

## BOOK REVIEWS

*Ethics: Alternatives and Issues*, by Norman L. Geisler. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 1971.) 270 pages. \$6.95. Reviewed by Harold B. Kuhn, Asbury Theological Seminary, Wilmore, Kentucky.

A study of titles of recent books in Christian Ethics reveals that the central issue facing the ethicist of our day is that of the basis for moral authority. To locate and substantiate authoritative norms for belief and action has always posed problems; but these problems seem to proliferate as the electronic media bring instant and worldwide information. To visualize the world's cultural differences tempts many to the easy solution—that all things, behavior included, are totally relative.

The volume, *Ethics: Alternatives and Issues*, addresses itself primarily to the problem of ethical norms and their justification. The author opts for "norms" rather than "ends" early in the discussion, and considers in turn the manner in which a normative ethic has been treated in recent times. Included in his investigation are, especially, the following: situationism, generalism, the several variant forms of universalism, alternate forms of idealism, and hierarchicalism. These are considered largely within the context of the question, What Is Man?, with a view to discovering parallels between that which will serve to human self-realization, on the one hand, and the mandates of the Biblical revelation on the other.

In Part II (Chapters 8-14), our author turns to the treatment of a number of empirical issues which are "alive" in our time. Building upon his conclusion derived from the discussions of Part I, that the Christian ethical stance is best understood in terms of "the hierarchical arrangement of the many relationships of love," (p. 137), he seeks to discover the appropriate attitudes of the Christian toward war, toward social responsibility, toward sex, toward contraception, toward euthanasia, and toward man's environment on this moist, blue spaceship Earth.

Beginning with the Biblical mandate to self-love, Professor Geisler moves into the areas just noted, attempting to show that the individual acts in legitimate self-interest when he assumes valid social postures. The use of Scripture in these chapters or the author's conclusions may not please all Evangelicals. To this reviewer, it seems that our author has used scriptural texts carefully, with a due regard for the *rightness* of God's creation, and for the dignity of persons and of personhood. He has attempted fearlessly to think through areas of perplexity, and to suspend judgment in cases in which the evidence is only partly available.

Parts of the volume are not easy reading. Some will have a bit of intellectual difficulty with such expressions as "conflicting universal norms," or his definition of Generalism as a mode in which "there are no universal norms." But these are largely semantic questions; and the author's explanations serve to clarify his meanings. The reader will, as he comes to the close of the work, appreciate the emphasis upon the strength of the obligations which fall upon man as a result of himself being the crowning creation of a Maker who has also given him an environment which is intended to be and to be kept as "good." This is a valuable contribution to Evangelical literature in general, and to the ethical endeavors of evangelicals in particular.

*The Stones and the Scriptures*, by Edwin M. Yamauchi. (Philadelphia, Pa.: J. P. Lippincott Co., 1972.) 207 pp. \$5.95. Reviewed by Charles Lee Feinberg, Dean and Professor of Semitics and Old Testament, Talbot Theological Seminary.

Dr. Edwin M. Yamauchi, Assistant Professor of History at Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, is known in Near Eastern studies for his careful and scholarly work reflected in books and journals. This work, though quite compact, will not disappoint the reader who has come to expect a high standard from the author.

His evaluation of the function of archaeology in biblical interpretation (pp. 19 ff) is a sane and valid one. He claims, "Far more than our need of these materials for an understanding of the Bible is our need of the Bible for an understanding of materials" (p. 21). The aim of his work is succinctly stated at the outset as well as his theological stance (p. 26). In view of his known and committed alignment to the conservative school of O.T. scholarship, it is somewhat disappointing to read of his broad characterizations of the fundamentalist movement (pp. 22-25). It is time orthodox men cease making fundamentalism the whipping boy; let it not be wounded in the house of its friends.

Now for specifics, Dr. Yamauchi prefers for the patriarchal accounts the early Middle Bronze Age on substantial evidence (pp. 36-37).

His discussion of anachronisms is good (pp. 40-42), and his solution of the early mention of the Philistines in Genesis is plausible (pp. 45-46). On the knotty matter of the date of the Exodus the writer opts for the 1270 B.C. (late date) with an acceptance of Kitchen's reconciliation of I Kings 6:1 with the archaeological data (p. 50). Wisely, he leaves a final decision as to biblical Ai in abeyance until further data are forthcoming (pp. 60-62). His refutation of Morton Smith's late dating of the Psalms is cogent (p. 66).

He manifests a commendable willingness to revise old views on the basis of new evidence (Rothenberg and Tell el-Kheleifeh dates, pp. 69, 180). Dogmatism is avoided on the location of Ophir (p. 70).

A few items are puzzling. How could Daniel and Ezekiel be in the same deportation (p. 82)? How could the block of a donkey's path by rubble in the 5th century B.C. be "vividly illustrated" by Miss Kenyon's recent excavations (p. 86)? Does Daniel 4:32 not refer to Nebuchadnezzar and not Nabonidus (p. 89)?

Conciseness marks the work throughout. Here is a beautiful work of condensation of the results of excavations and their relevance for the biblical period. The bibliography and footnotes show wide reading. Dr. Yamauchi's research is current and to the point (witness his treatment of the problem of Darius the Mede, pp. 87, 88). A number of bibliographic entries are from 1970, and current journal literature (1971) is included. Helpful illustrations and four indexes add to the usefulness of the volume.

A reverent and devout approach to the Bible is evidenced throughout. Hear the last sentences of the work (pp. 165-166): "Archaeology may show us the nature of Christ's tomb. But it can never be a substitute for that personal faith which carries the believer beyond the empty tomb to a living relationship with the Christ who today sits at the right hand of the Father." The worth of the book far exceeds its modest size. It will be found useful to student and teacher alike.

