

BOOK REVIEWS

Biblical Theology: Old Testament. I, by Chester K. Lehman. (Scottsdale, Pa.: Herald Press, 1971.) 485 pages plus bibliography and indices. Hardback \$15.95. Reviewed by Walter C. Kaiser, Jr., Associate Professor of Old Testament, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, Illinois.

A major evangelical work by an E.T.S. member on O.T. Biblical Theology which frankly traces its structural viewpoint to Geerhardus Vos and credits its refinements to 45 years of teaching deserves careful inspection by all students of Scripture. Especially is this true in a day when the "Biblical Theology Movement," which prides itself on using many of the insights and methods of Biblical Theology, is being written up in various obituaries; e.g. Brevard S. Childs, *Biblical Theology in Crisis*, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1970, 61-87; J. Christian Beker, "Reflections on Biblical Theology," *Interpretation*, XXIV (1970), 303-20; James Barr, "The O.T. and the New Crisis of Biblical Authority," *Interpretation*, XXV (1971), 24-40; and George E. Ladd, "The Search for Perspective," *Interpretation*, *ibid.*, 41-62.

What then does an evangelical like Lehman have to offer against such a threatening backdrop for the whole discipline? While he emerges well from the tricky area of methodology—using a combination of Geerhardus Vos and J. H. Titcomb (*Revelation in Progress from Adam to Malachi*, 1871)—nevertheless he is disappointingly brief. Possibly, his interaction with the discussions on methodology such as that produced in 1970 by Robert B. Laurin (*Contemporary O.T. Theologians*, Valley Forge: Judson Press) would have helped current readers to see the value of his approach to Old Testament Theology as over against that of others. Lehman correctly stresses *both* the principle of the historic progression of revelation and the principle of the organic unity of the message. As for the unity, he finds it in the numerous covenants that appear. The progression is found in various historic periods or eras which these covenants have marked off throughout the Old Testament.

Evangelicals will be disappointed with his obviously hesitant, but clear stand which lists seven reasons for accepting a Deutero-Isaiah theory (pp. 238-39; 306). However, he seems to clearly reject the documentary theory of the Pentateuch (pp. 33-36) and he places Daniel correctly in a Babylonian setting in 600 B.C. (pp. 353-54).

This reviewer found a strong case for an authoritative Old Testament

Theology, especially in his sections on the Fall, the Mosaic revelation and the Former Prophets. There were high points elsewhere, but the case began to crumble in the major prophets. While happily espousing a balanced position on such topics as a spiritual restoration and a national restoration of Israel, the organizing principle broke down and the tendency seemed to be to repeat the topics of systematic theology for all the prophets rather than discerning the covenant theme or any unique development for the different prophetic eras. Still there are many great movements even in this section, e.g. the God of Israel, Death and Sheol and the Holy Spirit.

The section on the Hagiographa was individually outstanding, especially on Proverbs; but its connection with the preceding revelation was once again the problem. This section of the canon is well known as the Achilles heel of almost every Old Testament Theology.

There are always those small caveats that one almost wishes were not there. But our differences as Christians are well known, and we must continue to speak to each other in love. For example, Lehman correctly takes a strong Reformed stand(?) on the efficacy of the Old Testament sacrifices in removing the guilt and presence of their sins (pp. 147-58), yet he favors a more or less dispensational stand on the possibility of men obtaining salvation by the quality of their law—keeping in the Old Testament (pp. 123-24; see our disclaimer in *JETS*, XIV (1971), 19-28).

Another feature which will please many, but disappointed this reader was the adoption of the double or multiple fulfillment theory for predictive prophecy. But if Nathan's promise to David was fulfilled in Solomon, what is the point of all the fuss in Hebrews 1:5? Of course it refers to Christ there, but on what grounds? And we cannot just answer: "On the grounds of inspiration" unless we are prepared to accept inspired, authoritative yet contradictory truth meanings for one and the same Old Testament message. Evangelicals must hurry and study E. D. Hirsh's book, *Validity in Interpretation* (New Haven: Yale Press, 1967), before we let out the back door what we worked so hard to keep over our front door, *viz.* a divinely authoritative Scripture.

Yet all of these quarrels are minor when compared to the major theological contribution made by this work. The reviewer has already used the work as a textbook in an elective Old Testament Theology seminary course with some 65 men and women and was more than pleased with the results.

The only consistent complaint he received was on the expensive price of the textbook (and it is indeed!), but there was abundant praise for the insights and the reverent handling of that section of our Scripture so little known by the Church. For years to come, Christians will give thanks to their Lord for giving Dr. Lehman to us, and the gift of his herculean task in an area which is almost legendary in its challenges and difficulties: Old Testament Biblical Theology.

The Holiness-Pentecostal Movement, by Vinson Synan. (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1971). 248 pp.; cloth \$5.95. Reviewed by William W. Menzies, chairman, Biblical Studies Department, Evangel College, Springfield, Missouri.

An increasing number of volumes relating to the Pentecostal movement is now appearing. Such interest likely is being generated by the surprising penetration of charismatic phenomena into a broad spectrum of churches, now far beyond the traditional Pentecostal movement. Surveyors of the scene who wish to explore the origins of the twentieth-century Pentecostal movement will look with particular interest on *The Holiness-Pentecostal Movement*. No interpretation of the origins of the Pentecostal revival rivals Synan's in placing this phenomenon in its historical and cultural milieu.

