

BOOK REVIEWS

A Future for the Historical Jesus. The Place of Jesus in Preaching and Theology. By Leander E. Keck. (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1971.) 265 pages and index. \$6.50. Reviewed by Clark H. Pinnock, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, Illinois.

The author of this luxuriously documented book is professor of New Testament at the divinity school, Vanderbilt University. He believes that the historical Jesus is indispensable to preaching and faith. At the same time, he is engaged in the new quest for Jesus, and concerned to set forth a new place for him in Christian thinking. In the carrying through of his purpose, Dr. Keck supplies the reader with a valuable guided tour of the options and the literature on his subject. He is particularly concerned to explain how we might present Jesus in our day as one whom men may trust. 'Trust' is the key word in this book, and is the category the author believes best captures the kind of response Jesus calls for. Not trust in Jesus as the theanthropic Messiah of historic Christian thought, but trust in the man of Galilee, the parable of God, and the paradigm for men.

Dr. Keck is the kind of form critic who, while not unaware of the great diversity of critical opinion, believes nonetheless that we can get back to the real Jesus. He conducts a careful survey of recent attempts to do just that, and sets his own proposal in the context of the discussion. Jesus is 'a question inducing figure' whom we are invited to trust. One's encounter with his life leads to a re-examination of one's own. Trusting Jesus means making him, the trusted person, the model for our own lives, the lens through which we now comprehend our own existence. Through him also we perceive the character of God. For example, in the cross we understand God to be a God who does not intervene in tragedy, and in the resurrection proclamation (not event) God is seen to vindicate Jesus as a trustworthy person.

Given Keck's critical presuppositions and liberal theological stance, I suppose we can be grateful for these minimal conclusions about the importance of the historical Jesus for faith. But for those to whom the Gospels seem to be deserving of rather more 'trust', they are but crumbs from the table, and fall far short of what it really is to trust Jesus Christ. Although we do indeed trust him as the window into ultimate reality, we find ourselves compelled also to fall down at his feet and worship him. This we cannot and must not do with respect to the historical Jesus of Leander E. Keck.

The Formation of the Resurrection Narratives, by Reginald H. Fuller. (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1971.) Pages xiv plus 225 and

indices. \$6.95. Reviewed by Clark H. Pinnock, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, Illinois.

In a well written and concise book, Professor Fuller seeks to meet what he sees to be a need in New Testament studies, namely, a re-examination of the resurrection narratives making use of form critical and redactional critical tools. His aim is not to smooth out the many inconsistencies he notices in the gospel records, but rather to discover the reasons that gave rise to them in the history of the tradition. Like more conservative scholars, he recognises that historical discrepancies in the biblical texts are an obstacle to faith, but unlike them he supplies a solution characteristic of negative criticism. The form of the book is neat and straight forward. He makes a close exegetical study of the resurrection narratives in what he believes to be their chronological order as documents: 1 Corinthians 15, Mark, Matthew, Luke-Acts, and John.

Fuller breaks with Bultmann on the resurrection. There must have been, he argues, an event over and above Good Friday that gave rise to the Easter faith. Like Bultmann he stresses that the immediate cause of this faith was the appearances of our Lord to the disciples. But he is prepared to go further, and say that the empty tomb is presupposed by them. Even though he holds that the accounts of the discovery of the empty tomb are overlaid with legends (the stone, the angels, the guards, etc), he still believes the core event is factual. The tomb was empty. 'He is not here he is risen!' Like Paul, he wishes to affirm that Jesus in his entire psychomatic existence was transformed and entered into eschatological existence. For this evangelicals ought to applaud the Professor of New Testament at Union Theological Seminary, New York.

However, as a kind of hyper-Paulinist, Fuller finds it necessary to rule out those passages in Luke and John where Jesus is represented as material and tangible. This apologetic motif goes against Paul's interpretation of the resurrection in terms of eschatological existence. At this point, we must demur. Fuller himself stresses resurrection as 'identity-in-transformation'. Why then should we not expect some emphasis on continuity as well as some on discontinuity? No doubt Jesus could materialize at will for the sake of the disciples, so that they might be assured that it was indeed *he* who arose. The logic of Fuller's argument on this subject nullifies somewhat his noble belief in the empty tomb.