*The Morality Gap*, by Erwin W. Lutzer. (Chicago: Moody Press, 1972.) 125 pp. \$1.95. Reviewed by Dr. Norman L. Geisler, Chairman of Department of Philosophy of Religion, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, Illinois.

This book is commended by Gordon Clark in the Foreword and by John Montgomery on the back cover. It is a brief but good critique of Fletcher's situation ethic, but it lacks in understanding of other Christian alternatives and in internal consistency. In these latter regards the book defends the view that the Christian is held guilty for doing an evil and must confess it to God when he chooses the lesser evil in an unavoidable moral conflict. Lutzer completely neglects the possibility that all moral conflicts are only apparent but not real. He argues only with the Greatest Good view (called Hierarchicalism) which holds that men are not morally guilty for doing their best in a conflict moral situation. The following analysis will reveal the biblical and logical weakness of Lutzer's position.

- I. Premises Lutzer's Lesser Evil view holds in common with the Greatest Good view.
  - A. Premises relating to moral absolutes.
    1. There are many moral absolutes (p. 98).
    2. These absolutes are normative for Christians (ch. 8).
    3. There are two sources of these absolutes: Scripture and Natural Law (100).
    4. Scripture is more complete and explicit than Natural Law (84).
    5. There are no exceptions to God's moral laws (96, 105).

6. Moral laws are not arbitrary but are rooted in God's nature (87, 112).
- B. Premises relating to the conflict of moral laws.**
1. Actual conflicts between moral laws are rare but some are real (ch. 9).
  2. Many conflicts result from previous sins (108, 109).
  3. Christians should make sure the conflict is real and not merely apparent (i.e., he should always look for third alternatives—Implied).
  4. When there is a real conflict one is morally obligated to do his best (58, 105-108).
  5. A man is not morally responsible for doing what is unavoidable (108, 112).
  6. One is not morally responsible for doing what was unintentional (106, 192).
- C. Premises relating to what should be done in conflict situations.**
1. Not all sins and virtues are equal (there are greater goods and evils—102, 107).
  2. God sometimes suspends moral laws which He has established (101).
  3. Men are never justified in intentionally breaking a moral law as such (96, 105).
  4. The end does not justify the means in moral matters for man (88, 104).
- D. Premises relating to Christ and moral conflicts.**
1. Christ never sinned (112).
  2. Christ faced all the kinds of moral situations we face (111, 112).
  3. Christ, like other men, was not responsible for unavoidable moral conflicts (112).
- II. Crucial premises held by Greater Good view but not by Lutzer's Lesser Evil view.**
- A. No guilt results from not keeping a lower moral law in order to keep a higher moral law in an unavoidable moral conflict (58, 106).
  - B. The sinlessness of Christ is incompatible with the Lesser Evil view (111).
  - C. Moral responsibility of men is incompatible with the Lesser Evil view (ch. 9).
- III. The reasons the Lesser Evil view does not follow from its own premises**
- A. The reason no guilt follows from not keeping a lower law in order to keep a higher moral law (based on the premises of the Lesser Evil view).
    1. Some moral laws are higher than others (102, 107).

2. Moral laws sometimes come into real unavoidable conflict (ch. 9).
  3. One is morally bound to keep the higher when there is a real conflict (58, 106).
  4. Men are not morally responsible for what is unavoidable (108, 112).
  5. Not keeping a lower law in order to keep a higher law is sometimes unavoidable (this follows from 2-4).
  6. Therefore, men are not morally responsible for not keeping a lower moral law when it unavoidably conflicts with a higher moral law.
  7. The Lesser Evil view holds that men are morally responsible for not keeping the lower moral law and must confess their sin (58, 106).
  8. Therefore, the Lesser Evil view is wrong (according to its own premises).
- B. The reason Christ could not be sinless if Lesser Evil view is true.
1. Christ faced all the kinds of moral situations which we face (otherwise He would not be our complete moral example—111, 112).
  2. We face moral situations where sin is unavoidable (i.e., where the lesser evil must be done—58, 106).
  3. Therefore, Christ faced moral situations where sin was unavoidable.
  4. But Christ never sinned (112).
  5. Therefore, Lesser Evil view cannot be true, for if it were then either—
    - a. Christ would not be our complete moral example (which it says He is), or
    - b. Christ is not guilty for doing the same thing other men are guilty for doing (which is a double morality invoked to save Christ's sinlessness).
- C. The reason moral responsibility is incompatible with the Lesser Evil view.
1. No one is morally responsible for what he could not avoid doing (108, 112).
  2. Lesser Evil view holds that sin is sometimes unavoidable (58, 106).
  3. Therefore, Lesser Evil view is incompatible with moral responsibility.

There are two ways out of these dilemmas for the Lesser Evil view: (1) Deny that it is really evil to not keep a lower law in an unavoidable conflict (and thus accept the Greater Good view), and (2) Repudiate the premise that one is not morally responsible for what is unavoidable (108, 112) and thus give up the doctrine of moral responsibility.