Vinson Synan is eminently qualified for his task as an interpreter of the origins of the American Pentecostal movement. His father served as executive officer of the Pentecostal Holiness denomination for 24 years. He himself pastors a Pentecostal Holiness church, and concurrently serves as chairman of the Division of Social and Behavioral Sciences at Emmanuel College, Franklin Springs, Georgia, the principal school of the denomination. This degree of association with a major group within the Wesleyan wing of the Pentecostal movement allows Synan to speak as a knowledgeable representative for an important segment of the revival. The book itself is an edited version of his Ph.D. dissertation. Synan's degree was granted by the history department of the University of Georgia. Dr. Synan is one of the founding fathers of the Society for Pentecostal Studies, and continues as perennial secretary of that body.

Several important contentions highlight Synan's book: (1) that the modern Pentecostal revival must be understood as a split-off from the Holiness movement which burgeoned in the nineteenth century in this country, (2) that the parentage of the Holiness movement, in turn, was Wesleyanism, which in its origins owes a greater debt to Anglo-Catholicism than to the Reformed tradition for its true identity, (3) that the Baptist-type of Pentecostal denomination was not the original motif, but must be seen as a subsequent development following the initial phase of the Pentecostal revival, (4) that the Pentecostal movement arose, in part at least, as a genuine expression of the Populist movement which appeared on the American scene near the turn of this century, and (5) that the Pentecostal movement was virtually the only truly interracial social grouping in the American South during the earlier days of the revival.

The Holiness-Pentecostal Movement is more than a chronology. It is an interpretation of an important religious phenomenon. The book is a fine blend of scholarship and writing skill. It is clear, readable, and moves through the traffic of ideas with a dexterity which keeps the reader from bogging down in distracting detail. Yet, the book is well-documented, with profuse footnotes used strategically to underscore the argumentation of the

author. The bibliography is impressive, disclosing a good command of the available materials.

Without question, Synan has produced the ablest interpretation of the origins of the American Pentecostal movement. Although all interpreters of this revival may not agree with all the contentions Synan has made, he has produced a work which will have to be reckoned with in all subsequent inquiry into the Pentecostal movement. Synan has made a distinguished contribution to American church historiography.

Old Testament Covenant: A Survey of Current Opinions, by Dennis J. McCarthy, S.J. (Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1972.) 89 pp. plus bibliography (pp. 90-108) and an index. \$3.95, paper. Reviewed by Walter C. Kaiser, Jr., Associate Professor of Old Testament, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, Illinois.

Since there has been such a spate of books and articles on the Ancient Near Eastern treaty form as it relates to the covenants of the Old Testament—commencing with the epochal essay of George Mendenhall (*Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East*) in 1955, the present work has become almost a necessity for everyone in the field. McCarthy has given us a veritable road map through this bibliographical wilderness which from an evangelical point of view has several significant fruitful avenues of research and numerous dead-end streets.

This work first appeared in an abbreviated form in *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 27 (1965) and then in German in 1967 entitled *Der Gottesbund im Alten Testament*. The English addition now has a postscript updating that German form, pp. 59-89.

When all is said and done, the most significant development would appear to be the unwillingness of many recent writers to find a treaty form in the Sinai narratives. But the biggest surprise for evangelicals will be the apparent willingness to see the treaty form in the "center core," if not the whole book of Deuteronomy as it stands in its present text! If I am not mistaken, this is the first major recognition (outside Evangelical circles) of the thesis of Meredith Kline's work on the *Treaty of the Great King*. (Cf. p. 17, n. 16; p. 26 and the crucial footnote 29; p. 28, n. 32; p. 72.) Sadly enough, the implications of such admissions are not discussed.

Two issues which have plagued Vassal-Treaty and Covenant research should also stimulate evangelical research more, *viz.*, the fact that "covenant" is a rare word indeed in the prophets (cf. chap. III) and the exact relationship that exists between the promissory covenants of Abraham and David and the Mosaic covenants. Repeatedly McCarthy calls for efforts to integrate the Davidic and Mosaic covenants (pp. 47, 49, 54f, 58, 85). Precisely so! Until this issue is squared away, Biblical studies will continue to be impoverished and seriously affected in its theological understanding of both testaments.

As things now stand, neither Julius Wellhausen's assessment of Old Testament religion as a strictly evolutionary development of the idea of the covenant, nor Walter Eichrodt's development of Old Testament theology as the explication of the Mosaic Sinaitic covenant have been successful. Neither have the studies of the covenant viewed from the vantage point of cult, history, or sociology been able to sustain their contributions as great synthetic principles for understanding the whole tenor of Old Testament thought. There are valid comparisons of some of the Old Testament covenants with the vassal treaties of the Ancient Near East, but which ones are they? And where are the literary forms for the others and for forms like the apodictic sayings? McCarthy seems to look hesitatingly to a Northern source for the Sinai covenant form and to a Southern one for the Zion, royal ideologies. We pray he will hesitate even longer—if indeed that is what he is doing, e.g. pp. 30, 73.

Evangelicals will profit immensely from a careful study of this volume, with its rich footnotes, bibliography and suggestions. What we need are several programmatic articles showing the theological connection of all the Old Testament covenants and promises.

The Epistles of John: Introduction, Exposition and Notes, by F. F. Bruce. (Westwood, N.J.: Revell, 1970.) 160 pp. \$4.95; and *The Letters of John*, by Dale Moody. (Waco, Texas: Word, 1970.) 136 pp. \$3.95. Reviewed by Ronald Scharfe, Fort Wayne Bible College, Fort Wayne, Indiana.

