BOOK REVIEWS

OLD TESTAMENT

The Book of Exodus, A Critical, Theological Commentary. By Brevard S. Childs. (The Old Testament Library) Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1974, pp. xxv, 659. $15.00.

In its own way, Childs' *Exodus* is a *tour de force.* Ten years in the making, his commentary represents nothing less than an attempt to establish a pattern for writers of Old Testament commentaries to follow in the future. While his major concern is to interpret the final form of the canonical text of Scripture, he would place stern demands indeed on anyone who might wish to follow his own example as demonstrated in this volume.

Childs recognizes, of course, that no single individual can master textual criticism, form-critical method, traditio-historical method, comparative philology and linguistics, New Testament studies, patristics, Reformation studies, theology, and the other disciplines necessary for the production of the ideal Old Testament commentary (as he envisions it). But he would insist that the present-day commentator who is serious about interpreting Scripture *as we have it* must make every possible effort to understand the stages it went through *before* reaching its final canonical shape as well as the major ways in which it has been interpreted *since* it reached that shape.

Childs' *Commentary* exhibits many excellent qualities. Although obviously not intended to be read through from cover to cover (book reviewers are the only people required to engage in such exercises as far as commentaries are concerned!), it held my interest and attention for the most part. The author offers several worthwhile guidelines by which to judge the extent to which recent commentators on the Decalogue have done their homework (pp. 438 f.). He provides a handy chart for

making comparisons between the various stipulations of the Book of the Covenant and their ancient Near Eastern counterparts in other law codes (pp. 462 f.). He stresses the fact that there is much more unity in the Book of Exodus than is generally recognized by modern critical scholarship (pp. 53, 200). His bibliography, while somewhat brief, includes a wide range of important works.

Needless to say, any writer who attempts a commentary on so grand a scale will disappoint his readers in certain respects. Childs is weakest in the areas of philology and archaeology. That *cedût* (Exodus 16:34 *et passim*) means "covenant (stipulations)" and is a virtual synonym for *berît* has long been recognized (cf., e. g., W. F. Albright, *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan*, pp. 106 f.), but Childs continues to translate it "testimony" (sometimes capitalized, sometimes not). In his discussion of Exodus 20:24 f. (p. 466), he makes no mention of the dirt altar discovered during the important excavations of 1962-67 at Tell Arad (cf. A. Negev, editor, *Archaeological Encyclopedia of the Holy Land,* p. 28). In dealing with the difficult final clause of Exodus 23:5, Childs (pp. 450 f.) apparently rejects the proposal originally made by U. Cassuto that the verb *czb* in that passage is illuminated by Ugaritic *cdb*, even though the proposal is almost certainly correct, since in II AB, iv, 12 the verb clearly means "to tie, cinch up (a saddle)." (To Childs' adequate summary of recent archaeological parallels to the horned altars of the Old Testament [pp. 525 f.] should now be added the fine example recently discovered at Beer-sheba; cf. Y. Aharoni in *BA* 37/1 [1974], pp. 2-6.)

But the conservative reader will be disappointed most of all with the relatively large amount of space the author devotes to his understanding of the pre-history of the canonical text. Whereas Childs on occasion admits the limitations of the documentary hypothesis (p. 170), including its circularity of argument to at least some extent (p. 572), he nevertheless stands squarely within the tradition of the source-critical approach to the text of Exodus (pp. 131, 149, 218-221, etc.), as in fact the title of his *Commentary* affirms. He therefore only rarely agrees with Cassuto and other Jewish conservatives and moderates, and even less with evangelical Christian exegetes, whom he almost never so much as mentions (unless they happen to stem from the "pre-critical" period—the seventeenth century or earlier). His characterization of the "traditional" approach to the interchange of divine names in the Pentateuch as a theory in "constant need" of adjustment "in every succeeding section" (p. 53) can just appropriately be applied to the documentary approach that Childs himself espouses. In any event, all of us can appreciate his observation that the way an alleged difficulty in the test is handled may tell us more about the handler than about the text (p. 437)! We may well wonder, then, whether the very intricacies of Childs' detailed dissections of Exodus are justified in terms of a deeper understanding of the materials dissected. The credo of Buckminster Fuller, inventor of the geodesic dome and other spare architectural marvels, is that "less is more." In the case of Childs' *Exodus,* we might legitimately ask whether *more* is necessarily more.