## IV. Some internal inconsistencies in the Lesser Evil view.

- A. Regarding the unavoidability of conflicts resulting from previous sins, it says
  - 1. The majority of conflicts arise because of previous sins (107, 109), and
  - 2. Unavoidability is *only* because of previous sin (112).
- B. Regarding exceptions to moral laws, the Lesser Evil view holds—
  - 1. Moral laws have no exceptions (96, 105), and
  - 2. God does make exceptions to moral laws (101, 106).
- C. Regarding the basis for moral laws, it affirms—
  - 1. Moral laws are rooted in God's nature and not merely His will (87, 112), and
  - 2. God can change a moral law if He wishes to do so (87).
- D. Regarding human decision in moral conflicts, it declares—
  - 1. Sometimes both alternatives are unavoidably evil (58, 106), and
  - 2. One is morally obligated to do the lesser *evil* (i.e., one is morally obligated to do evil—47, 58, 105-108).
- E. Regarding the consequences of moral acts, it says—
  - 1. Christian ethics is not performed with a view to how persons are affected (52, 104), and
  - 2. Evil acts are wrong because they affect persons (108).
- F. Regarding judging ethical systems, it holds—
  - 1. Ethical systems should not be judged by their results (36), and
  - 2. He judges Situationism because it produces an unstable social order (64).
- G. Regarding similarity in practice of ethical systems, it affirms—
  - 1. Similarity in practice does not mean similarity in principle (9), and
  - 2. It lumps with Situationism a view only similar to some practices (103-105, 110).
- H. Regarding Natural Moral Law, it contends—
  - 1. God has written a moral law on the hearts of all men (100), and
  - 2. There is a "radical difference" in men's understanding of moral law (99).
- I. Regarding the Greatest Good view, it says—
  - 1. It is absolute and normative (98, 99), and
  - 2. It is utilitarian and decides on its own values (100, 104, 105).
- J. Regarding morality and intention, it holds—
  - 1. A man is wrong if he intends to do evil but does not do it (92), and
  - 2. Abraham was not wrong because he did not follow through on his intention to kill Isaac (101).
- K. Regarding the suspension of moral laws, it claims—
  - 1. To "suspend" is merely verbally different from to "break," which is wrong (102),

2. And yet it admits that God suspends moral laws for men without guilt (101).

L. Regarding acting in view of higher moral norms, it insists—

1. The Bible nowhere approves of men acting in view of higher norms (101), and

2. Men are morally obligated to do their best and God sometimes acts for higher reasons to suspend a lower moral law (102, 107).

M. Regarding the number of absolute positions in ethics, he declares—

1. There are two views: Greater Good and Lesser Evil (97, 103), and

2. It refers to the Lesser Evil view as “*the absolutist*” position (111) [Emphasis added].

III. Some questionable premises implied in the Lesser Evil view.

A. Morality is appropriately modeled after the rules of a game (38, 89)

B. Unsaved men have no desire to love God (84). See Romans 7:15, 18, 22).

C. One is not blameworthy for not preventing a murder by falsifying (110). Cf. James 4:12.

D. A one norm absolutism is a logically contradictory view (62).

E. Even atheists live according to what they know as ultimate value (100).

IV. Some premises wrongly attributed to the Greatest Good view by Lutzer.

A. Man decides ultimate norms “on his own” (100).

B. Adultery is morally justifiable to get out of prison (109).

C. Every form of evil can be justified on a Greatest Good view (104).

D. Men decide on their own when to override lower norms (105).

E. Choosing a lesser evil is really a good (100).

F. It is sometimes morally right to break a moral law intentionally (97-98).

G. Christian martyrs should have denied God to save their lives (103).

All of these premises are denied by the Greatest Good position. But Lutzer attributes them wrongly to that position. In view of all the foregoing criticisms one can only conclude that Lutzer not only misunderstands the Christian alternative he attacks but that he actually holds that position himself. One thing is clear: Lutzer cannot get his conclusion from his premises, not logically anyway.

*How Dependable is the Bible*, by Raymond F. Surburg. (Philadelphia and New York: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1972.) 204 pp. \$5.95. Reviewed by Leon Morris, Ridley College, Melbourne, Australia.

This is one of the volumes in the *Evangelical Perspectives* series, a series which the general editor, John Warwick Montgomery, tells us takes

historic Christian theology with full seriousness and shows it to be "compatible with the best of contemporary scholarship" (p. 6). Dr. Surburg has an important theme and the question in his title is one that we must all face sooner or later. This book will give useful guidance to the general reader who does not wish to go into the problems very deeply. It certainly pulls no punches and Dr. Surburg leaves us in no doubt but that he finds the Bible completely dependable.

Unfortunately much of the treatment is too short, not to say superficial. Perhaps the author tries to do too much and in the limited space at his command he cannot deal adequately with the questions that arise. For example, when he introduces the Synoptic problem Dr. Surburg refers to it as "the dominant critical issue" but gets rid of it in one sentence (which he follows with one on the fourth Gospel which seems to be part of the same problem; p. 26). He returns to the problem later (pp. 141 f.), but has little more than a page on it. The Synoptic problem is too serious and too complex to be dealt with in such a fashion. Unfortunately other problems receive similar abbreviated treatment. The book would be a better one if it tackled fewer issues and went into them more deeply.

This book will be useful then to those who want a thoroughly dependable evangelical presentation of the case for the reliability of Scripture. But it will not satisfy those who are looking for a real grappling with the issues.

*Heshbon 1968: the First Campaign at Tell Hesban, a Preliminary Report*, by Roger S. Boraas and Siegfried H. Horn. (Berrien Springs, Michigan: Andrews University Press, 1969). 143 pp. plus viii and 16 plates. Reviewed by J. Barton Payne, Covenant Theological Seminary, St. Louis, Missouri.