These two excellent though brief commentaries, one British and the other American, on the epistles of John are welcome contributions to an important but sometimes neglected area of New Testament studies.

Bruce's commentary is written in somewhat the same style as his earlier work on *Ephesians* (1961). These studies, he states, "are intended chiefly for the general Christian reader who is interested in serious Bible study, not for the professional or specialist student" (p. 7). Nonetheless as in all his works there is much that will be of interest to the latter. As for canonical status, the evidence according to Bruce "points to the canonical recognition of 1, 2 and 3 John in stages, one at a time" (p. 19). The arguments for diversity of authorship between the fourth gospel and 1 John are not sufficient "to overthrow the evidence, both internal and external, for common authorship" (p. 31). The comments on the text are succinct yet lively! And a careful reading of the notes appended to each of the chapters will provide further insight and valuable bibliographical data.

Moody, Professor of Systematics at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville, Ky., acknowledges his indebtedness to B. F. Westcott especially, whose work on the Johannine epistles he terms "a model" (p. 7). Convinced "that one of the great needs of the churches today is biblical preaching based on historical exposition" (*ibid.*), Moody has produced for the preacher and the student an able commentary with many helpful

guidelines and suggestions regarding interpretation of key passages and significant Johannine terminology. As for authorship, "Recent investigations into the role of secretaries and the influence of Qumran, together with the importance of chronological development, tend to put Irenaeus in a better light than modern scholarship has thought" (p. 14).

Both commentaries are worth purchasing, and together with John Stott's commentary (1964) in the Tyndale series provide substantial material on the Johannine epistles from an evangelical perspective.

The Lord's Day: A Theological Guide to the Christian Day of Worship, by Paul K. Jewett. (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1971.) 169 pp. and bibliography and index. \$2.95. Reviewed by Gordon R. Lewis, Conservative Baptist Theological Seminary, Denver, Colorado.

Is Sunday, for a Christian, to be different from the other days of the week? Could Christian worship services be moved to other days of the week if it seemed more convenient? The professor of systematic theology at Fuller Theological Seminary skillfully argues that the Lord's Day, as distinct from the Jewish Sabbath and Civil holidays, is "anchored in the Easter event, more particularly in the first meeting of the risen Lord with his disciples as they were gathered at the time of the evening meal on Easter Sunday." Jewett's careful assessment of the evidence shows that "Christians commemorated that all-important event, which occurred on the first day of the week, by gathering on that day for table fellowship, as did the original disciples who ate and drank with him both on the night in which he was betrayed and in the evening of the day on which he arose from the dead." The early church changed the time of meeting from evening to morning, but its motto was "We cannot live without our Lord's Day celebration."

The theological justification for the gathering of the believing community for observance of the Lord's table as Professor Jewett sees it, is found in both the continuity of, and the change in, God's action in history. On the one hand, continuity with the Jewish sabbath is seen in the principle of a weekly meeting. No such weekly division of time was known in the Greco-Roman world prior to the establishment of the Christian church (except among the Jews of the diaspora). Failing to appreciate this unity with the Old Testament practice, the Reformers (and others, we might add), who stress the progress in redemptive history and the fulfillment of the sabbath rest in Christ, failed to appreciate the unity of redemptive history in the first century's continuation of the sabbatical division of time. On the other hand, Seventh-day advocates failed to do justice to the movement or change in redemptive history. Jewett's case against Seventh-day Adventism must be reckoned with. He charges Adventists, not with legalism, but uncritical argumentation. "Every piece of evidence that Christians have worshipped on Sunday is either explained away or cited as evidence

of apostasy. Thus it appears *a priori* certain that the voice of tradition can only support the Seventh-day Adventist position."

Must the Christian obey the fourth commandment? Author Jewett cannot say "No" with the Reformers, nor "Yes" with the Adventists. He says Yes, and No, but not in a contradictory way. He says Yes in one respect, and No in another respect. The first Christians worshipped on a new day to commemorate the new work of God in history, the resurrection of Jesus Christ; but they did so weekly, showing a measure of continuity with the ancient people of God in obedience to the sabbath commandment.

This theological understanding of the Lord's day leads to such rich implications as the following. "In the Sabbath commandment, then, we have a necessary reminder that we do not receive our worth from our work, but from our relationship to God. Work is for the sake of man, not man for the sake of work." Again, "Sunday, the day of the resurrection, in the light of which we both conclude and begin our weekly work, by delivering us from trust in our own works, proclaims our freedom from care and delivers us from worship of possessions, that is, of the god of Mammon, that we may worship the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." Sunday rest is not a question of techniques of divine worship or lists of requirements for humanitarian or hygienic value. "We do not do on the festal day as we do on workdays. The great breaking into world history on Easter Day corresponds to the little breaking into our individual history on the day of the weekly festal celebration."

Following a valuable survey of observances of the Lord's day in the history of the church, Jewett suggests four principles to guide believers in finding the will of God for Sunday. They can be properly appreciated only in the context of the whole work. (1) "He rightly observes the day, and he only, who does so in a faith which renounces all confidence in himself and his own works and rests in God only for the deliverance from the guilt and power of sin." (2) "He rightly observes the day, and he only, who meets with God's people on this day. The rest of the Lord's day finds its tangible expression, not only in the laying aside of our work, but also in the gathering of God's people for worship." (3) "He rightly observes the day, and he only, who does so with joy. The rest of the Lord's day is a joyous rest belonging to the day as a festive day." (4) "He rightly observes the day, and he only, who acknowledges that it especially belongs to the Lord. It is He who has hallowed and sanctified the day."

