christ-hymn (2:6-11) and the unity of the letter but indicates that he will not be discussing either at any length.

The commentary keeps emphasizing the important factor that Philippians is a letter and that it was intended for hearers (not readers). Not every reader may be as convinced as Craddock that "there is no indication that the writer or readers of Philippians ever thought it would be published, much less sacred Scripture" (p. 2). Paul's instruction elsewhere that his words were the words of God (1 Cor 2:13; 14:37; 1 Thess 4:15) and that his letters were to be exchanged with other congregations (Col 4:16) should caution us against too-hasty conclusions.

An interesting insight that can enrich one's interpretation is the author's contention that the letter would be read to the church as gathered for worship and that Paul would have been aware of this fact (p. 7). This helps to explain why his letters are so filled with confession, hymns, doxologies, eulogies, prayers and benedictions.

The author's effort to make this volume especially useful for communicators who must apply Biblical teaching to current situations is seen in many instances. One helpful insight is found in his discussion of 1:12-18, where he deals with Paul and the problem of the unworthy preachers. "The power of the gospel is not contingent upon the motives or feelings of the one preaching. For all the dangers of opening the doors of ministry to charlatans, it must be affirmed that the gospel has its own life and efficacy whether or not there is visceral authentication in the preacher. . . . More is at stake than how anyone feels. Too many genuine Christian witnesses and workers have been made to feel guilty because on a given day they labored from commitment rather than a warm heart" (p. 26).

In the difficult passage at 1:19-26 where Paul seems to vacillate between deep discouragement and the possibility of death and then a sublime faith where he is confident that he will remain alive, Craddock offers a perceptive observation. Dealing with the puzzling statement, "Which shall I choose? I do not know" (as if Paul were really in a position to choose), Craddock states: "Paul can take the initiative, walk into his own future, embrace rather than resist necessity, and be on top rather than beneath his situation" (p. 29).

Less satisfying to this reviewer were certain other comments in the book. The author seems strongly influenced by the view that the offices of bishop and deacon (1:1) were still a generation or two away and explains their mention in Philippians as simply functional rather than official (p. 13). He avoids taking any position as to the location of Paul at the time of writing (p. 19). The brief treatment of 2:6-11 identifies the material as a Christ-hymn but offers little in the way of expounding the richness of its content. His assumption that the church in Philippi was not involved in a Christological debate causes him to focus elsewhere (p. 42). One could wish for a stronger statement of the author's own Christology here. In discussing the unity of Philippians he takes no clear position as to whether two letters have been combined at 3:1, although he bases his comments on the text as we now have it "whatever may have been the literary stages

through which it had passed" (p. 48). He does not discuss the problem of the multiple gifts Paul received when he left Macedonia (4:15-16).

For those who desire ideas for preaching emphases from Philippians, this book has numerous fresh insights. It is not of course a basic book with which to interpret the text.

Homer A. Kent, Jr.

Grace Theological Seminary, Winona Lake, IN

Hebrews. By Louis H. Evans, Jr. Waco: Word, 1985, 259 pp.

While some commentaries "offer in-depth scholarship but no application to daily life" and "others are so popular in approach that biblical roots are left unexplained," the Communicator's Commentary series (of which the book under review is volume 10) seeks a combination of "biblical scholarship," "vivid illustrative material," and present-day application, says L. J. Ogilvie, general editor of the series, in his preface to this volume (p. 9). He goes on: "We have needed a contemporary commentary on Hebrews that explains the sweep of its deeper meaning and that exemplifies how to develop a series of messages or classes for preaching and teaching today" (p. 12).

Evans has produced a commentary on Hebrews that in many ways fulfills the goals of the series. His writing is clear and simple. When he comes to technical matters, such as textual criticism, he walks the reader through them using plain language. Evans fills each chapter with illustrations and applications so that the reader is left with no doubt about the contemporary relevance of Hebrews. Finally, while Evans sometimes proceeds phrase by phrase through a pericope, he is more likely to center on the theme of a passage and explain and illustrate it while examining closely only one or two words or phrases.

Evans observes that Hebrews might well be described as "the forgotten epistle" (p. 19). He suggests essentially two reasons for this: (1) the epistle's Hebrew thought pattern, focusing on the sacrificial system; (2) the epistle's structure, which alternates between doctrine and exhortation. Yet, maintains Evans, Hebrews has a vital relevance to the Church today, for its objective is the nurture of believers (p. 31).

As Evans proceeds in matters both of introduction and exegesis his conclusions are generally well within the mainstream of evangelical scholarship. The commentary contains few surprises. Evans does quite well in overcoming the obstacles he perceives to modern appreciation of the epistle. In a brilliant stroke he outlines Hebrews by separating doctrine and exhortation onto separate sides of the page (p. 32) so that the reader can clearly see the progress of the doctrinal argument. Furthermore he succeeds in bringing the OT background to life through such devices as a diagram of the tabernacle to complement the discussion of 9:2-5 and putting the reader in the shoes of a first-century Jew with descriptions such as this one accompanying 10:11-18: "The court of the temple was a busy place of liturgy; some came with obviously sincere and humble hearts; others swaggered their way through crowds and the process with a kind of haughty disdain and arrogance, nevertheless fulfilling the law. Some wore the garments of Pharisees, some of peasants; some were businessmen and others housewives. All Israel was there, every day, month after month, year after year. The dust never seemed to settle in the area of the tabernacle. It had been going on like this for centuries and probably would continue. But was there not a better hope? Joel, Isaiah, Jeremiah—what did you mean? David, where is the joy?"

More problematic is the section in Evans' introduction on the use of the OT in Hebrews. He concludes that the author of Hebrews followed the *middôt* in his interpretation of the OT. Evans then asserts (and restates the point in his treatment of chap. 5) that, while arguments based on the *middôt* were convincing for first-century Jews, twentieth-

century minds may correctly consider them invalid. We must therefore make a distinction between the historically-conditioned argument and the truth to which it points, which remains true despite the invalid argument. I was pleased to see Evans tackle this complex issue, but his simple solution raises more questions than it answers.

I might make one addition to Evans' list of reasons for modern avoidance of Hebrews: the troublesome apostasy passages. Evans' addresses the question of loss of salvation head-on in his discussion of 6:4 ff., tracing it back to the third-century rigorist controversy. But unfortunately he gives the passage superficial treatment, including providing only quotes from Calvin to settle the meaning of "have tasted the good word of God and the powers of the age to come" (6:5). Evans concludes that the passage refers to the regenerate losing their salvation, without any consideration of the opposite view. His discussion of the other pertinent passages is no more satisfactory.

I must note, finally, that Evans sometime falls into common preachers' pitfalls. He is prone to overly long illustrations and occasional tangents, such as launching from 9:16 into an exhortation to the reader to make a will (p. 165). His word studies are sometimes grounded solely in etymology or yield three-point sermons based on multiple meanings of one word (e.g., p. 66). In addition Evans tends to make overly confident assertions. Most egregious is the statement that 11:3b refers to the fact that visible objects are comprised of invisible protons, neutrons and electrons (pp. 197-198)—and this with no argumentation or even a "perhaps." Such criticisms may seem trivial, but this commentary, even more than a technical work, is likely to serve as a model for preachers and teachers, as indeed Ogilvie intends.

In conclusion we may commend Evans for what is generally an admirable job, given a difficult task. Yet I suspect that this commentary, in meeting the series' objectives, will prove most useful not for providing insight into difficult passages or phrases but in helping the user discover a central theme and contemporary application around which to build a lesson or sermon.

S. D. Hull

Brookdale Presbyterian Church, St. Louis, MO

Interpretation and History: Essays in Honour of Allan A. MacRae. Edited by R. Laird Harris, Swee-Hwa Quek and J. Robert Vannoy. Singapore: Christian Life Publishers, 1986, 300 pp.

A *Festschrift* is designed to honor and express appreciation for the labor and the life of a great man of scholarship. This volume of seventeen essays and three tributes was presented to Allan MacRae on the occasion of his eighty-fourth birthday. Needless to say, the recipient of this *Festschrift* is indeed worthy, for he has left indelible marks of scholarship in the fields of Biblical studies and ancient languages. For some five decades MacRae pursued the "habitual vision of greatness" in academic study and personal meditation, both of which have helped scores of eager students and esteemed colleagues to take every thought captive for Christ in all areas of life.

The volume concerns itself with issues that impact the interpretation and historical validity of the Bible. Major emphasis is given to OT, NT, theology, philosophy, Church history, missions and hermeneutics. The contributors are well known to the evangelical community and bring to the work a wealth of erudition and diversity of thought. There is little new ground broken, but some of the essays do provide valuable insights. E. Smick's essay, "Israel's Struggle with the Religions of Canaan," stands out in the OT section. Citing various ancient cultic manuscripts, Smick attempts to show that the OT prophets were not "literary iconoclasts, nor did they change idiom deeply rooted in Ca-

naanite polytheistic culture, but used it to enrich their unique view of God and accepted those vestiges of the truth remaining in the false religions" (p. 132). The essay is documented well from both primary and secondary sources.

The theology and philosophy section is perhaps the strongest single compilation of essays. This may be due to the impact MacRae had on his students in challenging them to examine with meticulous care various points of theological, exegetical and philosophical controversy. V. Grounds' essay "The Bible and the Modern Mind" is a concise and cogent piece that historically scans the development of the modern mind and attests that the NT, a collection of ancient literature produced by pre-scientific Semites, "has the power to fascinate, enlighten and transform the most modern of moderns" (p. 182). W. Paul's article, "Time and Historical Significance," is another well-documented essay, which calls for a clarification of the analytic philosophic terms "time" and "significance" as they relate to the conceptual consciousness of various communities. Paul contrasts three traditions—African, Hindu and Christian—to reveal the conceptual set concerning time and significance that is presupposed by each. A theoretical model is provided that challenges historians to reflect the modern situation with an "eye to the symbolic ways in which communities may attempt to give their own histories substantive import."