Boraas and Horn are to be commended for carrying out a professional responsibility promptly and well. Far too often the enthusiasm of archaeologists for their digging has not been reflected by a corresponding dedication to making the results of their excavations available in an adequate printed form (or to reviewers in getting out prompt reviews). Here, however, a year after their first season of field work, the Andrews University Heshbon Expedition has not simply published; it has published three times. First came a semi-popular and yet full survey in the *Biblical Archaeologist*, XXXII:2, pp. 26-41 (May, 1969); then, the details in the *Andrews University Seminary Studies*, VII:2 (July); and finally, the book under review, which was printed by Brill in Leiden but constitutes *Andrews University Monographs*, Vol. II (still in 1969). Actually it is reprinted from the *Studies*, with even the same page numbers (starting p. 97, on to p. 239); similarly, the plates from from X to XXV. Yet for those whose interest goes beyond BA's analysis, and for whom the AUSS may not be available, these preliminary field reports form a welcome resource volume.

Tell Hesban is located 15 miles southwest of Amman in Transjordan and is best known as the site of Biblical Heshbon, the capital city of the



Amorite King, Sihon, who was overcome by Moses just before Israel's conquest of Canaan. Yet Siegfried Horn's digging in 1968 primarily involved late (Arab) occupation levels, and only in the Area B sounding did it get as far down (= back) as Persian period (Iron III) remains. Pottery fragments, however, include Iron II, Iron I, and Late Bronze. The bulk of the *Heshbon 1968* volume consists of summaries by Horn's four area supervisors. At the peak of the mound Area A produced a significant basilica-church of the 6th Christian century, tentatively reconstructed in Fig. 7a (opp. p. 160). From Area D (south edge of acropolis) came a well valued Arab structure (p. 198), from C (west slope) a potsherd with a clear Latin stamp of the manufacturer (p. 141), and from B an ostrakon from 500 B.C., containing a list of names and analyzed by F. M. Cross (pp. 223-229).

The two questions of greatest interest to Biblical scholars are, per force, only hinted at in the present study and are related to the site's inadequate water supplies for significant habitation, prior to the development of cisterns: (a) whether Heshbon was first founded by Sihon (suggested in *IDB*, II:596) or was previously Moabite and taken over by the Amorite conqueror (favored by Horn, p. 88; cf. *BA*, 32 (1969), 28); and (b) how far back into the LB age, urban transjordanian settlement does extend. But this is the story approached by the digs that came after 1968.

*Deuteronomy: The Gospel of Love*, by Samuel J. Schultz. "Everyman's Bible Commentary." (Chicago: Moody Press, 1971.) 123 pp. plus notes and bibliography. Paper, 95c. Reviewed by Wallace Alcorn, Moody Bible Institute, Chicago.

When the editors of Moody Press asked Samuel Schultz to write the volume on Deuteronomy for their "Everyman's Bible Commentary" series, they knew what they were doing because he not only has mastered the book but has come to understand what is necessary to inspire appreciation for it. Everyman's Bible Commentary (only two New Testament volumes still due and ten Old Testament volumes completed) are small paperbacks selling for under \$1. Intended for mass distribution to a general conservative readership, the treatments are non-technical and the language and arguments simple. Recent volumes have been written by men recognized for their scholarship in the material covered and the present work offers introductory material far more adequate than many of the earlier releases. This is a fine approach to Deuteronomy to use in local churches and other non-academic situations where depth must be limited.

It offers distinct help to the scholar, nonetheless, by its example of a creative use of the material. Schultz has recently indicated that his teaching of Old Testament survey to undergraduates at Wheaton College has undergone a marked transformation since he began to introduce them to Old Testament studies by using Deuteronomy as a summary of the Old Testament in a form most meaningful to those who lack an appreciation for it because of preoccupation with the New Testament. Thus he feels it appropriate to call the book "The Gospel of Love."

His description of the documentary theory seems disproportionate to both his critique of it and his exposition of the text. Yet this may be due to a conviction that such is best introduced in regard to this book which is itself an introduction to Old Testament study.

He says what must be said about the text and manages to do so in the brief space available in a work of this sort. He makes sufficient use of the suzerainty analogy to make clear the unique character of the book and yet does not confuse the reader with unnecessary technicalities about it.

Everyman's Bible Commentary is the better because of Schultz on Deuteronomy. This book can be used with lay groups with the confidence that it is simple enough to be understood and of help and yet not oversimplified to the point of being inaccurate.

*Mark, and II Corinthians, Self-Study Guides*, by Irving L. Jensen. (Chicago: Moody Press, 1972.) Each 112 pp. Reviewed by Larry Richards, Wheaton College Graduate School, Wheaton, Illinois.

These self-study guides are a cut above similar recent books, particularly in their careful attention to the development of the argument of sections and passages. They challenge serious study of the text, rather than invite to an "easy" but superficial exploration. Yet the approach falls short of the promised excellence for group or class study, by consistently focusing on the conceptual "how do you think." This is a serious drawback, because the genius of group or class Bible study is probing to relate God's Word to the experiences and needs of the participants. Thus "how do you experience" a problem or promise dealt with in a passage becomes more vital than what do you "think" about the issue raised. An adequate book for group study must guide the members into joint sharing of their lives and experiences in the light shed by Scripture. . . and the discussion questions provided here fall short of providing this guidance. If you are looking for an approach that helps develop a grasp of the content of a book of the Bible, these study guides are highly recommended. If you are looking for an approach that helps bring the meaning of a book of the Bible in to the life of the learner, look elsewhere.

*Luke: Historian and Theologian*, by I. Howard Marshall. (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan Publishing House, 1971.) 222 pp. and indices. Reviewed by Gilbert Bilezikian, Trinity College, Deerfield, Illinois.