One would like to ask why a fifth principle was not added. From the evidence presented connecting the Lord's Supper and the Lord's Day, it would seem that he only observes the day properly who partakes of the Lord's Supper.

If it is not already evident, this reviewer considers *The Lord's Day* a highly significant work. It shows the interrelation of "practical" and "theological" issues. It exemplifies sound methods of theological research.

It contributes meaning to a practice all too often considered a hypocritical sham. It should give prospective ministers and those already in the pastorate a new sense of the significance of their Sunday ministry. It should give backbone to church boards in maintaining meaningful Sunday services. And it should help parents to explaining to their children why Christians faithfully assemble with other Christians on the first day of each week.

Scripture Cannot Be Broken, by Theodore Engelder. Foreword by W. Arndt. (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1944.) Reprinted by Hope, Inc., Mora, Minnesota 55051. 498 pp. \$7.95. Reviewed by Pastor Edward A. Johnson, St. John's and Grace Lutheran Churches, Ohioa, Nebraska.

During 1971 two evangelical classics on the authority and inspiration of Holy Scripture were republished after many years out of print. Kregel Publications (Grand Rapids, Michigan) republished Gausson's *Theopneustia* under the title *Divine Inspiration of the Bible* as part of its Kregel Reprint Library (382 pp., \$5.95). Hope, Inc., of Mora, Minnesota, republished Dr. Theodore Engelder's classic, *Scripture Cannot Be Broken*. Dr. Engelder, who died in 1949, was for many years a professor at Concordia Lutheran Theological Seminary of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod in St. Louis.

This monumental work of devout scholarship by a fully committed believer and competent scholar shows why many of his former students still speak of him with great esteem. His work originated as a series of articles in the *Concordia Theological Monthly* between April, 1941 and December, 1942 under the heading of "Verbal Inspiration—a Stumbling-Block to the Jews and Foolishness to the Greeks." It is undoubtedly no mere coincidence that both of these works defending the orthodox doctrine of inspiration—that by Gausson as well as the volume by Engelder—should reappear just at the moment when the issue of Biblical authority has been brought into sharpest focus in the contemporary crisis at Concordia Seminary in St. Louis.

Dr. Engelder subtitles his volume "Six Objections to Verbal Inspiration Examined in the Light of Scripture." He intends to show "that it should be impossible for (the Christian) to speak of, and think of, errors in the Bible."

Such viewpoints impeach the authority of the Lord Jesus. He also points out how preposterous is the charge that the post-Reformation theologians invented the concept of verbal plenary inspiration.

Finally, he defends *verbal inspiration from the charge of setting up a "legalistic authority of the letter."* Verbal inspiration is shown to be a "holy bondage" for the Christian. The alternatives are fearful: slavery to human concepts and the latest findings of the scholars, or to evolution or some other current ideology, or the works-righteousness which the rationalists

engage in without realizing what they are doing. No, as slaves of God, we are His freed men and women, sure in what we believe and what we have put our trust in unto everlasting life.

The book is both homeletical and polemical. Engelder spares no words in accusing the rationalistic Bible scholars of "fomenting treason," robbing the common man of his certainty of salvation and breaking men's hearts. "The moderns are filling the city of God with doubt and fear and despair." If one misses mention of current developments like the "God is dead" movement, Bultmann's theories, or Whitehead's process theology, at least one is reminded that the problems of 1972 are no new problems, but frequently are rejuvenated versions of heresies that have been with the church of God since her beginning.

The book has certain stylistic weaknesses. Much of it is repetitious. A good 150 pages could have been excised without losing any of the essential argument of this handy-sized (8½"x5") volume. The mass of detail makes it tedious reading. Almost every page quotes an extensive passage from a German or Latin writer without benefit of translation and seldom with paraphrase. The printing itself (photo offset) is uneven, with some pages poorly inked, others overinked or blurred.

As thorough as Engelder's study is, we could wish he had given more attention to the human side (mechanical details of writing, copying, printing, etc., and occasional copyists' errors leading to doubtful reading of some passages) in a way that avoids the critical errors which Engelder rightly scores.

Probing the New Testament, by A. M. Hunter. (Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1972.) 156 pp. \$2.45. Reviewed by Murray J. Harris, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, Illinois.

Anything from the pen of A. M. Hunter, who was Professor of Biblical Criticism and Exegesis in the University of Aberdeen for some twenty-six years, is worth reading, since he combines scholarly insight and pastoral concern with an attractive, straightforward literary style. *Probing the New Testament* is no exception. Here are sixty-four brief essays which shed lexicographical or grammatical light on many a dark or difficult passage in the New Testament.