The weaknesses of this effort were few. The articles, though short, adequately articulated the vital issues facing Biblical interpretation. The exception to this was R. A. Peterson's essay on "Christ's Death as an Example in the New Testament," which was far too brief in dealing with this neglected and misused concept. Another notable absence was the impact of liberation theology on modern Biblical interpretation.

The scholarship of this *Festschrift* reflects the vision of the man it was intended to honor. It is the product of careful, thoughtful erudition attesting to the fact that the mantle of contemporary theology has been passed from a brilliant mentor to worthy proteges.

John M. Kenney

The Stony Brook School, Stony Brook, NY

Joy in the New Testament. By William Morrice. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985, 173 pp., \$8.95 paper.

New Testament scholar A. M. Hunter notes in the foreword: "In the past we have had learned studies on Faith (*pistis*) and Love (*agapē*), but to my knowledge, none, or few, on Joy (*chara*). Dr Morrice's book, the fruit of long study of the various words for Joy in the New Testament, fills the lacuna." Hunter's statement sums up well the contents of the book.

The volume has two divisions. The first, "Varieties of Joy," deals with the various words that the author believes to be part of the word group belonging to "joy." In a somewhat consistent manner he looks at the word in classical Greek, the LXX and the NT. In the second part, "Our Heritage of Joy," he takes more of a book-by-book/thematic approach, beginning with the life of Jesus as witnessed to by the various NT sources. He then proceeds book by book from Luke-Acts, through Matthew and Mark, to Revelation.

Morrice targets pastors and serious laypeople. He has removed many of the notes and technical matters and added a warm devotional spirit. This volume will help many to see what some of the connections are between the various words used for the concept of joy. The reader will also be able to use this book as a topical-lexical tool.

Many readers, however, will be disappointed that Morrice does not opt for Pauline authorship of the pastorals or for Petrine authorship of 2 Peter. But there are other serious methodological defects.

Any concern for current developments in linguistics is missing. There is no attempt, at least in this book, to validate his inclusion of such an array of words in the concept of joy. He does not discuss semantic fields, for example, nor does he thoroughly discuss all the uses of a particular root. *Charis* in Rom 6:17 is overlooked, as is the use of the word in Eph 3:1, 14. And why does he not discuss the significance of joy when it occurs in the context of the kingdom of God and of the coming of the Spirit? Morrice is not consistent, especially in part 1, in his use of "root," "word," "concept" and "cognate." (Certainly several "words" can express the same "concept," but he does not make this clear.) This inconsistency causes confusion. For example in chap. 6, when he analyzes *hilaros*, *hilarotēs*, he talks about the use of the "word" in classical Greek (p. 45). When discussing the NT, however, he says, "The *root* [italics mine] occurs only twice in the New Testament" (p. 46). But in his summary (p. 48) he notes that "*hilaros* and its *cognates* [italics mine] are found in classical Greek." He then refers to the NT use in the same manner.

Another point on which he is deficient is in his failure to deal with the Semitic background. When he analyzes a word in the LXX he does not consider what it meant in Hebrew. Also when an OT passage is quoted or alluded to in the NT he does not give attention to historical and literary distinctions. Though rarely referring to OT texts containing Hebrew parallelism that are being quoted in the NT, even then he does not consider the particular kind of parallelism and what it means for interpreting a Biblical text (cf. Luke 1:47 on p. 21 and p. 66; cf. especially p. 30, where he refers to Psalm 16 in Acts 2:26).

Another methodological weakness concerns his lack of entering into the minds of the authors of Scripture. He does not sufficiently consider in his analysis the author's intentions and concerns for his audience or the book's structure. For example, why does Luke especially use the concept of joy? Methods using both diachronic and synchronic elements are missing.

In addition Morrice makes no attempt to enter into sociological structures to discover the meanings of various words. For instance, the various words and terms for "joy" in OT history and in Jewish backgrounds are not discussed. Certainly the concept/experience/expectation was there. (What did *šālôm*, "peace," have to do with salvation expectations, especially with the coming of Jesus the Messiah and of the kingdom of God?) More than a few literary examples need to be analyzed in order to understand a concept. All of these factors lead to a superficial understanding of joy in this book.

Though it is questionable whether Morrice's book is "a learned study on joy," no doubt some will find it useful.

Ben Aker

California Theological Seminary, Fresno, CA

Expository Dictionary of Bible Words. By Lawrence O. Richards. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1985, 720 pp., \$19.95.

W. E. Vine's multivolume *Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words* has served decades of students, pastors and laymen alike and continues to be reprinted and marketed widely. Now Zondervan has attempted to produce a replacement for Vine that deals in one volume with key theological words from both OT and NT in light of current scholarship and theological controversies. Nearly 1500 words are discussed in articles ranging from a paragraph to several pages in length. Longer articles are subdivided into sections on OT and NT use of words and occasionally further according to use in one subsection of a testament or in major teaching passages on the subject. The translations followed are the *NIV* and *NASB* with heavy emphasis on the former. Richards frankly admits

that his dictionary is not a fresh work of scholarship but a digest of others' studies. His goal is to make the fruit of these studies accessible to the person untrained in Greek or Hebrew so that he or she may understand the meaning of key words in the English translations of the Bible rather than importing into the text modern, western concepts of what those words mean. Seventy-five pages of indices of foreign-language terms, Scripture references, and subjects discussed, along with abundant cross-references to other articles within the body of the dictionary, greatly enhance the work's usefulness.

One can hardly dispute the stated goals of this reference tool. Vine needs updating, abridgment, and supplementing by attention to the OT. Nor will many readers of this *Journal* take issue with the major theological perspectives underlying Richards' exposition. He is thoroughly evangelical in outlook and writes with a warm (even devotional) tone, assuming that his readers are Christians and exhorting them to a clearer understanding and implementation of the truth on all fronts. On sensitive and divisive issues, such as baptism, healing, and women in the Church, he treads gently and usually acknowledges the diversity of opinion among commentators. His style is concise and readable, and the selection of words is for the most part adequate. He unfortunately only seldom acknowledges the secondary sources he has used, but quite frequently his conclusions seem consonant with C. Brown's *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology (NIDNTT)* and Harris, Archer and Waltke's *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament (TWOT)*. For the most part, choices of which words merit lengthier treatment seem sane, though "fulfill," "gospel" and "parable" are three exceptions that seem much too brief. Richards is at his best when he is summarizing key texts on a subject with a paragraph or more of exposition. Of necessity the more common, brief theological syntheses assume rather than defend numerous delicate exegetical decisions. Some of the subjects that seem quite accurately and carefully handled include "create," "giving," "judge/judging," "justify/justification," "life and death," "love," "obey/disobey," "peace," "poor and oppressed" and "sickness and health."

There are major questions, however, surrounding the production of this work and its usefulness. The most obvious involves its format. Despite its title, in imitation of Vine's, it is neither expository in most of its articles nor does it limit itself to the meaning of words. A more accurate title would be *A Theological Dictionary of Biblical Concepts*. The multiword titles of some of the longer articles prove that the author is aware of this, and occasionally he includes important reminders that theological controversies are solved not by the meanings of words themselves but by their uses in given contexts. Still, the overwhelming impression that the work conveys belies this recognition, as individual words are repeatedly said to be key technical theological terms, infused with special meaning, or—in Richards' most overworked expression—simply "exciting." A good example of extreme overspecification is the definition of *har* in the OT: "a mountain that is majestic and impressive in its rugged power" (p. 338). More remarkably we are told that the three seemingly "accidental" uses of *Christianos* in the NT point perhaps to "the three aspects of Christianity that stood out in the minds of the unbelievers" (becoming, living as, and suffering as a Christian; p. 163). The appropriation of the traditional, atomistic type of word study leads to some puzzling omissions of texts that are highly relevant to the subjects at hand but just do not happen to include the particular word being discussed. Thus no reference to 2 Corinthians 4 or 6 appears under "pain and suffering," nothing on Ephesians 4 in the subsection "basic passages on spiritual gifts" under "gift/gifts," and no treatment of *parabasis* or *paraptoma* under "sin" (and no separate entries for "transgress" or "trespass").

A second question involves usefulness. From time to time exhaustive lists of references for the various Greek and Hebrew terms underlying a given English word are supplied, but for the most part only representative illustrations are offered. What is the lay reader to do for verses in which a word occurs about which he or she wants more

information if no reference is given to which of the various foreign-language terms underlies it? Presumably a concordance that does this is still needed (e.g. Strong's or Young's). For topics where Richards does not differentiate the usage of words in various subsections of Scripture or among individual writers, then something like *TWOT* or *NIDNTT* would also seem essential if the reader is not to risk misinterpretation. But for the person who consults such reference works, Richards' volume is superfluous. One is left wondering how useful his work really will be if one wants to be sure he or she is not being misled through oversimplification.