Except for the specialist, the field of Gospels criticism often suggests some remote and futile battle where potentially momentous issues are disputed without ever being settled. After nearly two centuries of critical inquiry in Christian origins, the Synoptic Gospels remain at the forefront of New Testament research—but as of now, not without the prospect of significant breakthroughs. Until recently, Synoptic studies consisted mainly of minute analysis of the first three Gospels in order to unravel the incredibly complex web of literary connections which bind them together. Even

before it became evident that such efforts would remain inconclusive, the attention of scholars had turned to another approach by focusing on source-analysis rather than on literary interdependence. Although this discipline (called form-criticism) found broad acceptance, it failed to resolve the questions left unanswered by the literary-critical approach. In fact, it contributed problems of its own, not the least of them in the area of basic methodology.

However, since the mid-fifties, a sort of McLuhanesque revolution has been shaking the world of New Testament scholarship, thus opening a new front of investigation. Realizing the inadequacy of the rigid and dissective methods of source-criticism, a number of scholars began to regard the Gospels as integral documents reflecting both the theological identity of their authors (called redactors), and the needs, interests and beliefs of ambient Christian communities for which the Gospels were written. The advantages of this method (known as redaction-criticism) are obvious. The Gospels are no more subjected *ipso facto* to ruthless fragmentation and their component parts wrenched from their framework to be analyzed on the basis of debatable critical presuppositions. An attempt is now made to view them as authentic expressions of the faith of early believers seen as specific individuals writing within the context of the theological milieu to which the Gospels were originally destined. Obviously, it is possible to undertake such a task on the basis of negative assumptions and to assess subjectively the amount of redactional manipulation which the Jesus-story has allegedly undergone in order to serve the cause of faith. But it is also possible to use the methods of redaction-criticism to define the distinctive traits of the theologies reflected in the documents of the New Testament without minimizing the relevance of the historical events which fostered them.

It is precisely to such a task that Dr. I. Howard Marshall, a British Methodist minister and Lecturer in New Testament Exegesis in the University of Aberdeen, has devoted this volume. After surveying the results of the modern approach to Luke-Acts, he commends the valuable contributions it makes to our knowledge of the New Testament in the recognition of the distinctive significance of each Gospel and a concern for the recovery of early Christian traditions through the examination of successive levels of transmission. But he also takes exception to the radical views espoused by practitioners of the redaction-critical method from Conzelmann to Haenchen, such as the salvation-history concept and existential interpretations of the Gospel message. His corrective emphasis stems from a careful definition of the relation of history to faith. He argues that, according to Luke and to the early church, there is no necessary conflict between these two concepts, and that Christian faith is based upon historically verifiable events. The author is therefore willing to take Luke seriously as a historian but without denying the fact that Luke was regarding history from a distinct theological perspective.

Luke's key theological motif is defined as the concept of salvation

revealed in the historical events of the person and ministry of Jesus. Since Luke's theology of salvation finds its derivation in the historical data available to him, the author states that the evangelist was generally conservative in his use of tradition. It is essentially at this point that Marshall parts company with redaction-critical scholars who "emphasize the individuality of an author against the sources which he used." Against them, Marshall claims that "Luke was basically faithful to the traditions which he was using; he was drawing out motifs already present in them rather than radically reshaping the material and adding to it from his own ideas" (p. 212).

This work constitutes an excellent introduction to the latest developments in New Testament investigation. It reads like a tranquil disquisition based on solid erudition and, unlike the work of scholars of less conservative orientation often characterized by a certain shrillness of tone, it comes through as a refreshingly non-doctrinaire piece of work. It provides the evangelical student with an effective, although somewhat succinct critique of tendentious assumptions often upheld as the *sine qua non* condition for respectability and acceptance in redaction-critical research. Hopefully, it opens the way to evangelical scholars for application to other parts of the New Testament of the method of redaction-criticism which may prove to be an instrument particularly well-suited for the vindication of the integrity of the basic documents of the Christian faith. This battle is neither remote nor futile.

*A Society Ordained by God. English Puritan Marriage Doctrine in the First Half of the Seventeenth Century*, by James Turner Johnson. (New York, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1970.) 219 pp. Reviewed by John H. Gerstner, Professor of Church History, Pittsburgh Theological Seminary.

Johnson sees significant development in Puritan thinking between 1600 and 1650, from Perkins to Milton. Beginning with a description of the general Puritan viewpoint, he shows its divergence from the Augustinian and Medieval. Puritanism accepted the three traditional Augustinian purposes of marriage: namely, *fides*, *proles*, and *sacramentum*. It tended, however, to drop the third and place most emphasis on the first (considering it as fellowship or companionship and elevating its priority in marriage above procreation which the Roman Catholic church made most fundamental). This stress on companionship, with God's love as the necessary grace for such, later Puritans, such as Gataker, stressed still more until Milton made it so fundamental that its absence virtually annulled marriage and justified divorce. Milton was not altogether antinomian, according to Johnson, because he maintained the necessity of laws as channels for human good including matrimonial good.

The book is well written, neatly structured, and hugging the primary documents, (although the author does not indicate clearly enough that he is only sampling the Puritan literature). It is dispassionate in tone, neither praising nor damning, and heavily analytical in method. While

analysis is a distinguishing feature of the volume still it is in this area that the author, perhaps too charmed by his own virtuosity, fails, at time crucially. We note a few examples. Gataker's emphasizing equality of husband and wife before God is supposed to militate against the hierarchical structure but deeper analysis would show that equality has to do with nature while hierarchy has to do with function (p. 98). Johnson finds it to be a "short step" from Perkins' love in Marriage to Milton's no love, no marriage; but, this overlooks the vast difference between the *esse* and the *bene esse* of marriage (p. 90). Again, the subordination of procreation in marriage does not mean that it is dispensable (p. 115). Apparently, Johnson thinks that because Perkins says that God gives love, God does not command it (p. 118).