Among the multitude of fine, incisive observations made by this "prince of popularizers," the following are worthy of mention: "hate" in Deuteronomy 21:15 f, Malachi 1:2 f and Luke 14:26 (cf. the parallel in Matthew 10:37) means "love less"; in Mark 10:45, Matthew 22:14 and Romans 5:18 f. (*hoi polloi* (=Hebrew *harrabim*) means "all" and not "many, but not all"; the answer of Jesus to the Pharisees and Herodians in Mark 12:17 contrasts a transient and a permanent obligation: "Give Caesar the taxes that are his due; but as coinage bearing God's image you belong to

God and should seek first his Kingdom"; *hoste edoken* ("so that he gave") in John 3:16 speaks of an actual fact, not a potential gift (*hoste dounai*, "so as to give")—"the gospel is not the propogation of an idea . . . it is the proclamation of a deed" (p. 56); in John 16:7-11, the Paraclete is Counsel not for the defense but for the prosecution, the "world" standing in the dock; "knowing Christ after the flesh" (2 Cor. 5:16) "means having inadequate, worldly, superficial, one-sided . . . ideas of Christ"—that is, a carnal christology; Paul commends Epaphroditus for his noble "gambling with his life" (Phil. 2:30); Aristarchus, Mark and Jesus Justus were a "tonic" (*paregoria*) to Paul (Col. 4:11); I Thess. 5:21 f may be paraphrased thus: "(Like expert money-changers) test everything: keep the good metal, and refuse the spurious coin"; I Timothy 4:8 teaches, not that religion ensures that a man makes the best of both worlds but that it assures him of real life both here and hereafter. And Professor Hunter's own rendering (on pp. 117 f) of Philippians 2:6-11 in iambic trimeters should not be missed.

It is somewhat surprising that in discussing the "primitive Christian triad" of faith, love and hope in Colossians 1:4 f, the author does not note that Paul specifies Christian hope—here defined as inheritance "stored up in heaven"—either as an actual ground of faith in Christ and love for fellowbelievers or as a powerful incentive for their continued expression. Again, in his discussion of *arrabon*, Hunter tends to overemphasize the word's commercial connotations. When Paul uses this term (2 Cor. 1:22; 5:5; Eph. 1:4) he is probably not conceiving of the Spirit as God's "down-payment" on the believer's inheritance, an initial and provisional installment differing from the full payment not in kind but in degree, but rather as the God-given pledge of the believer's acquisition of immortality through a resurrection transformation, as God's guarantee of the fulfillment of his promises, and as the divine assurance of the realization of the Christian's hope.

Not only the theological student and the theologically literate layman but also the teacher of New Testament will find this slender volume informative, illuminating and enriching.

The Cross and the Flag. Edited by Robert Clouse, Robert Linder and Richard Pierard. (Carol Stream, Ill.: Creation House, 1972.) Hardback \$4.95, paper \$2.95. Reviewed by Vernon Grounds, Conservative Baptist Theological Seminary, Denver, Colorado.

Has there been a marked tendency throughout the 20th century for evangelicalism in the United States to identify itself with the interests, values and policies of American nationalism? Does that tendency still persist among those Christians who staunchly adhere to the fundamentals of historic Protestantism? Do people who stand on the theological right tend to be political rightists as well, carrying the cross in one hand, waving the flag with the other?

Allowing for all possible qualifications, the one honest answer to these questions must be a forthright yes. I personally recall, for instance, the bulletin-board of a certain Baptist church which in a permanent inscription announced to all passersby that it was set for the defense of fundamentalism and Americanism, as if those two terms were synonymous or inseparable. We must not, *per contra*, ignore the evangelical contribution to social criticism and reform (qualifications, however, are here and now being ignored), but the almost jingoistic orientation of American Bible-believers is written inexpungably into the record. More than that, if I may base a sweeping sociological pronouncement on my own observations, that orientation continues to control the politics of all too many members of those churches which are genuinely orthodox.

Here, then, in a series of very able essays by a group of younger scholars is a welcome corrective of the prostitution of evangelism into a sub-Biblical culture-religion. Against a commendable background of learning and information, the contributors to this volume discuss some of today's most sensitive issues—militarism, disarmament, revolution, war, the Israel-Arab tinder-box, ecology, poverty, racism, the radical right, the radical left, and Women's Liberation. Committed to a high view of Scripture, these critical lovers and loving critics of evangelicalism are endeavoring to be Biblical—socially, economically and politically as well as theologically. Hence they have no hesitancy in attacking a number of sacred cows; they have no hesitancy, either, in advocating positions which their fellow-believers often stigmatize as leftist.

Their approach, however, while occasionally sharp and necessarily negative, is objective, dispassionate, and peaceful. Indeed, I could have wished for more prophetic fire and passion! Heralds of the new day which is hopefully dawning within our American churches, these essayists lay down no political platform and offer no blueprints for a utopian society. They simply remind us that political problems inevitably become moral problems, and on moral problems the Bible speaks in a loud voice. What they plead for is some serious thinking and rethinking instead of a close-minded patriotism which proudly renders to Caesar the things which are God's.

As the best book of its kind now available, a courageous affirmation of where things are at and ought to be at in Christian social ethics, *The Cross and the Flag* deserves the attention of all American evangelicals.

The Ministry and the Ministry of Women ("Contemporary Theology Series"), by Peter Brunner. (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House.) Paper. 39 pages. Reviewed by Doris Roethlisberger, Trinity College, Deerfield, Illinois.