One critical opinion is particularly important and interesting. Rather than deny the empty tomb stories as many of his colleagues are inclined to do, Fuller elects to deny the burial accounts! He finds no motive in the women's coming to the tomb on the third day if in fact Jesus had received the full burial described in the Gospels. There would have been no need to have embalmed the body. If one of these stories is to be denied, the burial account or the empty tomb story, we may be grateful Fuller chose the one he did! At the same time we doubt that the discrepancy is insuperable. The question arises in my mind, however, in connection with this and other apparent inconsistencies in the resurrection narratives, where is the book on

this subject by an evangelical scholar, or any orthodox Christian for that matter, which vindicates the Gospel history at the various points where it is presently under attack? It will not do to point to works written when source criticism held the field. We need a volume just like Fuller's is, careful, readable, concise, to turn to in answering such questions as he raises.

Herod Antipas (Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series, Vol. 17), by Harold W. Hoehner. (Cambridge: The University Press, 1972). 437 pp. plus bibliography and appendices. \$22.00. Reviewed by W. Ward Gasque, Regent College, Vancouver, B.C., Canada.

Herod Antipas, called "Herod the tetrarch" in the New Testament (Luke 3:19; 9:7, Matt. 14:1; Acts 13:1) and described by Jesus once as "that fox" (Luke 13:32), was the younger son of Herod the Great by Malthace. After the death of his father, he inherited the Galilaean and Peraean portions of his divided kingdom. He appears on the pages of the Gospels because of his part in the imprisonment and execution of John the Baptist (Mark 6:14-28) and because of his brief encounter with Jesus when He was sent to him by Pilate (Luke 23:7-12).

In spite of the importance of Herod Antipas as the ruler (under Rome) of the domains in which John and our Lord ministered, very little work had been done by scholars on his life and times prior to the publication of the present volume. There were reasons for the neglect—notably the dearth of known facts concerning his life, scarcely extensive enough to provide material for even a brief biography. Still, Hoehner has demonstrated that quite a lot of material exists and that this can be arranged in an orderly manner so as to throw tremendous light on the chronology of Herod Antipas's life, the geography of his realm, the sociology of his time, and his relations with John, Jesus, and Pilate, and thus illuminate the text of the Gospels.

The work at hand is a model of historical scholarship of which it would be difficult to speak too highly. The author provides all students of ancient history, the Bible, and Jewish studies with all they could ever desire to know (and perhaps then some!) concerning his subject. He brings together linguistic data, historical and archaeological information, and literary texts, and discusses them very thoroughly indeed.

The text is carefully documented with extensive footnotes, and there is an excellent bibliography which runs to some forty-five pages. To the main body of the work are attached eleven rather lengthy appendices which deal with matters supplementary to the main discussion. There are also full indices to ancient and modern literature cited, as well as to names and subjects. Externally, the book seems to be remarkably free from typographical errors, a rather rare occurrence these days.

If the author manifests any weakness, it is the tendency to be overly repetitious. There are too many summaries of the preceding material and statements such as "This chapter will discuss..." However, this is a very minor point and detracts little from the value of Hoehner's study. All in all,

it seems safe to say that the author has written what will be the standard work on Herod Antipas for many years to come. By producing this fine work he has brought honor to Dallas Theological Seminary (where he teaches), The Evangelical Theological Society (to which he belongs), and the general cause of Christian scholarship. One may hope that this will be but the first of many worthwhile books from the author's pen.

This monograph should be in every theological seminary or Bible College library; it is well worth the seemingly high price tag placed on it by the publishers.

Essays on Religion and the Ancient World, by Arthur Darby Nock; edited by Zeph Stewart. (Oxford: The University Press, 1972). 1092 pp. plus bibliography and indices. Reviewed by W. Ward Gasque, Regent College, Vancouver, B.C., Canada.

Arthur Darby Nock (1902-1963) was a distinguished professor at Harvard University for many years, generally regarded to be "the world's leading authority on the religion of later antiquity." In spite of his extreme erudition and numerous ambitious projects, he wrote few books. With the exception of his seminal work entitled *Conversion* (1933), his justly famous though slim volume on *St. Paul* (1938), and a long essay on "Early Gentile Christianity and its Hellenistic Background," which was published in book form shortly after his death, his writings, appeared as articles or reviews in numerous technical journals and, therefore, have never been particularly accessible to any but specialists. Now with the appearance of these two volumes so carefully edited by Professor Zeph Stewart and so lavishly produced by Oxford University Press his work is readily available to a much wider audience.