In general, this is a useful work covering an area not previously examined in even this much detail, but its subtitle is seriously **misleading**—"English Puritan Marriage Doctrine in the First Half of the Seventeenth Century"—because in no satisfactory way can Milton be considered truly "Puritan." Even if he could be, his teaching on marriage represents a virtual rejection of the Puritan doctrine contrary to all the recognized Puritans of the first and the second half of the seventeenth century. The argument by which Johnson tries to prove otherwise, while strenuous, scholarly, and objective is, as we tried to indicate above, inconclusive.

*Elijah: Confrontation, Conflict, and Crisis*, by Howard Hendricks. (Chicago: Moody Press, 1972.) 64 pp. Paperback, \$1.00. Reviewed by S. Herbert Bess, Grace Theological Seminary, Winona Lake, Indiana.

The professor of Christian Education at Dallas Theological Seminary has given us five studies from the experiences of the prophet Elijah. His chapters are: (1) *Elijah in Confrontation*, which dwells on the bold appearance of the prophet before King Ahab to predict the ensuing drought, (2) *Elijah in Concealment*, concerning his period of hiding at the brook Cherith, (3) *Elijah in Conflict*, dealing with the contest in the Baal prophets on Mt. Carmel, (4) *Elijah in Communication*, which centers on his prayer life, and (5) *Elijah in Crisis*, which reflects on the prophet's flight upon Jezebel's threat against his life.

This is not a biography of Elijah, nor is it an expository treatment of the full text relating the above-mentioned events. It appears rather to be a series of five sermons on these events, possibly edited from recordings. These abound with good illustrations drawn for the most part from Professor Hendricks' personal experiences.

The author has drawn many spiritual lessons from the record of the prophet's life that are instructive and encouraging. This devotional work is especially appropriate reading for the pastor, or other Christian worker, but of little use to the Biblical scholar.

*The Love Command in the New Testament*, by Victor Paul Furnish. (Nashville and New York: Abingdon Press, 1972. 240 pp.; appendix pp. 219-23 "New Testament words for Love." Index of passages; index of modern authors. \$6.95. Reviewed by Wilber B. Wallis, Covenant Theological Seminary, St. Louis, Missouri.

Professor Furnish has singled out for special emphasis the "love command," as the title of his book indicates: "...in the New Testament love never loses its character as a sovereign command" (footnote, p. 215). There appears to be an absolutizing of the love command: It remains a command, standing "over every 'ethical system'..." (p. 215).

In contrast to the view of John Murray that "...the Pauline statement, "Love is the fulfillment of the law [means] that love *requires* that *all the statutes* of the law be obeyed...", Furnish sets his interpretation of Paul and John: "...the concept of obedience itself is radicalized in such a way that it no longer has reference to the believer's relation to *the law*, but to the claim of God which is normatively encountered not in the body of the law but in the person and work of Jesus Christ" (p. 200). Furnish is even able to say that the "double commandment" of Deuteronomy 6:4, 5, "...is clearly regarded within the Synoptic traditions as the criterion and measure by which the law itself, with all its various commandments, is to be judged..." (p. 200).

Furnish aims at an "...understanding of what the theological bases were upon which the earliest church's ethical teaching was founded and the way it went about interpreting and applying its gospel in daily life..." (p. 215).

The author's handling of "the great commandment" in Mark 12:28-34 illustrates his method of exegesis and his conception of the "theological bases" of the early church.

Furnish says that "...whatever fleeting glimpses of Jesus' own words may come, will come as by-products of our exegesis which as such, can only be of texts which are already *interpreting* Jesus' teaching in the light of the Easter faith" (p. 23).

Furnish argues that the Marcan section 12:28-34 is especially designed to show that "...what is important for true religion is belief in and worship of the one true God and obedience to the moral law, not religious ceremony or cultic performance..." (p. 29). He thinks that when the scribe reformulated Jesus' answer, he introduced an entirely new element, so that "...the Great Commandment is now deliberately and emphatically assessed as "much more [important] than all whole burnt offerings and sacrifices..." (p. 28). Hence the Marcan version has been formulated for apologetic purposes, and this formulation had been accomplished already before Mark and was taken over by him (p. 30).

I think that this reading of the Great Commandment is quite banal. Furnish's interpretative word "important" is inadequate. Jesus' criticism

was not against the cult as such, but the *legalistic* performance of it. Hence, Jesus said, "Unless your righteousness far exceeds that of the Pharisees and scribes, you shall not enter the kingdom of heaven." How shall we have a righteousness for exceeding that of scribe and Pharisee? Jesus' analysis of the legalistic position was that it "...neglected the weightier provisions of the law; justice, mercy, and faithfulness..." (Matt. 23:23). This is a more profound and ethical analysis, and a true indictment of legalism. We surely can make no headway in understanding the New Testament unless we see that Judaism did indeed hold to an *ex opere operato* theory of the cult worship. What had dawned on the scribe of Mark 12 was the radical supernaturalism in the command to love God and neighbor in the sense intended by Moses and Jesus Christ. As Paul said: "Circumcision is of value, if you practice the law; but if you are a transgressor of the Law, your circumcision has become uncircumcision" (Rom. 2:25). Hence the radical misreading of the narrative, making love for God and neighbor "more important" than sacrifice is not to the point. What was needed was a whole new religious theory—a new soteriological principle—not simply that one should love God and neighbor *instead of* doing sacrifice, but that serving God and neighbor *and* sacrificing should be done *in love*. "...And if I give all my possessions to feed the poor, and if I deliver my body to be burned, but do not have love, it profits me nothing" (I Cor. 13:3). It is the absence of love, the neglect of the weightier matters, which makes the offering of sacrifice or any service, legalism. It is the old issue between a religion of merit and a religion of grace.