Brunner wrote this article for a German periodical in 1959 and it appeared in English translation in the *Lutheran World* also in 1959. Brunner

first sorts out the historical Lutheran position of women and their ministry. In so doing, he points up the fact that the church fathers, including Luther, often rejected women as ministers because of standards of respectability and propriety (both subjective norms), rather than with sound theological research and argument. Brunner then defines what he and the reformers mean by the term minister, pastor, shepherd or even bishop. The position of minister is based on the commission with which Christ called His disciples and includes the following duties: preaching of the Gospel, administration of the sacraments, giving of absolution, rejection of false doctrine and excommunication of the ungodly. Men are called to be ministers by the leaders of the institutional church (really a call by the Holy Spirit). Women just don't fit in this category. Here are a few of the questions Brunner poses as he begins his argument: What about the significance of Genesis 1-3 for the proclamation of the Gospel? Can we make dogmatic use of the creation account as Paul did in I Corinthians 11 and 14? Can we relate the fall to the prohibition against women teaching in the church as in I Timothy 2? Is there in the Timothy passage a judaistic concept of the woman that we must reject in the light of the Gospel? Brunner does a good job of grappling with these complex questions.

We must, writes Brunner, account for sexual differences between men and women, but the church can't be satisfied to borrow insights from biology, psychology, philosophy, sociology and medicine, and then to such insights tack on a misunderstood Christian principle and thus think the problem is solved. Brunner argues in the rest of the article that the question of whether or not women should be ordained to the ministry depends on the theological doctrine of the nature and relationship between the God-given sexes. Finally, he tries to relate what he understands the doctrine to be to the order of the church as it relates to women and the ministry.

To clarify the place of woman in the created order, Brunner stresses that the relationship she has to man is subordinate, but it's a theological, not a sociological subordination. It is, as he writes, an "ordering under," but also it's an (*Einordnung*) "ordering into." This concept which he calls the *kephale*-structure is theologically stated: God is the head of Christ; Christ is the head of the man and man is the head of the woman. This term "head" means that it comes prior to, that it determines, leads. The head is the power that begins; it is *principium arche*. This whole idea of headship is based on the original creation relationship of man and woman in Genesis where the woman is created "from" the man and "for the sake of man."

Headship, as I understand Brunner, doesn't mean what business and administrative terms generally mean by leadership, power and determination. No, it's a godly, personal position. The head doesn't strive for his own power; he doesn't try to manipulate others. Rather, this subordination is two-sided as it is described in the New Testament. He calls it *hypotage*, and its effect is something inclusive. It is "a unified mode of behavior that determines all actions, but in particular manifests itself as a subordination."

To Brunner, the relationships between God and Christ, Christ and man and man and woman are different. Each is unique to itself, and yet all are built on the principle of subordination. It is this principle of Christian subordination that Brunner believes keeps women from the position of pastor because he questions whether woman can exercise spiritual authority over men in the assembled *ecclesia* without repudiating the *kephale*-structure. It seems that Brunner thinks this structure would only be damaged if women enter what he defines the position of the pastor. He encourages women to all other functions in and out of the church. Brunner emphatically states that whether the woman is married or single has no dogmatic relevance for the decision in this controversy. He also refutes the idea that this subordination is a moral decision for an individual to make. This subordination, he writes, can't be fulfilled by a man or woman's Christian humility. Rather this subordination is a divine arrangement. The personal attitude of men and women determines how they handle this subordinate position in Christ.

Brunner concludes that being a pastor and being a woman contradict each other, and he believes that the woman, as well as the man, suffers when the *kephale*-structure is broken. However, he does allow for great freedom for both men and women in assisting the pastor. He spells out six broad areas where women as well as men can function in pastoral assistance, including distribution of the bread and cup at the Lord's supper, leadership training, areas of Biblical instruction. He follows this list with a list of eight "no-nos" where women can't function because of his interpretation of the *kephale*-structure. Fifteen thought-provoking questions for discussion follow.

Brunner sees three categories of people in the ministry of the church: the laity, pastors and prophets. Women have great freedom in the laity, and he does believe that a woman can be a prophet. But she is excluded from the pastoral-preacher position of leadership.

Brunner's discussions of divine arrangement and/or order, and the meaning of headship are both timely and need to be further studied. After reading this article and thinking about Brunner's definition of a pastor, I'm questioning the many areas in which many pastors assume authority in the local church. Could it be that we've expanded the role of the pastor so that he is not doing what he is called to do. Maybe if the pastors begin to limit their duties, then many persons (men and women) will latch on and assist him in the ministry of the church.

The Heart of the Old Testament, by Ronald Youngblood. (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1971.) 106 pp. plus bibliography. \$2.95, paperback. Reviewed by Thomas A. Nicholas, Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

For this series of semi-popular thematic studies Dr. Youngblood has

selected nine concepts which he believes constitute the heart of the Old Testament. The themes chosen are monotheism, sovereignty, election, covenant, theocracy, law, sacrifice, faith, and redemption.

In his treatment the author has "attempted in each case to define the concept, describe the cultural setting in which it arose in ancient Israel, delineate the various stages through which God's people passed as they grew in their understanding of it, and discuss briefly its ultimate fulfillment in Jesus Christ" (Preface). Because he is convinced that the heart of the Old Testament actually is fulfilled in Christ as he is presented in the New Testament, he hopes that this book will demonstrate to the reader the basic unity of the entire Bible.