A criticism that some readers might consider a strength of the work is its moderate dispensational and noncharismatic stance. Thus we are told, without any acknowledgment of varying viewpoints, that "for you and me, faith in Jesus does not come through an observation of miracles" (p. 118), that "when it was clear that Israel would not accept Christ as Messiah/King, Jesus began to speak of the kingdom in parables" (p. 379), and that the prophetic destiny of Israel includes a "reestablishment of a national identity" and "reoccupation of the Promised Land" (p. 356). More seriously, Richards' view of OT religion and Jewish beliefs in Jesus' day is at times significantly warped. Thus he establishes a false dichotomy when he claims that "the OT saint . . . lived a godly life by trusting God and having a personal relationship with him rather than by looking to law and trying to keep it" (p. 398) and astonishingly alleges that "the chiseling of the Ten Commandments on stone tablets does not suggest so much their permanence as it does the cold, unresponsive, and crushing impact of a law that stands outside the human personality, necessarily judging it" (p. 581). In his treatment of the Pharisees they are misleadingly labeled "the theological conservatives of their day" (p. 484—an expression surely more appropriate for the Sadducees) and treated without differentiation as all having "a smug sense of self-righteousness" (p. 318).

Finally, as is perhaps inevitable in a single-author work that attempts to range as widely as this one, there is a variety of misstatements of fact and troubling omissions. Into the former category fall the claims that "it is generally accepted" that Luke's genealogy is from Mary (p. 41), that *kephalē* carried the "well-established sense of source and nourisher of life" (p. 328), that "taste" cannot indicate a contrast with "partake" in Heb 6:4–5 (p. 587), and that "the notion of wages is the same in all cultures" (p. 615). Under the latter heading one might cite the lack of any reference to the angels at the tomb under "angels," to Matthew 25 and 1 John 5 under specifically controversial NT uses of "brother," and to the role of memorization under "teaching." More surprising is Richards' failure to refer at all to Philemon under "serve/servant/slave" and to ignore the two NT criteria for legitimate divorce in favor of an ethic that declares that for the NT age when "heart commitment to covenant love is consistently rejected, a legal divorce may follow. . . . God, then, has provided divorce for those whose marriages have already been destroyed by the hardness of a human heart" (p. 233).

Space forbids further discussion of occasional idiosyncratic exegesis. The problems that have been cited must not be permitted to obscure the generally sane and reliable theological syntheses of Biblical concepts that Richards produces. The larger questions of whether a work of this format should have been produced in the first place and entrusted to one scholar over a period of "many months" (p. xi) rather than to a committee over several years and whether it will prove anywhere as useful as it hopes to be are issues that remain. When students ask me if I recommend a work like Vine's I tell them to save their money until they can buy *TWOT* and *NIDNTT*. I am afraid my recommendation will be the same concerning Richards. For laypeople whose ambitions are more modest, Richards will be helpful. But a reference work that inculcates the principle that theology is learned from major teaching passages on a given subject rather than from word studies or surveys of entries in a concordance has yet to be written. In this light Richards merely perpetuates many of the semantic fallacies that J. Barr's work should

have laid to rest more than two decades ago.

Craig Blomberg

Cambridge, UK

The Bible in the Churches: How Different Christians Interpret the Scriptures. By Kenneth Hagen, Daniel Harrington, Grant Osborne and Joseph Burgess. New York: Paulist, 1985, 148 pp., \$8.95.

This interesting work is a compendium of essays on hermeneutics and criticism written by representatives of three major traditions: Catholic, evangelical and Lutheran. An overview article on the use of Scripture in the Church precedes the three descriptive essays. Each essay contains a brief exposition of Eph 2:1-10, but the room given to this passage is too short in each essay to really indicate the differences of approach. The key to the book is found in the description of how each tradition views Scripture, especially the different approaches to getting at its message. As such it is a helpful volume for one trying to understand why different traditions handle the Bible so differently.

The opening article by Hagen examines the history of Scripture in the Church. It examines how the Bible was read in each of the major periods of Church history. How did the settings in which the text was read influence how it was treated? The Bible was read as a document tied to the monastery, then to the university, next to the advent of the printer alongside the rise of the study of ancient sources, then to the pulpit of the Reformation, and finally to the Enlightenment with its critical method. Each of these associations influenced the way Scripture was viewed. The article is descriptive, making little effort to evaluate whether or not the developments were good. There is little new here for anyone familiar with the general progress of the history of interpretation. Beginning seminary students might benefit most from it, though the treatment by Krentz (*The Historical-Critical Method*) and the study of Hasel (*New Testament Theology*) are better treatments of developments since The Renaissance.

The first essay by Harrington represents the Catholic approach, especially recent Catholic study from the European and American perspective. Two recent events influence this school of interpretation: Vatican II, and the acceptance of the historical-critical method in much of Catholicism. One senses that if a Church dogmatician had written the article, perhaps its tone might have been slightly different. The article is committed to ecumenism and traces how one can be a Catholic, believe in inspiration, and still use critical method. Harrington notes that the Bible is coming to have renewed emphasis in Catholicism. He then traces ten elements of historical study of Scripture and mentions all the areas anyone who studies Scripture academically in search of its historical message must deal with. In fact, what stands out here is that Catholic study of Scripture looks very much like the approach of many Protestants, a point that might surprise some who are not familiar with post-Vatican II Catholicism (though the roots of this movement in Catholicism came well before Vatican II).

Osborne writes a very interesting piece that ought to be read by all evangelical students who do not have any sense of how the evangelical tradition emerged. The article traces the relationship between fundamentalism and evangelicalism. He notes that neither movement is a monolith, a point that is often missed in today's popular discussions of the movement (especially as conducted in the media). There is a diversity in the movement and an interesting history behind its approach to Scripture. Osborne focuses on the tension between private, pietistically focused interpretation, which he calls "common sense realism," and the need to be aware of a community of interpretation, a more corporately focused and interactive approach to exegesis. The roots of evangelicalism are

found in a movement that rejected critical method and emphasized the individual's ability to interpret Scripture with his Bible and the aid of the Holy Spirit, the inductive study approach. This movement was diverse from the start, but in the 1930s the conflicts between different, major leaders left the movement in some disarray. Splits multiplied, and although Osborne does not put it this way, the question became whose interpretation was correct since Scripture is true and each claimed to have Spirit-led interpretation.

The 1940s saw the rise of evangelicalism as it is known today. In many ways it differed from what Osborne calls militant fundamentalism. It sought dialogue, rejected separatism, was more open on eschatology, believed in cooperative evangelism, pushed for eclectic education as the founding of Fuller indicates (older schools like Dallas, Western and Westminster and younger schools like Trinity and Denver could also be mentioned as identifying with at least some of these goals). It also refused to identify conservative political causes with orthodoxy and had a social concern. The basic issue that distinguished a fundamentalist and an evangelical was separatism. Osborne could perhaps be faulted for defining evangelicalism too narrowly in the characteristics mentioned above in that the list appears to highlight some of the more outstanding characteristics of a wing of the movement. But he is certainly right in arguing that the distinguishing characteristic is the evangelical's willingness to engage in dialogue and debate rather than in confrontation or pure opposition. (It must also be said, however, that the reviewer knows many people who refer to themselves as fundamentalists and yet are not separatist and confrontational. It is clear that generalizations are being presented here of a very complex movement. It would seem to me that the distinguishing feature of an evangelical is his pursuit of dialogue and realization that he must engage in discussion, especially with those who with him hold to a high view of Scripture.) For Osborne, this willingness to dialogue has led many evangelicals to move past common sense realism and individual inductive method to a more comprehensive approach to exegesis that includes an awareness of how the religious community, conservative and nonconservative, is handling the Bible.

Osborne then goes on to note how many evangelicals also feel comfortable making use of the tools of historical study, though he also notes how they do not just accept these methods as others use them. Some evangelicals distinguish between a usable method and questionable presuppositions that generated the original approach. Osborne also notes that some evangelicals wrestle with whether critical methods can be used at all since they would argue that the methods are so tainted that they cannot be adopted without compromising Scripture. The discussion itself shows the tensions with which the evangelical works as he enters into these areas. The difficulty of the questions being tackled underscores the need for a "community" approach in these areas. Much of the rationale for ETS itself lies in dealing with these tensions. Osborne's essay is a very helpful examination of the origins of the evangelical approach to Scripture as well as being suggestive about why debates within the current movement exist.

The Lutheran article by Burgess is the most polemical in the book. He regards the concept of *sola Scriptura* as difficult because it means different things to different traditions (but that of course is a problem with a myriad of theological terms). Inspiration is difficult to define as well, especially how the divine and human mix together. He examines in particular five presuppositions in the approach to Scripture that all have problems: issues of unity, reason under Scripture, miracles, facticity, and propositional truth. In its place he emphasizes a more creedally focused center: Christ alone, grace alone, faith alone, cross alone, and Scripture alone. As such he appears to draw a wedge between how one can view Scripture (it is uncertain) and how one can view the confession that emerges from it (one can hold it as a center). But how can one get to the second without some sense about how the first is to be viewed? As much as I wrestled with trying to be sympathetic to the approach of the article, its inconsistency with regard to being

able to find creedal confidence from statements derived from a source surrounded with severe questions left me with the impression of a halfway house built on sand. One suspects Burgess also represents only a wing of Lutheranism.

Harrington closes the study by noting points of agreement and disagreement in the articles. All pursue the historical message of the text, but each comes to the text with different concerns. The Catholic knows his Church has not been sensitive in the past to this historical pursuit. The evangelical has revivalist and fundamentalist tendencies in his approach, while the Lutheran has roots that are concerned with issues formulated in the scholasticism that followed Luther. Catholicism tends to be oriented to the hierarchical structure of the Church, evangelicals are more individualistic, and Lutherans are focused on the gospel center. A second difference is how difficult terms are defined or seen differently in the traditions. A third difference is how to address the concerns of today. It is the issue of application where often less discussion has really occurred. In fact others in the third world often criticize the narrowness of a westerner's concerns as he reads Scripture. Again Harrington is descriptive here and in a brief space does highlight some key points of difference.