Furnish's failure to state the merit-grace issue clearly is paralleled by his failure to understand Paul's method in Romans and Galatians (p. 110). It is true that the first half of the double commandment is missing in Romans 13 where love for the neighbors is being discussed, but the equivalent of the first command is discussed in Romans 10. I think it is highly significant that Romans 10 is not mentioned at all in Furnish's treatment. He has not seen that the real demand of Moses in Deuteronomy 6:4, 5 is reiterated in Deuteronomy 30:11-14 at the conclusion of the farewell address. This concluding emphatic treatment, where Moses himself disavows legalism, the contemplated performance of some great deed of self-salvation to gain merit before God, is analyzed by Paul in clear parallelism to the great commandment of Deuteronomy 6:4, 5. "If you confess with your mouth Jesus as Lord, and believe in your heart that God raised Him from the dead, you will be saved." Hence the very format of Romans is geared to the logic of the great double command: chapters 1-11 analyze and answer the question what must I do to be saved, and chapters 12-16 answer the question, how shall a Christian live. The great double command answers both questions in terms of the supernaturalism of the Gospel.

Furnish says, "... It is surprising that Paul here [Galatians 5-6] makes no reference to Jesus' teaching and makes no use of the Great Commandment as such. The commandment to 'love God' (Deut. 6:5) is not cited here or anywhere else in the Pauline letters..." (p. 97). On the contrary, the parallel is cited and carefully analyzed by Paul. Paul declares that

his message is the same as Moses', and constructively, the same as Jesus'. Moses, Jesus and Paul saw the gospel in the demand to acknowledge the unique Lordship of Jehovah and to submit one's whole life (including trusting in Him) to Him.

*The Love Command in the New Testament* is an ably-written book. It is an important book. It is rather clearly a radical re-reading of the New Testament in anthropological terms. To set the love command above the law and over every ethical system is indeed to reinterpret radically and to make our mystical experience of "the claim of God which is normatively encountered not in the body of the law but in the person and work of Jesus Christ" the "theological basis" of our ethical life. John said quite the opposite: "By this we know that we love the children of God, when we love God and observe His Commandments" (I John 5:3).

*Form Criticism of the Old Testament*, by Gene M. Tucker. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971.) 84 pp. \$2.50. Reviewed by R. K. Harrison, Wycliffe College, University of Toronto.

This booklet forms part of the *Guides to Biblical Scholarship* series, which aims to introduce readers to modern methods of biblical study. In the main the author expounds Gunkel's views on form-criticism, and shows how they have been accepted by some other scholars. However, the work is not a critical investigation, and therefore the author appears blissfully unaware of the limitations of Gunkel's approach as pointed out by Freedman and others.

Equally serious is the fact that advances in form-criticism since Gunkel's day are completely ignored. Thus the author seemingly does not know that Deuteronomy can now be assessed form-critically in the light of second millennium B.C. Hittite international treaties, or that Genesis provides an ideal starting-point for form-critical study in terms of a group of underlying Mesopotamian-type tablets which can be recognized strictly according to their form.

As a guide to Gunkel's pioneering efforts this booklet is informative. As an introduction to Old Testament form-criticism, however, it is woefully deficient.

*Old Testament Theology: Basic Issues in the Current Debate*, by Gerhard F. Hasel (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972.) 95 pages plus a bibliography and index. Paper, \$1.95. Reviewed by Walter C. Kaiser, Jr., Associate Professor of Old Testament, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, Ill.

This book had to be written! With the future of the whole discipline of Biblical Theology at stake and the obviously pessimistic mood of current Old Testament theologians, it was time for a succinct reassessment of where the discipline had been and where it was headed. While the novice to the field may be slightly bewildered by the apparent plethora of names,



positions, and intertwined issues, all others must admire the positive benefits which can be derived from this shrewd, terse and at times brilliant analysis of some extremely complicated matters.

Four of the book's five chapters deal with Old Testament Theology's most sensitive areas: (1) methodology, (2) history, (3) center (German *Mitte*) or unifying point, and (4) relationship between the testaments. Each chapter is a masterpiece of concise statement and brief evaluation. They usually center around the leading personality on each issue. For example, while finding five different methods of doing Old Testament Theology (Descriptive, Confessional, Cross-Section, Diachronic and New Testament Quotation), he rightly draws attention to the bifurcation espoused by Krister Stendahl which separates what the text "meant" from what it presently "means" to us. Hasel allows B. S. Childs to put the torch to this view and Evangelicals must sit up and take note of these important criticisms before they fall into the identical trap of the Descriptive method. In my opinion, this is the most crucial question in the modern era for hermeneutics, exegesis, and Biblical Theology.

Likewise, chapter 2 focuses on G. von Rad's sharp antithetical contrast between two types of history in Israel: the critically assured minimum and the theologically maximized kerygmatic picture of Israel's history. This double track thinking is neatly answered by aspects of the Pannenberg school which again rightly insists that this dichotomous situation be ended by reinstating the original unity of facts and their meaning.