Although each theme is treated briefly (just one, "covenant," occupies more than ten pages), the author has managed to include much helpful material in surprisingly comprehensive surveys. As each theme is developed through the various stages of the history of redemption in the Old Testament, a number of texts are illuminated by some of the more commonly recognized sources of light from the ancient Near East (*e.g.*, the significance of adoption customs uncovered at Nuzi for Abraham's experience in Genesis 15-17). Because the author believes that these concepts should not only be understood historically, but are also relevant today, he has suggested a judicious number of applications. We are warned against patronizing references to God such as "the man upstairs" (p. 18), and told that the Decalogue speaks to "situation ethics" (p. 21) as well as to "the temptation to use the sabbath day for unworthy purposes" (p. 73). While written for the comparative newcomer to Old Testament studies (technical and semi-technical terms are carefully defined), Youngblood has permitted his readers to see some important hermeneutical principles being applied. They discover, for example, that although a particular word may be used infrequently, the idea behind that word may be of prime importance and may be studied by means of related words in other contexts (*e.g.*, "faith," p. 87).

Perhaps the greatest value of this book lies in the large degree to which the Old Testament is allowed to speak for itself—either in well-chosen direct quotations or in summaries provided by the author.

This exposure to the Scriptures themselves may well stem from the author's high view of the authority of the Bible. He says, "Always and in every situation we are to subject ourselves to the Bible, to the commandments of the Bible, and to the divinely-given interpretations of the commandments as they are found in the Bible" (pp. 21 f). Some readers will not concur with the late date apparently assumed (though not argued) for the Exodus (pp. 12, 47, 102).

On occasion confusion may result from the organization of the material. The author raises the question with respect to election as to why God chose the Jews. Three pages later the correct answer is given in the words

of Deuteronomy 7:8, "because the Lord loves you." Between the question and the answer, however, there is reference to psychological ("a passive mentality") and intellectual ("an informal logic") factors which indicate that the Semite would be "a worthy recipient of God's revelatory designs" (p. 28). Although acknowledging that these comments may not be valid for this situation, the author nevertheless concludes that "we can say without fear of contradiction that the sovereign God always chooses the best individuals to carry out His purposes..." (p. 28). While a discussion of God's providential preparation and equipping of the Jews to become the recipients and bearers of his revelation (if this is what was intended) is not out of order, its intrusion at this point in the discussion is quite misleading. The reader may wrongly conclude that these factors, or others like them, *do* provide an external basis for God's electing love.

The chapter on theocracy contains a good treatment of the various theocratic officers and the responsibility of each to be in conscious subjection to the "Word of God written" (p. 62). "Sacrifice" provides a fine discussion of the practice and significance of the same in the Old Testament (largely taken from the Pentateuch and Isaiah 53), and was the theme most thoroughly integrated with the teaching of the New Testament.

The chapter on law contains a helpful exposition of the Ten Commandments, affirming that Christians must take issue with those who declare them to be out-of-date.

In his opening chapter on monotheism, Dr. Youngblood affirms that there is no conflict between monotheistic doctrine and trinitarianism (p. 15), and although he finds hints of plurality in the Old Testament as well as monotheistic statements in the New, the resolution is nevertheless expressed in terms of *two* ideas, not one. It would perhaps have strengthened his effort to set forth the unity of the entire Bible, if he had found reasons why "God did not reveal Himself prematurely in clearly defined trinitarian terms in the Old Testament Scriptures" other than the fact that "to have done so would have been to provide needless temptations to polytheism in the light of the cultures of that early time" (p. 15). Such reasons can be discovered with more warrant in the relationship between revelation and redemption. Since the content of written revelation is structured by the history of redemption, it was not until the redemptive acts of the Incarnation and Pentecost were accomplished that the revelatory words about these events were fully set forth in the New Testament.

We would make two concluding observations about the author's expressed desire "to demonstrate the basic oneness of the Scriptures [by tracing] the development of certain key ideas from one end of the Bible to the other" (Preface). First, he has achieved some success in this with respect to the Old Testament, since it is largely within that Testament that the progress of the concepts has been treated. This is a worthwhile contribution in its own right. It stands in opposition to many current affirmations of disunity within the Old Testament canon. It will help guide the reader to a proper understanding of these themes.

Second, this apologetic aim has been necessarily less successful with respect to the unity of the entire Bible. The New Testament references are simply not developed *sufficiently* to accomplish this. Since a minimal extension is made into the New Testament, and because the Bible is a unity, some *display* of this unity has been provided. At best, though, it has been only reflective or suggestive of the unity that exists between the Testaments, rather than demonstrative of that unity. It should be observed with respect to methodology that to the degree that the unity of the Old and New Testaments is to be *reflected upon*, and not merely *reflected*, to that degree the emphasis must of necessity fall upon the New Testament. This necessity is dictated by the nature of the unity of the Bible, which is (in part at least) redemptive-historical and Christological. We are therefore compelled, living as we do between the Incarnation and the Parousia, to seek that unity where it comes to its proper, its most comprehensive, and its final focus, *viz.* in the New Testament revelation of the redemptive work of Christ.

No doubt, however, Dr. Youngblood, in spite of the indications in the preface, has not really intended to reflect upon, or seek to demonstrate, the unity of both Testaments. He is, therefore, not to be faulted for this lack. For the degree of unity that *has* been shown by the author, those readers being introduced to the study of the Old Testament by this book should be most grateful. This fundamental unity must be taken fully into account if one's study of either Testament is to be characterized by truth and richness of understanding.