This work is designed as a descriptive exercise in comparing denominational approaches to Scripture. As such it succeeds quite well. It does make interesting reading to see how each writer is very concerned to explain the forces that fashioned his movement's identity and perspective toward Scripture.

Darrell L. Bock

Dallas Theological Seminary, Dallas, TX

Biblical Exegesis and Church Doctrine. By Raymond E. Brown. New York: Paulist, 1985, 176 pp., \$8.95.

Brown is already respected in evangelical circles for his commentary on John in the AB series. Here he has written a book that should be of great interest to scholars of the ETS in light of the recent controversy over the historicity of the Matthean magi account.

Brown's main thrust is to defend the "centrist" consensus among Roman Catholic NT scholars against "distortions" by both the ultraconservative and liberal extremes. The ultraconservatives (e.g. R. Laurentin) tend to oppose the historical-critical method because they believe it undermines Church dogma. According to Brown, the liberals (e.g. H. Küng) distort the method because they use it to overthrow established dogmas of the Church. Brown defends the middle ground. He is convinced that there is "no irreconcilable conflict between the results of Catholic historical-critical exegesis and the nuanced understanding of Catholic dogma" (p. 37). By "nuanced" he means the opposite of a naive understanding that does not distinguish between the truth infallibly taught and the way the truth has been phrased.

Brown develops his thesis by examining the presuppositions of the discussion. He then expands on an earlier note that NT Scripture is actually only the first-century phase of tradition, so that the old discussion of revelation versus tradition is passe. He completes the second chapter by discussing three categories of relationship between Scripture and doctrine: (1) doctrines for which there is "abundant but incipient basis" in Scripture—e.g., the Trinity; (2) doctrines for which there is slender basis: the virginal conception of Jesus, his bodily resurrection, the papacy and Petrine succession; (3) doctrines about which the Scriptures are virtually silent: Mary's continued virginity, immaculate conception and assumption, and the sacramental status of five of the seven sacraments. In this discussion he develops the concept of the "trajectory" of doctrinal development from

a greater or lesser basis in Scripture to the eventual authoritative position of the infallible teaching Church on the subject.

After noting pros and cons of dealing with the issue of ordination of women he concludes: "Those who claim as their only authority Jesus of the NT, whether they be ultraconservative or liberal, may well be in conflict with the church that has to face problems Jesus never faced. Thus, I am reaffirming the paradoxical position that only a nuanced view of development is really loyal to the best Catholic traditions and can preserve Catholicism today. Neither a fundamentalist interpretation of the NT, which finds later dogmas with great clarity in the NT era, nor a liberal view, which rejects anything which goes beyond Jesus, is faithful to Catholic history" (p. 52).

The author elaborates on his thesis in subsequent chapters by sketching the two extremes of the Catholic spectrum in their "misunderstandings of the interaction between criticism and dogma" (chaps. 3—4). His concluding chapters sketch three doctrines: Mariology, pneumatology and ecclesiology. Finally there is a chapter relating both to the preaching described in Acts and to early Christian doctrinal priorities. Notes on the shroud of Turin and on Laurentin's exegesis of the infancy narratives complete the volume.

From a work with the goal Brown has set, one would expect a defense of the historical-critical method. While he does describe the method somewhat, his main defense seems to be that it represents the majority or "centrist" view and that his opponents are minority extremists. He offers no argumentation that might appeal directly to the "reasonable" among the ultraconservatives who tend to reject the method.

The historical-critical method of exegesis rests on the historiographical method, which in the view of many is highly susceptible to the subjective choices of the historian. For instance, does one consider a document true until proven false or false until proven true? Or is yet a third alternative possible? Historians differ. Brown's arbitrariness shows itself when he claims that as an historian he does not know whether Jesus was born of a virgin since only Matthew and Luke mention the virginal conception (pp. 35, 37). How many times must the Scriptures mention an event for it to have happened? Would Brown accept three witnesses? Or four? He does not say.

A related issue is the "pigeonhole" procedure of form criticism. For Brown, because the story of the magi is an example of a specific form of literature we need not consider it reliable narrative history. Again, where is the proof? A valid genre is identified in literature by the process of induction from many specific examples. Evidence must be given both for the force of the genre itself and for the passage in question being interpreted as a legitimate example of that genre. In Brown's *The Birth of the Messiah* (p. 198 and Appendix 8) he does present arguments that this is "Christian midrash," but he makes no reference to that here.

Brown's handling of Church doctrine raises questions for this reviewer. In his discussion of the 1964 Pontifical Biblical Commission he claims that it made a clear distinction between the apostles who preached and the evangelists who wrote, so that the writer of Matthew and John could not have been eyewitnesses and apostles (p. 14). Brown's distinction seems too strongly drawn. My reading of the Pontifical document fails to detect such an exclusivity.

The author's concept of "trajectory" is a novel way of avoiding the charge of fideism, a charge implying that he accepts the Church's teaching without adequate Biblical or historical support. From slim Biblical evidence—or even from no Biblical evidence at all—the Church may traverse doctrinal space to affirm as fact such things as the perpetual virginity of Mary: "So also by living with the image of Mary and reflecting on her relationship to Christ, the church could have come to a factual statement about a facet of Mary's career after the birth of Jesus—the ongoing virginity—precisely because this facet was seen to be meaningful in church life" (p. 42).

Brown's chapters illustrating his method, such as on the Holy Spirit and the local church, have much with which evangelicals may agree. With other chapters the opposite is true, such as that on Acts, which avers a contradiction between the apostles' use of the temple and Stephen's sermon. Brown makes Stephen teach that God was offended by the very building of the temple. If so, the apostolic Christians (and Jesus?) were wrong to frequent it. But, in this reviewer's judgment, F. F. Bruce's *Defense of the Gospel in the New Testament* presents a better analysis of Stephen's sermon.

I recommend this well-written book to all evangelicals interested in the historical-critical method or in the recent discussions in the ETS on the main issue.

Gilbert Brewster Weaver

John Brown University, Siloam Springs, AR

Biblical Exegesis and Church Doctrine. By Raymond E. Brown. New York: Paulist, 1985, 176 pp., \$8.95.

Over the past three decades, a handful of writers have established themselves as the vanguard of American Roman Catholic scholarship. The author of this book is one of them, and the person to whom it is dedicated, J. A. Fitzmyer, is another.

This little book is a collection of essays, many of them published in an earlier form elsewhere, that seek to position Brown in a "centrist" (his designation) position in the spectrum of current Catholic Biblical scholarship. He detects opponents on both the right and the left, though most of his energy and his sharpest remarks are aimed at those who are more conservative than he.

In the first chapter, "Historical-Critical Exegesis of the Bible in Roman Catholicism," Brown offers a potted history of the rise of historical-critical exegesis in the Catholic communion, with selective quotations from Pope Leo XIII to Pope Paul VI. Brown says that Catholicism came to historical-critical exegesis more slowly than did many Protestant groups but has now embraced these approaches more officially and openly than any of them. He then defends these developments against two groups: (1) "revisionists of a literalist or fundamentalist tendency" who are "annoyed by biblical criticism because it underlines the human elements in the Bible"; and (2) revisionists "for hermeneutical purposes," who may find Biblical criticism barren, or who argue that "biblical works, once written, have a life of their own," or those "who seek to use Scripture in support of a cause" (including various Marxist and feminist interpretations). Brown concludes: "The future lies not with the rejection of the historical-critical method (which I regard as a permanent contribution to human knowledge), but in the refinement of the method, so that it will answer appropriately posed questions even more accurately, and its contributions to the larger picture of biblical interpretation can be seen in better perspective." The weakness of this essay is that some of Brown's opponents are cast in stereotypical and reductionistic garb: They allow no place for the "human element" in Scripture, they read the Bible ahistorically, and so forth. Such arguments take care of the lunatic fringe but do not deal squarely with the best of his opponents' positions.

In the second chapter, "Critical Biblical Exegesis and the Development of Doctrine," Brown begins with a discussion of what he understands "infallibility" to mean with respect to Catholic teaching. His most crucial point, I think, is this: "Even though we may insist that a doctrine is infallibly taught by the church, that doctrine is historically conditioned and may have to be reshaped as we come to perceive more fully just what issue really was at the heart of the divine revelation and how much of the way in which that issue was once formulated represents changeable conceptions." With all respect, that kind of formulation opens a barn door large enough to accommodate almost any-

thing, including the reformulations advanced by, say, Bultmann or Cupitt. Such theological positions Brown himself would of course want to disavow, but it is hard to see how his own formulations would enable him to do so on any unambiguous methodological basis. Discussion of various doctrines in the rest of the chapter make for fascinating reading for any Protestant. Brown himself admits that the move from an apparent trajectory in the NT documents to a later full-blown theological statement is one thing, but the move to a full-fledged theological statement where there is no NT evidence in support of the doctrine is another. Yet even so he manages to defend the infallibility of the doctrines of the perpetual virginity of Mary and of her immaculate conception. I remain surprised that a mind capable of finely-honed and gentle skepticism regarding the NT documents can so easily be persuaded by the slender and skewed evidence of non-Biblical, later ecclesiastical documents. And that is quite apart from the more foundational question about the locus of authority for the Church: Is it located in Scripture, or in a deposit of faith entrusted to the Church (a deposit that includes Scripture) and that is interpreted, sometimes infallibly, by her?