But the most impressive chapter for this reviewer was chapter III on "The Center of the O.T. and O.T. Theology." Can any single concept be employed to bring about a structural unity in the Old Testament message? Is there an inner unity that binds together the various themes, concepts and motifs of the Old Testament? After all, isn't it the final aim of Old Testament Theology to demonstrate such an inner unity? Precisely so! Here is the heart of the whole matter, but sadly Hasel fails on the brink of success. He concludes that this search must be abandoned immediately. The Old Testament Theologian "cannot" and "must not use a concept, fundamental idea, or formula as a principle for the systematic ordering and arranging of the Old Testament. . . ." (p. 62). Rather, he should take a "multiplex approach with the multi-track treatment of longitudinal themes" (p. 93). However, this approach is also doomed from the start, for it too will fail "to demonstrate whether or not there is an inner unity that binds together the various theologies and longitudinal themes, concepts and motifs" (p. 93). The only thing going for unity in this approach is the longitudinal aspect of the historical development. So far so good, but there must be more! Hasn't the text itself reflected on its own development and connections? Isn't there a theme which may be inductively discovered rather than arbitrarily imposed as a grid over the text? We believe there is such a theme clearly announced, longitudinally developed in the history of Israel and comprehensively embracing all related themes, concepts and motifs in the Old Testament, *viz.* the "promise" theme. (See

provisionally this reviewer's articles: "The Blessing of David: The Charter for Humanity" in *O. T. Allis Festschrift* edited by J. Skilton, Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1973, and "The Promise Theme and the Theology of Rest," *Bib. Sac*, Spring 1973). This theme will also solve the relationship between the testaments and contrast with the eclectic approach taken by Hasel (p. 77). Initially, one need only do a word study on "promise" in the New Testament to be convinced of the uniform testimony to this assertion. The time is ripe for a new Old Testament Theology which satisfactorily answers all four important issues raised in this significant monograph.

*Labor Problems in Christian Perspective.* John H. Redekop, editor. (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1972.) 364 pp. \$6.95. Reviewed by David E. Carlson, Assistant Professor of Sociology, Trinity College, Deerfield, Ill.

Theological Society members will find this volume of twenty-six articles on labor problems both instructive and disappointing. Those sophisticated in theology will find most of the articles ignoring, ignorant or naive in Christian perspective. On the other hand, Society members who are not well read in labor issues will find an informative array of articles from both a pro and anti-labor viewpoint. The fact that the Christian perspective is used to defend or support differing viewpoints regarding labor and management is one of the most fascinating dimensions of this book. It should provide a wealth of material for the discussion of Biblical hermeneutics, which in my opinion is the key issue when one attempts to integrate a Christian frame of reference with current life problems.

Redekop edits this volume with the "conviction that the Christian ethic is relevant to labor problems in contemporary society." (preface). The reader must plow through several articles before this bias becomes evident. There are two reasons for this. First, the editor provides no introduction to the collected writings other than a brief preface which inadequately presents the book's theme. The editor assumes the reader has knowledge of and understands the meaning of the Christian ethic. The second reason for the hidden bias is that the papers generally lack specific references to Biblical materials or to the Church Fathers. After reading the first article which made no reference to Christianity I was briefly encouraged reading the title of the second article, "A Christian Philosophy of Unionism." To my discouragement, the only thinking which approaches the Christian perspective is some vague references to a papal encyclical "Rerum Novarum," a 1908 Federal Council creed, and "the pattern for Economic Justice" of 1946. The most the book can claim in the first section is "thinking by Christians"; it is questionable whether the articles introduce one to "Christian thinking."

I almost put the book down for good when I got to the third article, "Constructive Labor Legislation." What encouraged me was its brevity and the last two paragraphs entitled "The Christian's Role." To my disappointment he merely referred me to Matthew 20, 21, 25 with the statement,

"These principles must be carefully considered by anyone searching for a Christian view on the problems of labor." What principles? I rechecked the title at this point to see if I was reading the right book. Was not this the stated purpose of the book?

The remaining sections of *Labor Problems in Christian Perspective* suffer generally from the same difficulties noted above. However, there are some specific essays which Theological Society members will find helpful in developing their own Christian view of labor relations. These include the editor's only article in the book which is tucked toward the back. This article could more profitably have appeared as the introduction to the book because it introduces the reader to several labor problems and issues with which I feel it essential to be acquainted if one is to understand the book's themes. Specifically, Redekop addresses the issues of the control and abuse of power by unions, the impossibility of unions being religiously neutral, class struggles, compulsory union membership, the right to strike and scab, political connections and influence and lastly, corruption in unions.

Three essays are noteworthy because they struggle with the nature of labor problems. Vandesande argues that the Christian perspective dictates a redefinition of labor problems. Typical of radical thinking he sets up a dichotomy between secular and religious views of labor. He defines labor struggles in Marxists economic terms of class struggle and materialism and then argues the Christian is not fighting "against 'flesh and blood', not against classes, but again sin-lawlessness-for hearts, 'for out of the heart are the issues of life.'"

Antonides further develops this theme stressing that the Christians must rephrase the question ("is man the master or servant of the machine he himself has built?") and restructure the problems (alienation—man separated from the processes of production and nature). He discusses the problem of labor within the context of a "crisis of our age" which is essentially not a crisis of technology but . . . a crisis of faith." Antonides argues that the Christian "must not merely diagnose" the present labor struggles as alienation of man from God, himself and fellowman but must "regain the vision of the unity of the body of Christ" and acknowledge that "Christ's redemptive work also redeems our labors." "Alienation," by Hart is profitable to read in conjunction with the above paper as it further clarifies the concept of alienation in spiritual terms.

If you find the above articles stimulating you will be motivated to continue reading the several other papers which begin to develop the meaning of the Christian ethic. I recommend Schmidt's essay because it is one of the best attempts in the volume integrating a Christian perspective with labor problems. Dion's paper is no doubt the best summary of Christian principles in this book of readings. "Work in Biblical perspective" by Nederhood will further contribute to the readers developing theology.

From here the reader is on his own. The remaining articles have little in the way of Christian thinking although they are elaborating of labor problems.

*Labor Problems in Christian Perspective* is not recommended for theological or college libraries. It has no index which makes its worth as a research tool questionable. Its level of theological sophistication is sophomoric and its perspective is often more humanistic, democratic and moralistic than Christian.