Decisions! Decisions!, by George A. Chauncey; *Foreign Policy Is Your Business*, by Theodore R. Weber; *Rich Man, Poor Man*, by Donald R. Shriver, Jr. (Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press [Chime Books].) 122, 128, 111 pp. plus notes and bibliography. In *Christian Ethics for Modern Man*, edited by George A. Chauncey. Reviewed by Harold O. J. Brown, *Christianity Today*, Washington, D.C.

Under the general editorship of George A. Chauncey, John Knox Press has inaugurated a series of study and discussion guides intended to introduce ethics as an intellectual discipline to Christians who are interested in taking their personal responsibilities seriously.

The term "ethics," like "morals," usually comes up in daily conversation only in the context of a violation of norms, particularly of the norms of a specialized group, such as "medical ethics" or "congressional ethics." Many people know that the academic discipline called ethics exists as a branch of philosophy and also of theology, but most books on the subject tend to start with Aristotle and lose the normal reader long before he approaches Immanuel Kant.

The introductory volume in the series, *Decisions! Decisions!*, written by the general editor, is an attempt to make it clear to the layman that

everyone constantly makes moral judgments and decisions, and that if one is a Christian, one ought to make a conscious effort to make them in the light of Christian teaching and standards. He shows how to analyze moral judgments, classifies ethical systems and principles according to type, and helps the reader to see the ethical principles which may be unconsciously followed in the various kinds of decisions that one makes. However, Chauncey's breakdown of ethical theories into results-, duty-, and responsibility-oriented structures, with the nod going to the last type, does not seem to make an adequate distinction *within* responsibility-oriented ethics between letting one's responsibility be prescribed by an objective revelation and hoping somehow to sense it from a variety of criteria in an ongoing life process. Similarly, in contrasting the Christian life seen as obedience to God's law with the life seen as response to God's activity, he creates a false impression that the giving of the Law was not part of God's gracious *activity* toward man.

Decisions! Decisions! therefore appears as a readable, stimulating, and valuable introductory study guide, somewhat marred by the fact that its author does not really seem to face up to the historic Christian conviction that there is a clearly revealed will of God which has normative value for all men at all times, and as a consequence does not adequately distinguish between an ethical system based on conscious acceptance of and obedience to the propositionally expressed revelation of God in Scripture on the one hand, and on the other, one which merely tries, in a more general way, to be Christian in its inspiration and thrust. Thus he does not lead the reader/user of his guide to a position which he will understand the need of choosing right in a difficult situation purely and simply because God tells him to.

Theodore R. Weber's *Foreign Policy Is Your Business* can serve the useful purpose of awakening Christians to the fact that if they live under a representative form of government, they have a share in the major foreign policy decisions of their government, and thus bear part of the responsibility for them. Because there is widespread ignorance of and virtual indifference to this important aspect of a citizen's accountability as a Christian, Weber's guide will be a helpful corrective in circles where Christian responsibility is understood primarily in an individualistic context. Unfortunately the author seems to have swallowed a good many of the currently-popular *cliches* about militarism and the Vietnam war, and thus his examples may more adequately represent the *idees fixes* of the anti-war movement than the real issues at stake in international conflict.

In some ways the most sensitive and provocative of the three works is Donald W. Shriver, Jr.'s *Rich Man, Poor Man*, which examines many of the assumptions of our consumer- and consumption-based prosperity. Writing in an engaging style and making frequent use of dialogue, Shriver can alert thoughtful American Christians to the fact that the old Adam has a big share in the unquestioning approval which so many of us give to the

economic status quo as it has developed—so greatly to our personal advantage—since the Depression.

To sum the matter up, the series should prove a useful tool to introduce ethics as a serious discipline of Christian self-examination and reflection, and as an aid to more consciously responsible decision-making. It will not be adequate, however, to make its users aware of the fact that the Bible does contain truly binding precepts and that over a broad range of human activity the difficulty lies not so much in deciding what we ought to do but in doing it. It is weak on biblical content, and while generally compatible with a conservative evangelical understanding of biblical authority, does nothing to make it explicit and foundational. Therefore, unless supplemented by other material which does do this, it will be defective as a guide to Christian living.

The Cosmological Argument, by Bruce R. Reichenbach. (Charles C. Thomas, 1972.) The author is a graduate of Wheaton College with a Ph.D. in philosophy from Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois. Reviewed by Norman L. Geisler, Chairman, Department of Philosophy of Religion, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, Illinois.

After teaching at Trinity College, Deerfield, Illinois, Dr. Reichenbach assumed a position at Augsburg College, Minnesota, where he is currently the chairman of the Department of Philosophy. His book on *The Cosmological Argument* springs out of his doctoral work at Northwestern on this same subject.

The book has 150 pages with index, but the issues covered would take many other writers twice as many pages. It is a closely reasoned and clearly written presentation and defense of the basic argument behind theism. It is the opinion of this reviewer that the book is the best work on the subject by an evangelical thinker since Stuart Hackett's *The Resurrection of Theism* (which is now out of print). Reichenbach's defense of the Cosmological Argument is long over due among evangelicals, especially those well trained in philosophy.

If you are looking for a clear statement and definitive defense of the essential proof for theism, then this is it. Reichenbach meets everyone from Hume and Kant to Bertrand Russell on their own ground in a straight forward and incisive manner. The book is a must for all theologians and philosophers who are disenchanted with straw-man attacks on theism.

This is not the place to enter into minor criticisms. The work is solid, worthy, and should be given serious attention by evangelicals who have too long been under the spell of skepticism presented to them under the guise of presuppositionalism.