Chapters 3 (rather short) and 4 (rather long) deal with "Liberal Misunderstanding of the Interaction Between Biblical Criticism and Dogma" and "Conservative Misunderstanding of the Interaction Between Biblical Criticism and Dogma" respectively. The latter deals in particular with the infancy narratives and constitutes a reply to Catholic conservatives J. McHugh and R. Laurentin. The fifth chapter is devoted to "The Contribution of Critical Exegesis to an Understanding of Mary and Marian Doctrine." Here Brown rapidly surveys the more important NT texts to arrive at a fairly minimalist understanding of Mary, one that would comport quite nicely with most Protestant views. This, in his view, fosters the possibility of ecumenical study. Nevertheless such results do not in his view jeopardize Roman Catholic dogma, since that dogma will ultimately depend on the magisterium, not on Scripture, as he has outlined his position in chap. 2. Chapters 6 and 7 similarly survey rather cursorily what the NT says about the Holy Spirit and about the "local church" respectively, and in each instance there is an attempt to draw lines from these summaries to modern "centrist" Roman Catholic teaching. The eighth chapter, under the title "The Preaching Described in the Book of Acts as a Guide to Early Christian Doctrinal Priorities," focuses attention on what the author of Acts was trying to get across to his audience, allegedly in the 80s of the first century, not on what the named preachers (Peter, Paul, etc.) were trying to say to their respective audiences. There is no "both/and" in Brown's thinking here, but a very sharp disjunction. The chapter especially underlines "the time-conditioned character of the biblical accounts" while trying to draw some commonalities in the various sermons.

As usual, Brown's work is invariably well written and clear. The book is clearly an "in-house" document, written by a Catholic for Catholics. To an outsider it provides not only fascinating insight into the immense diversity found especially in the academic circles of the contemporary Roman Catholic Church but also a startling portrayal of how one learned theologian in the Church of Rome must adopt, to remain faithful to his Church, the most incredibly fideistic stance toward the decisions of the magisterium while his own critical proclivities drag him in an opposite direction when he handles the Scriptures themselves.

D. A. Carson

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

What Christians Believe About the Bible. By Donald K. McKim. Nashville: Nelson, 1985, 192 pp., \$9.95.

Donald McKim has attempted the rather demanding task of surveying "in a neutral

manner" the major contemporary theological views of Scripture. The result is a compact, well-written volume that begins by providing an overview of historic Catholic and Protestant views followed by a survey of classical liberal and subsequent modern theological developments.

The work has a twofold value in that it stimulates readers to consider their own origins while at the same time providing the opportunity to become acquainted with other traditions. Chapters on theology as story, liberation theology, and feminist theology provide a basic but critical introduction for those of us who should know more about these movements.

A central issue for many will be the question of whether Biblical inerrancy should be understood as the historical position of the Christian Church. The basic theme addressed in the author's well-known co-authored volume, *The Authority and Interpretation of the Bible*, is again advanced without noticeable change. Inerrancy is said to be the product of seventeenth-century Protestant scholasticism advanced through the nineteenth-century Princeton figures of A. A. and Charles Hodge, Warfield, and Machen. A. A. Hodge is credited with introducing the notion that the original autographs of Scripture were infallible when interpreted in the sense intended (p. 68).

Although the author is attempting to speak from the disinterested perspective of a reporter, the work nevertheless demonstrates his commitment to a particular historical understanding. Belief in inerrancy is said to constitute a violation of the basic Protestant assumption that faith precedes reason. Turretin, for example, is classified as "a Protestant version of . . . Thomas Aquinas," who gave reason priority over faith (p. 64). The idea that the Bible can be in any way equated with scientific fact is viewed as an extension of natural revelation and consequently within the Thomistic camp (p. 65). Conversely, those who hold to a more modified view of inerrancy are possibly standing in the true tradition of Calvin, the Westminster Confession and Augustine himself (p. 64). The latter is held to have believed in the principle of accommodation (p. 177 n. 78), even though one of his best-known letters (number 28 to Jerome) specifically denies such.

Many of those who hold to a high view of Scripture will find the association of inerrancy with Thomism objectionable. This seems to be an epistemological "bum rap" in that the association is completely arbitrary. Why not, for example, argue that Duns Scotus was a Thomist because of his ten reasons for the credibility of Scripture? The real question is not the relation of faith to reason but rather that of inductive as opposed to deductive methodology. Scotus and Ockham were both anti-Thomistic. Their philosophical systems simply prompted different ways of stating the priority of faith. A second point of contention is the assumption that inerrancy is only a modern complement to the "original autographs" theory. It is the historical-critical method, a product of eighteenth-century German rationalism, that really has questionable parentage. Conversely, the generic type of thinking that underlies the original autographs assumption can be traced through both Luther and Calvin to Augustine.

Finally, those of us who represent the tradition of Hodge and Warfield may bristle at the classification of our system as "scholastic theology" (chap. 5). It does seem a bit unfair that the imprecation of scholasticism should be cast at even the most basic attempts to understand revelation propositionally. There are, after all, other options than Thomism and neo-orthodoxy. The presupposition that faith does not stultify reason may lead to thinking that appears scholastic but is in reality based on deductive assumptions. On the other hand, McKim has made a very valid point in observing that we all too often do allow reason to precede faith. This is especially clear in the way many of us have done our apologetics. This volume offers a sobering reminder that in epistemology it is easier to fall from faith than from grace.

James F. Breckenridge

East Coast Bible College, Charlotte, NC

Introduction to the Study of Dogmatics. By Hendrikus Berkhof. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985, 120 pp., \$7.95.

This book, by the author of *Christian Faith: An Introduction to the Study of the Faith*, is designed as the first book to be read by young students beginning the study of dogmatics in theological seminaries. It is indeed a first step for learning how to "do theology" (an expression I have never really understood). In the author's own words, after reading this book "the reader should know what to expect of the field [of dogmatics]—no more, no less." Berkhof succeeds in his purpose. Most of the members of ETS will neither agree with nor appreciate his constant attack on those who hold to inerrancy, but on the whole the book will be found to be very helpful for new students. Chapter 5, "Dogmatics in Time and Space," is especially helpful for the student as he struggles with current question of contextualization. The most disappointing chapter is chap. 6, "The Foundations of Dogmatics." After surveying various historical foundations—the Church (Roman Catholic), the Scriptures (Reformation), revelation, the Spirit, and man—Berkhof tries to bring them all together as one foundation. One wonders if the house of dogmatics that he builds on this foundation will be able to stand.

In the introduction Berkhof says that it was his desire in writing this book to produce an "impartial introduction" and that he realized the danger of "ventilating my own ideas." He goes on to say that the reader will have to judge whether he succeeded. This reader does not think that he has been impartial. But this does not mar the book to such an extent as to make it useless to evangelicals. The book is very readable (thanks at least in part to a fine translation by J. Vriend) and should prove helpful in more fully equipping evangelicals to "do theology."

LeRoy H. Ferguson, III

University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC

God: The Question and the Quest. By Paul R. Sponheim. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985, 214 pp., \$19.95.

The claims Christians make are in contention today. The burden is upon us to expalin how claims about God relate to fundamental human experience—our struggle to understand self, world, and history. With this challenge Sponheim opens a weighty exercise in apologetics.

But this is not a traditional apologetic. While the language of claim and coherence, objection and answer is employed, much less certainty about the nature or uniqueness of Christian claims is assumed or contended for than that of typical apologetic exploits. Sponheim finds it preferable to carry out his effort along the lines of a "conversation" with the unbelieving, a conversation in which more than the first half of the book is used to listen to questions raised about Christian faith claims. This moment of "listening" is so empathetic that the constructive case given later is radically circumscribed (which he willingly admits). The assumption operating here is that an honest appraisal of belief today will recognize that people can exist on both sides of the boundary between belief and unbelief. As such it is simply human to question about and quest after God.

There is a spirit of openness here that is both refreshing and bothersome. No "pat answers" are given for the extremely difficult questions posed by the critical methods of modernity. Sponheim even struggles commendably to diffuse the atheistic implications of much Enlightenment thought. But unfortunately he takes up the task within the spirit of modernity itself. While differing with the conclusions of classical liberalism, he admits that "their task is ours, since we are children of the Enlightenment" (p. 12). To

be specific, all conversation about God must be carried on under the condition he describes as "modernity's elliptical reality of self and world." This condition maintains that our consciousness is constituted fully by the relationship of self and world, thus making investigation of reality possible on these terms alone. More than once Sponheim concedes that such a posture makes it difficult to avoid reinterpreting theology into anthropology after the manner of Freud and Feuerbach.

In conducting the conversation there are questions about Christian faith that both parties must attend to, and there are responses by the Christian faith that are intended to commend it.

The questioning involves three areas. (1) How can the believer know even though all knowledge claims must be tied to experience? The presuppositional stance is rejected because of a lack of criteria for adjudication. It is argued that faith must solidly locate the knowing of God in the reality of self and world but need not restrict itself to the confines of positivism. Drawing on Toulmin, Sponheim argues that theology has a right to its criteria because such standards are "field dependent." Moreover the openness of the universe and our knowledge of it allows for the openness of faith. Other attempts to exclude the knowledge of God by equating it with self and world (Feuerbach and Freud) are addressed as well. Finally, some intimations of an overarching solution found in process notions of God and the world are mentioned as a way of insuring knowledge from the finite to the infinite. (2) What is the nature of the world about which faith claims to know? Is the content of our belief verifiable when even the concept of God strikes so many today as incoherent and irrelevant? Is there theodicy after the holocaust? Claiming that the content of faith is noncognitive will not do because knowledge claims have been made. The solution to various tensions discussed is to be found in a God dynamically related to the world (a process God). (3) What is the ethical and pragmatic impact of the Christian faith? Does it fulfill the self, work for good in the world, and provide a judgment for history? Against Nietzsche and Fromm, Christian faith gives us responsibility to create rather than stifle ourselves. And again, supposing God as integrally connected with the world and its temporality adds a kind of tentativeness that Sponheim believes encourages action. In fact underlying all of his answers is the belief that the world is caught up in God and that God is changed by the world.