Many of the essays and reviews contained herein will be of interest to the Biblical scholar or the student of early Christianity. Of special interest to the *Neutestamentler* will be the above-mentioned essay on "Early Gentile Christianity," "Paul and the Magos," "the Vocabulary of the New Testament," "Gnosticism," and reviews of M. Dibelius's essays on Acts, H. J. Schoeps on Paul, and E. R. Goodenough on *Jewish Symbols in the Graeco-Roman Period*.

The extent of Nock's interest and expertise is phenomenal. He can write with equal authority on the Christian liturgy and the magical papyri, on Roman religion and Zoroaster, on Mithraism and Egyptian popular religion. Nock is difficult to read: his work is so full of detailed evidence and cautious qualifications that it is necessary to exercise great patience in order to follow the author's train of thought to its conclusion. But the one who "endures to the end" is richly rewarded for his long suffering.

One can learn nearly as much from Nock's example as he can from the actual data provided by his writing. Two lessons stand out as important. First, Nock displays a natural aversion to daring hypotheses and generalizations. (He is said to have remarked that it was hard for him to formulate

any general statement about the ancient world to which he could not think of at least one exception.) His tendencies in this area may have been taken to an extreme and were probably ultimately responsible for the fact that he published so little. They saved him however, from the tendency to confuse progress in scholarship with newness or sensationalism.

The fundamental principle underlying Nock's work was the insistence on context. The question is always asked, "Does the context in which each piece of evidence is found support the interpretation which a given author has suggested?" All the evidence must be brought together and every issue examined in the light of all of the available information. As Stewart points out, Nock had a genius for seeing the relevance of unnoticed evidence. Thus he is not always easy to read, but he is rarely superficial.

An added extra for book reviewers is the gracious spirit which characterizes Nock's criticism of other scholars' writings. He is never nasty, always gentle. His assumption seems to be that young scholars should not be discouraged, while older scholars should be honored for the good work they have done. He never forgets the human element that goes into writing a book. Even if he radically disagrees with an author or finds his work disappointing, he is always willing to see the good features which are present. In short, he practiced the Golden Rule in this sphere, as well as in ordinary life.

In addition to the fifty-eight essays and reviews contained in these two volumes, the editor has included twenty-four memorable *obiter dicta* and a bibliography of his writings. Also useful are the indices of cross-references to his various publications and of books reviewed. The editor has provided us with very full indices to the contents of the two-volumed collection.

The New Testament: The History of the Investigation of Its Problems, by Werner Georg Kummel. Translated by S. MacL. Gilmour and H. C. Kee. (Nashville and New York: Abingdon Press, 1972.) 510 pp. plus biographical appendix. \$10.95. Reviewed by W. Ward Gasque, Regent College, Vancouver, B.C., Canada.

All who are engaged in scholarly study of the New Testament will welcome the appearance in English translation of the revised edition of a work which has long been the standard work in German. It is a comprehensive history of New Testament criticism from its beginnings (primarily, late eighteenth century onwards) and, as such, contains a treasury of information for the serious student and teacher. For those who are not familiar with the main thrusts of Biblical research over the past two centuries, it will prove to be a trustworthy guide through the maze of historical detail and a major source of bibliographical information.

One of the chief values of Kummel's work is that he quotes extensively from the writings of the scholars whose work he is discussing. This does not always make for smooth reading, but it does assure one that the various writers are not being misrepresented. Also useful is the biographical ap-

pendix (pp. 466-98), which provides a brief introduction to the major scholars mentioned and also refers to more extensive evaluations of their works and bibliographies of their writings.

The reader should be aware that Kummel writes from a German Protestant perspective, representing the more radical school of New Testament criticism. This leads him to neglect the work of British scholarship in general and the work of conservative scholars in particular. Thus it would be well to study the similar work by Stephen Neill, *The Interpretation of the New Testament, 1861-1961* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), alongside of Kummel, so as to gain a more balanced perspective. Both volumes should be required reading by any who desire to be engaged in advanced New Testament studies.

The translation seems generally good, the format attractive, and the price reasonable. One only regrets that the unfortunate practice of putting the footnotes at the end of the book was necessary. Still, this is a work to be recommended highly. Both publisher and translators are to be congratulated on the happy idea of making this important work available to a wider, English-speaking audience.