The turn to commending the faith begins by explaining how the Christian faith intensifies the development of selfhood in relation to the Other. The intensification in the self-transcendent experiences of art and morality yields an even more profound hymn of joy when the self is caught up in God. To know God, and particularly to know Christ, intensifies our human becoming. The next means of commendation offers faith as the best way of comprehending the world—making sense out of life in its various dimensions. God as Creator and the contingency of the world as witnessed in the traditional proofs explain basic human questions, and a model in which the two are reciprocally bound eliminates difficulties raised by their relationship. The last effort at commendation is that of reconciliation. In Jesus Christ an actual absolute is given wherein finite temporality and the divine are seen together by faith. In redemption God's being is advanced by being "co-constituted" with and suffering for the finite. What human freedom and history fail to do, and what faith longs for, God does for everyone (universally).

In a final chapter Sponheim assesses the conversation in the hope that it will continue. Once again skeptical notes are sounded about Christian claims, and a call to dialogue with other faiths in terms of equality emphasizes his degree of openness.

Needless to say, there are categories within which Sponheim operates that will be foreign and unacceptable to many readers. It is an important work, nevertheless, in that it represents an honest attempt to present an apologetic that an unbelieving intellectual might read. Many of the answers are persuasive because they are the product of good listening. Some must be further examined because of their connection with a process

metaphysic.

Robert G. Umidi

Northeastern Bible College, Essex Fells, NJ

God in Creation: A New Theology of Creation and the Spirit of God. By Jurgen Moltmann. San Francisco: Harper, 1985, 360 pp., \$25.95.

It may be appropriate that this is—as far as I can determine—the first book by Moltmann reviewed in *JETS*, for here he emerges not only as our most creative contemporary theologian but also the one with the most to teach evangelicals. Earlier in *The Crucified God* (1974) he explored the meaning of Christ's suffering for reflection on the Trinity and concluded that the cross makes it necessary to understand the world within the history of God (rather than trying to understand God within history). God is not the impassible God of Greek philosophy but one who accepts in his being the whole of suffering humanity. In *The Trinity and the Kingdom* (1981) he spelled this out, further shaping a social doctrine of the Trinity that begins with the history of Jesus and seeks to realize itself in "a community of men and women, without privileges, without subjugation" (p. 198).

God in Creation picks up the argument and presents an ecological view of creation that corresponds to the social view of the Trinity presented previously (he promises a complete Christology and ecclesiology in succeeding volumes). As he began with the reality of suffering in his earlier work, so here he takes as his starting point the current ecological crisis. Creation, he notes, can only be properly known in a nonhierarchical, participatory way. Ultimately this means recognizing creation to be a home for the glory of God (he quotes Jonathan Edwards), which is accomplished by the Spirit, for "it is always the Spirit who brings the activity of the Father and the Son to its goal" (p. 9). Here the so-called ecological crisis is really a theological problem. In an interesting contribution to the discussion he points out that it was the nominalist conception of God as *potentia absoluta* that has produced science in the mode of domination and power. But if the world is the home of a loving God "it has to be treated according to the standards of divine righteousness" (p. 31).

His treatment of human creation and the image of God is likewise rooted in this ecological view of creation understood as home and community. Humanity is first of all *imago mundi*, part and fellow sufferer with other creatures. But he/she, like the rest of creation, is defined by a particular relationship to God, a relation that is best seen in Christ, in whom humanity becomes "the mode of God's appearance in his creation" (p. 228).

But humanity is not the crown of creation. This position is reserved by Moltmann for the Sabbath, that feast of creation when God faces, experiences and finally indwells his work. Here his most original contribution emerges. For though creation is the starting point for salvation history, the latter exists for the sake of creation. The end of redemption is a creation that perfectly displays God's glory and has become for God and his creatures an eternal fellowship of love. But this has been inaugurated by the resurrection of Christ and the renewing work of the Spirit. Here then is the means of re-integrating nature and history, the study of which has been so hopelessly divided in western thought. Again it is the celebration of the Sabbath each week that speaks both of the fulfillment of natural time cycles by the feast of creation when the world will be at home with God and of the end of history anticipated by the death of Christ. Work is not for the sake of production and consumption but for the Sabbath glory of God. The world is not for the sake of human life but for the Sabbath revelation of God's glory.

Creation is not belittled in this. It is, rather, put in its proper "energy field." Body and soul are seen in a relationship of fellowship and interpenetration, just as humanity participates with the rest of creation. The directionality inherent in life gives it its meaning, but only as it is mortal and vulnerable (except a grain of wheat fall into the ground and die). Moltmann recalls G. Hendry's *Theology of Nature* when he sees death and mortality as a central pattern of the world. Death comes before life. If health is the strength to be human, illness and suffering do not distract but rather contribute to that end. Indeed this fact is interpreted "messianically," for the very transience and weakness of the creature becomes a source of hope as the Spirit awakens and articulates the yearnings of the whole enslaved order for God (Rom 8:14–21).

As interesting as his affirmations are his critiques. Readers of *The Crucified God* wondered at times if God was really free or whether he was bound to an idealistic eschatological process. In this book Moltmann makes a definite break with the tradition of Schleiermacher, who could not hold to a temporal beginning. If there is no first creation "there is nothing that can withstand the nothingness that annihilates the world" (p. 79). He likewise rejects Tillich's emanation and the finite God of process theology. Interestingly he finds in the decrees of Reformed theology a possible model for understanding God's decision to creation, because this ties his decision to his inner nature. God's resolve must be rooted in the divine ground of life that comes to itself in the eternal rest of the Sabbath.

In all this there is much to learn. But not all of the uneasiness this reviewer felt with earlier work is gone. Questions remain in two areas. First, Moltmann still seems to hold to a radical economic view of the Trinity. Though less strident, reference to the "history of God" still leaves one wondering whether the God/world distinction is clearly preserved. This is seen for example in his decided preference for energistic and organic categories, which though often helpful carry their own liabilities (at creation "the divine Being flows into the fount of creative potentialities" [p. 168], and finally "the energies of sin themselves have to be redeemed" [p. 234]). He continues his project of de-Hellenizing theology, so necessary in many respects. (His treatment of the influence of Greek psychology on our spiritualized conception of the Trinity is masterful.) But this too carries dangers. He wonders, for example, how there can be anything outside of God. Is there a "counter-God"? While it is true that we have overemphasized transcendence, it is also possible to identify God and creation to such an extent that God and world become correlatives of each other. Must God withdraw into himself to create a space in which he can act? I believe that Moltmann wants to avoid these problems—he specifically rejects pantheism and even panentheism (which A. Peacocke proposes). But I am not always satisfied that he does.

A second and related problem follows: If all that is becomes a part of the history of God, one wonders what is left of the freedom of the creature. Is it possible to turn away from this promised Sabbath if the energies of the Spirit are working throughout all of creation to bring it about?

But this is a book that will long be read as a definitive study of contemporary thinking on creation. It amounts to a systematic course of immense complexity and surprising lucidity. It is time that evangelicals began a serious dialogue with Moltmann.

William A. Dyrness

New College, Berkeley, CA

The Christian Hope. By Brian Hebblethwaite. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985, 244 pp., \$9.95.

This book aims to introduce its readers to the Christian hope for the afterlife as well

as for this world. Under the former rubric Hebblethwaite deals with death, the intermediate state, the *parousia*, the resurrection of the body, the last judgment, heaven and hell, and the consummation of all things. Under the latter he looks at the Church's role as an agent for social change.

This is one of those books that, at least for those who know something about the subject already, should be read backwards, because Hebblethwaite is not altogether "up front" regarding what he is up to. In other words, he does not announce his revisionist theses—toward which the whole work builds—in the preface but waits to reveal them in the last chapter or two, when he gets into some moderately heavy (for college students) philosophy of religion, which seems to be his real interest, in spite of the Biblical and historical prolegomena that take up most of the book.

Hebblethwaite tries to be fair and balanced, but "good guys" and "bad guys" inevitably emerge. Some of his favorite things include eschatology (but not apocalyptic, with its determinism and utopianism); John's gospel (but not the Apocalypse); the Bible as a self-contradictory witness to God's Word; Origen's optimism about the restoration of all things (but not Augustine's pessimism—not to mention the "morally incredible" double predestination of Calvin and Edwards, the latter badly misinterpreted as a total reactionary); Aquinas' and Dante's visions of heaven (but not the Westminster Confession's detailed description of the future); and the major Protestant Reformers who rediscovered the eschatological urgency and immediacy of John and Paul without succumbing to the apocalyptic social radicalism of T. Müntzer and his ilk. More recent adventists and millennialists are mentioned briefly (e.g. the dispensationalists) and summarily dismissed as apocalyptic literalists who totally misunderstand the Bible. Happily, according to Hebblethwaite, the critical interpretation of Scripture aids us in endorsing an evolutionary view of creation (he likes Teilhard de Chardin). But he faults E. Troeltsch for his relativism, the process theologians for their denial of a personal afterlife, and the liberation theologians and the World Council of Churches for their almost purely this-worldly political utopianism (he himself is neither Tory nor Labour but a Social Democrat). Hebblethwaite treats with respect the arguments of S. Travis, a "sensitive evangelical" (and Cambridge graduate), against universalism but finds them ultimately unconvincing (pp. 194, 217–218).

The most stimulating chapter for me was Hebblethwaite's conclusion, wherein he presents his own positive eschatology. Essentially, philosophical, ethical and theological imperatives seem to outweigh for him the witness of the Scriptures and the tradition of the Church. Or, as he might put it, philosophical, ethical and theological considerations—in forming a coherent, intellectually and morally credible belief system—move him to select certain, more central strands of the Bible and ecclesiastical tradition instead of others less central and incompatible with them. In any case, among his more important conclusions are that heavenly hope spurs Christians to earthly social reform, that God is temporal, that the intermediate state must be reinterpreted as an expanded version of purgatory in which the sanctification of believers will continue and the conversion of unbelievers (including adherents of other religions) will occur, that only a nonmaterial body is resurrected (but what of Christ's resurrection body and the empty tomb?), that universal salvation is more believable than annihilationism and especially everlasting punishment, that the last judgment must be drastically softened, and that the final state will involve the beatific vision of God in the communion of all the saints, who shall continue to grow spiritually. All in all, Hebblethwaite's admittedly speculative scheme looks like a mixture of the eighteenth-century (Biblical) assertion of the finality of Jesus Christ, in the ecumenical context of the Nicene Creed (the Trinity), together with a strong dose of Biblical criticism, evolutionism, and awareness of other religions and of the problem of evil—all rationally (linguistically?) analyzed but based upon the spiritual-

aesthetic experience of a moderate Christian mystic—in short, the *via media* of an Oxbridge Anglican.

In sum, Hebblethwaite's volume is valuable as a competent survey of Christian views about the future, but I cannot recommend it for most evangelical college students, both because of its difficulty and because of its slighting of the evangelical tradition (e.g. G. C. Berkouwer was overlooked), not to mention Scripture. Nevertheless, Hebblethwaite rightly reminds us of some important evangelical Achilles' heels about God's goodness and love in relation to hell (note Paul's "universalistic" passages), predestination, and other religions—as well as the ongoing need to come to terms with evolution and Biblical criticism. This is a thought-provoking book, and I was glad for the opportunity to read it.

Earl William Kennedy

Northwestern College, Orange City, IA

Ignatius of Antioch. A Commentary on the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch. By William R. Schoedel. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985, xxii + 305 pp., \$34.95.

To those familiar with the history of NT studies, the inclusion of a commentary on the *Letters* of Ignatius in a series like Hermeneia needs little justification. One of the landmark events in the study of early Christianity—J. B. Lightfoot's demolition of F. C. Baur's Hegelian reconstruction of early Christianity—was grounded upon a careful study of the date and authenticity of the Ignatian epistles. Moreover these letters have a Janus-like character. As the author notes, they not only "point forward" in that they "reflect . . . shifts of emphasis that have remained constitutive of traditional Christianity to this day" but also "look back" in that they exhibit in fuller form developments rooted in the first century and shed light on certain features of the NT documents themselves.

In view of the importance of Ignatius it is remarkable that the bibliography of this commentary can list only four predecessors. Thus the publication of Schoedel's work is a major event in Ignatian studies. The editors of Hermeneia are to be commended for choosing to make commentaries on early extra-canonical writers such as Ignatius part of the series and for their wisdom in commissioning Schoedel to write this volume, for he has produced a commentary quite worthy to be published in the centennial year of Lightfoot's monumental work on the same corpus.

The positions and conclusions reached in the introduction remind one of the Matthean householder who brings forth things both new and old. On the one hand, for example, regarding the issues of date, the authenticity of the middle recension, and historical details relating to Ignatius' ministry and travels, Schoedel essentially reaffirms the positions reached by Lightfoot and Zahn, concluding after a careful assessment that recent challenges to the modern consensus (such as those by R. Weijenborg and J. Rius-Camps) are very tenuous and unconvincing. His discussion of Ignatius' personal situation, on the other hand, has a distinctly modern ring to it. A "quest for personal identity" and "a blow to his self-esteem" are seen as key factors for understanding the form of Ignatius' Christianity. In all, a rather nice balance is achieved. Traditional positions are affirmed not because they are old or traditional but because they still best explain the data, and newer perspectives derived from the social sciences are utilized not because they are new but because they do in fact aid in better understanding the text.

A key issue for any interpreter of Ignatius, and one to which Schoedel makes a substantial and significant contribution, is the question of his religious and intellectual background. The mysteries, Hellenistic Judaism, and especially gnosticism have been claimed as the source of many key Ignatian concepts, but Schoedel convincingly dem-

onstrates that popular Hellenistic culture is far more influential than any of these. True, Ignatius occasionally draws upon "potentially mystical or marginally Gnostic images and ideas," but he remains at heart a product of the Hellenistic urban and rhetorical culture. New materials from the period have been utilized to show that even elements once thought to be more or less original reflect stock topics or models. Ignatius, in short, is far more at home in the Hellenistic urban clubs than among the gnostic conventicles.

For all this, Schoedel notes that Ignatius "transforms everything that he has absorbed. And thus exegesis is still more important than parallels." Here he makes a point worth re-emphasizing for NT studies, where all too often the listing of parallels—Biblical as well as secular—has substituted for serious analysis of the way in which the material has been put to use. That is to say, the early Christian writers were neither as indebted to popular religions and culture as some liberals would, on the basis of lists of supposed parallels, have us believe, nor are they as uniform and monothematic as some conservatives, using different lists of parallels but in a similarly superficial way, attempt to claim.

The commentary proper is generally clear, concise and apt, and it has a strong philosophical bent. In this respect Schoedel usefully supplements and updates Lightfoot (who remains nonetheless indispensable). Few difficulties escape his attention, and more than once he proposes what will likely become definitive solutions. A prime example, to name just one, is his treatment of the much-disputed reference to the "archives" in *Phld.* 8:2. They are, in light of parallels in Josephus, unquestionably the OT, and the point at issue between Ignatius and his opponents revolves around the proper interpretation of the OT—a finding of no little historical import.

There are instances, to be sure, where the comment seems a bit thin, and differences of opinion over details (such as text and punctuation) inevitably come to light. But it would be churlish to dwell on them in view of the overall excellence of the volume. Schoedel has produced a reliable and authoritative guide to Ignatius and given us a superb example of the kind of fundamental, foundational research upon which any responsible historical reconstruction must be based.

Michael W. Holmes

Bethel College, St. Paul, MN

The Place of Faith and Grace in Judaism. By David R. Blumenthal. Austin: Center for Judaic-Christian Studies, 1985, 29 pp.

God acts to reveal his grace in three ways, says Rabbi Blumenthal. Creation is his "first act of grace," covenant his second, and forgiveness his third. God can forgive because we in a particular instance deserve his forgiveness—such forgiveness is grounded in God's justness and fairness—or he can grant us pardon when we do not merit it. There is, further, a sense in which grace can be used to describe a human action. In this sense it is "an act of exceptional kindness and goodness" (p. 17).

Having sketched a picture of divine and human grace, Blumenthal goes on to reflect on faith. Faith understood as "a matter of belief" is, he asserts, an intrusion into Judaism stemming from the medieval influence of Islam and Christianity. Citing A. J. Heschel, Blumenthal sees faith rather as faithfulness (p. 19). He cites Gen 15:6 to prove his point, an interesting counterpoint to a Pauline interpretation of that text but one with some precedent in James 2, to say nothing of rabbinic sources. "To have faith, then, means to live a life of concrete holiness—in deeds of kindness, in deeds of social conscience, and in deeds of ritual. . . . For a Jew, the future redemption is . . . dependent upon faithfulness to God, Torah, and Israel" (p. 23). Faith is not "a single transforming experience which,

having happened to us, shapes our lives. Nor are we dealing with an act of intellect and will" (ibid.). Faith is, it would seem, primarily unrelenting right response to the ethical demands God has revealed, especially in the Torah but presumably also in Jewish tradition. Faith "for the religious Jew . . . is only *teshuvah*, repentance or returning, as the compass needle always returns to the north" (p. 24).

In a glowing foreword D. A. Pryor rightly reminds us that early Christians saw the OT-NT relationship as one of basic continuity. For this reason and others, "Jewish scholarship can greatly enrich our understanding of the Bible." Yet, as he notes, Blumenthal articulates an understanding of two crucial theological concepts from a point of view "different from ours as Christians." This is putting the matter mildly. Blumenthal states that both Jews and Christians are "rewarded if each responds to the call of God in his or her own way," and he speaks of "the transforming presence of Jesus" in the lives of some Christians, "as Torah and God transform my life" (p. 28). Certain Jews of NT times, at least, would dispute this facile equating of two ways to redemption: one whose source and inner dynamic is the Messiah Jesus, and one whose is not. Many Christians today, and no doubt many Jews, continue clearly to perceive this fundamental distinction. Though Blumenthal to some extent apparently does not, his thoughts are valuable as a succinct representative summary of learned Jewish opinion on a matter of unquestioned importance. The open, personal warmth and spiritual fervor that animate his reflections are especially winsome features.

Robert W. Yarbrough

Liberty University, Lynchburg, VA

Peace in Our Time? By David Atkinson. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985, 221 pp., \$4.95.

Atkinson has again contributed a useful work on Christian ethics, this time not on sexuality but on politics—i.e., war. As should be expected, Atkinson writes from an English perspective, but that very removal from the North American scene (although not from the issues) gives his work a tone of objective distancing that is quite helpful, especially in the somewhat polarized climate in the United States.

The work is not mainly an argument for a particular position but a discussion about how to think about the issues of war and peace in general. This is clear in that the whole work is sandwiched between the dilemma of "James," a British university student, with a letter to "James" summarizing the contribution of the book. The suggestions for further reading at the end really are just that, and they include a variety of Christian positions.

The main content of the book is divided into three parts: (1) a preliminary section that gives an overview of the hermeneutical issues and historical positions taken by Christians, (2) a central section (obviously the major part of the work, being fully forty percent of the whole) that discusses some of the major themes in Christian ethics (order, justice, peace, Church and state, sermon on the mount, force, power, forgiveness, meaning of citizenship), and (3) a final section that raises issues concerning how these might apply to the particular issue of nuclear war and deterrence. This section appropriately ends with a chapter called "Alternatives," for Atkinson does not pretend to have a final solution.

In general this is a very good book. Atkinson does what he does quite thoroughly. His one weakness is that he does not explore the Christian pacifist option thoroughly in either its nonresistance or nonviolence forms. There is not one footnote to such positions, and the suggestions for further reading also lack the most substantive works (e.g. J. H. Yoder's several books). Thus while the pacifist option is discussed it really never gets a chance to present its most weighty arguments. But given that H. Thielicke and J. Stott

seem to be the most-cited authors and to state the basic position of Atkinson, the book does help one to think Christianly. Since North American evangelicals have often tended to neither think Christianly about nor become involved in this crucial issue, forgetting that a nuclear war could kill as many people in minutes as abortion does in several years, this is a tremendous contribution.

Atkinson is honest. He does not hide his own position. He believes in participation in a "just war" but does not believe that nuclear war can ever be just or that deterrence can be justified according to Christian ethics. He is a "realist," however, in his suggestions about alternatives. Yet his burden is not in pushing his conclusions but in showing what a Christian needs to consider in coming to these or other conclusions. On this or other political issues the principles presented are broader than the issue of warfare. This approach challenges the simplistic thinking that often colors evangelical discussion and gives a more honest and realistic forum for looking at nuclear arms than either an "ignore-it-and-preach-the-gospel" or a "the-Russians-will-get-us-otherwise" approach.

While I would like this book to be read alongside one by a pacifist so as to give a full picture, it is a book that should be read and discussed. It is most suitable for a college or seminary class on Christian ethics or a Christian campus group. One wishes that adult Sunday-school classes would be willing to do the thinking necessary to examine this issue. With politicians playing to "born-again" constituencies it is no time for us to be ill-informed or sloppy in our thinking. We can be thankful for Atkinson's contribution and pray fervently that it will be used. It is timely, important, and well done.

Peter H. Davids

Regent College, Vancouver, BC

Evangelical Ethics: Issues Facing the Church Today. By John Jefferson Davis. Phillipsburg: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1985, 299 pp., \$13.95.

After a brief introductory chapter, "Dimensions of Decision Making," the author proceeds with a consideration of the following contemporary moral issues: contraception, reproductive technologies, divorce and remarriage, homosexuality, abortion, infanticide and euthanasia, capital punishment, civil disobedience and revolution, war and peace.

Davis has done thorough research in preparation for this work. Forty-five pages of documentation accompany this well-written book. Unfortunately it is not easily accessible since it is all at the back.

The book is especially helpful in providing an historical perspective on each issue. For example, Davis traces the use of artificial contraception from ancient to present times. He provides similar assistance with a history of artificial insemination. In addition to this historical perspective he also treats each subject Biblically and makes application to contemporary society.

Davis holds that "the teachings of Scripture are the final court of appeal for ethics" (p. 9). This study might have been enhanced by a more thorough critique of alternative views. He devotes four and one-half pages to "Cases of Conflicting Obligation," but more could be done to counteract the tendency toward situationalism found among Christians today.

In view of the recent political developments in the Philippines, the chapter on civil disobedience and revolution is quite helpful in setting forth criteria for justified acts of civil disobedience and a "just" revolution.

With the increasing popularity of vasectomy as a means of birth control, I would have appreciated a more Biblical evaluation of the ethics of this issue. Is the destruction of God's reproductive design for the human body ethical? Davis leaves us hesitating because

of possible hazards and uncertain consequences, but a stronger theological case (for or against) might have been presented.

Davis' treatment of the divorce-remarriage issue is little more than a restatement of the popular, evangelical viewpoint that allows divorce for adultery and desertion. The survey of Biblical texts is too brief to deal adequately with the complex grammatical and exegetical issues involved. More consideration could have been given to the arguments of those who hold to the permanence of marriage.

This book makes a significant contribution by presenting a Biblical and historical perspective on what must be regarded as the most serious contemporary moral issues facing the Church today. The volume provides a good foundation for discussion on these issues and would be useful to both pastors and teachers. *Evangelical Ethics* would also serve well as an introductory textbook for a class on ethics or contemporary moral issues.

J. Carl Laney

Western Conservative Baptist Seminary, Portland, OR

Full Christianity: A Catholic Response to Fundamental Questions. By Richard W. Chilson. Mahwah: Paulist, 1985, 136 pp., \$3.95.

The aim of the book is to answer questions about Catholicism that "remain unanswered in the public mind." The format is to ask a question such as "What does it mean to say that the Pope is infallible?" and then to give a concise answer. In all there are fifty questions, which are developed under five headings: "Scripture, Authority, and Revelation"; "Jesus Christ"; "The Church"; "Christian Life"; and "Other Questions."

Although the book is intended to be primarily a brief apologetic for the Catholic faith, the author admits both in the preface and the introduction that this work has been prompted by "the fundamentalist challenge." So at least part of the purpose is to defend the Catholic faith against the evangelistic efforts of groups such as Campus Crusade.

While the author emphasizes throughout the book that there is much room for diversity in the Catholic Church and that he does not speak for all Catholics, it is obvious that the author represents modern, not traditional, Catholicism. In his views he emphasizes that the Church has changed in the past and is in the process of change now. The Bible does not prohibit such change because the community preceded the Scriptures, produced and preserved them, and now is the proper interpreter of them to a changing world. Our response to the world then should change as the needs of the world change. Several other statements show that he has imbibed deeply from the well of modern theology. He says, "Modern Scripture scholarship makes clear, not every word in Jesus' mouth in the Gospels is an actual word he said" (p. 67). He defends humanism and says it can "prepare the ground for Christianity" (p. 128). He seems to be a strong supporter of liberation theology (p. 130). He also states that Daniel was written much later than the book claims (p. 123).

Perhaps the most interesting view expressed is that concerning other Christian churches. "The church views herself as a series of concentric circles." The Pope stands in the center, next comes the Roman Catholic Church, then the Eastern churches, the Orthodox churches, and the various Protestant churches. But the Church does not end here. The cults such as the Mormons are next; they are followed by Jews, Moslems, and other great world faiths. In short, "the church encompasses all humanity" (pp. 85-87). While the author obviously would like to embrace universal salvation, he admits that hell is necessary to allow man some choice in the matter.

The book is well written and easy to follow. It will provide the reader with some insight into the development and rationale behind many Catholic beliefs. However, it

represents not so much what the Roman Church has been in the past but what it is in the process of becoming—if more liberal minds prevail.

Gerald Cowen

Criswell College, Dallas, TX

Global Mission, A Story to Tell: An Interpretation of Southern Baptist Foreign Missions. By Winston Crawley. Nashville: Broadman, 1985, 400 pp., \$11.95.

The theme song of Southern Baptist mission organizations is "We've a Story to Tell to the Nations." For the past 140 years the "story of Jesus and his love" has been told around the world by Southern Baptist missionaries. Now, with the exception of Wycliffe Translators, Southern Baptists have more missionaries (3,500 full time and 6,000 volunteers) in more countries (105) than any other missionary organization. Nevertheless, little is known about Southern Baptist missions by others. Just as more theology has been preached than written, so doing missions has been more characteristic of Baptists than writing about missions. The missing emphasis is now receiving more attention, and this book is a significant contribution to that endeavor.

The book shows the impact that W. O. Carver has had on Southern Baptist missions. Carver developed his philosophy of missions around Ephesians 3. Crawley develops a similar theme around Matt 6:10, "Thy Kingdom Come." In so doing, he examines the history of Southern Baptist missions, the present situation in Southern Baptist missions, and the future direction of the mission board. The history is briefly outlined and lays the groundwork for Crawley's excellent presentation of the system of missions that is carried out by Southern Baptists. Monies are given by the local churches to the cooperative program that supports the Foreign Mission Board and other denominational agencies. Candidates come from Southern Baptist churches who have received training at Southern Baptist institutions.

Crawley devotes over one-half of the book to the theology and philosophy of Southern Baptist missions. This is the real strength of the book and had not been done since Carver's work earlier in this century. Crawley is conversant with approaches among evangelicals and nonevangelicals alike. He demonstrates the uniqueness of Southern Baptist objectives and strategy in contrast to other missions. He does this in a very positive way in a chapter entitled "How Do We Relate to Others?"

The reader will find the chapters dealing with church growth, contextualization, social needs, and indigenous churches to be especially helpful. It is here that Crawley shows his breadth and depth as a missiologist. The reader may not agree with every conclusion reached by the author but will be helped to think further about these important matters. In general Crawley maintains balance in his discussions of these important but controversial matters.

David S. Dockery

Criswell College, Dallas, TX