Let's not put him down too quickly, however. His *Commentary* is

immensely more useful than Noth's *Exodus* in the same series, and we hope that the Westminster Press will have good sense to phase out the latter in deference to the obvious superiority of the former. And, after all, the title of Childs' volume includes the term "theological" as well as the term "critical." That "critical" was placed first in order was due more to logical and chronological than to alphabetical reasons, to be sure. But Childs had earlier signalized his intense interest in matters theological in his programmatic monograph, *Biblical Theology in Crisis* (Westminster, 1970), on which his *Commentary* represents something of an advance.

It would be pedestrian of me to tell our readers on what pages Childs' theological insights are to be found, since even a casual reading of the *Commentary* reveals them to be extensive and ubiquitous. Suffice it to say that any Bible student with the patience to do a little digging will uncover theological nuggets in large numbers—sometimes controversial, frequently edifying, always stimulating.

In short, since Childs' *theological* approach to the text is unabashedly Christian, and since he takes Romans 15:4 seriously, his readers will find his *Commentary* addressing their hearts as often as their minds.

Ronald Youngblood

Bethel Theological Seminary,
3949 Bethel Drive
St. Paul, Minnesota 55112

Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament. Edited by G. J. Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren (translated by John T. Willis) Vol. I. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974, ix-xx, 479 pp., $18.50.

The English translation of the German edition which appeared as four fasciles in 1970-72 marks the advent of another triumph on the expanding shelves of theological dictionaries of the Old and New Testament. This first volume covers the Hebrew alphabet from *abh* to *badhadh* and features 39 contributors, including three Americans: Frank M. Cross, Harry A. Hoffner, and G. W. Ahlstrom. The official translator is John T. Willis, Associate Professor of Bible at Abilene (Texas) Christian College. In his preface, he projects an annual volume in the series appearing about one year after he each fourth German fasicle—an ambitious goal for both publisher and translator!

As might be expected, the 53 articles vary widely in their effectiveness and theological insights. However, this reviewer would assign the pride of place to Horst Dietrich Preuss's (Göttingen) discussion of *eth, cim*, "with". After quickly surveying the "secular use" on two pages (pp. 449-50), he rightly devoted the greater bulk of his article to the "theological use" (14 pages); and with a skill rarely observed in theological dictionaries, he developes the discussion within covenient historical units without yielding to the temptation of giving bloodless cold descriptions or kerygmatic flights of subjectivism. Rather, the reader is treated to thematic or topical arrangements of the material, each with its own diachronic treatment. The article, which concludes with a special discussion of "Immanuel" of Isaiah 7-9 and its relationship

to Ahaz (pp 458-63), is teeming with insight and with fairness to the text and context rarely seen in biblical scholarship. He rightfully connects this promise with the one made to David in 2 Samuel 7:16 and then masterfully isolates the crucial points and practically solves the *crux interpretum* of Isaiah 7:14ff.

But even more significant is his use of this key teaching passage in what amounts to a canonical focal point of the diachronic development of a theological word. Such a feature would have sharpened many of the other articles in *TDOT* and supplied an objective criteria against which the otherwise random remarks might have been made.

Such a suggestion, of course, immediately raises the continuing debate: what is meant by "Theological" in such a dictionary? The editors did give a brief notice to this question in their preface, claiming that their purpose was

> to analyze its religious statements ... in order to shed as much light as possible on the content of Old Testament thought in a given text, tradition, or institution. Thus "theology" is understood primarily in a descriptive sense, just as one might speak of the theology of Augustine or the theology of Luther.

For many, this will only reintroduce the unanswered question of Brevard S. Childs, "Does not theology need *normative* as well as descriptive categories in order to execute its task?" ("Interpretation in Faith...," *Interpretation* 18 [1964], p 433; italics ours.) To be sure, this is not a caveat against truly descriptive or diachronic treatments; nor is it a plea for the use of something akin to the "Analogy of Faith" as an exegetical or lexical tool whereby the N. T. is made the normative base by which we interpret the original or "deeper" [?!] meaning of the O. T. text. It is, however, a plea for a full use of all the canonical statements which *preceded* a text and were available to both writers and readers and to which the writers themselves often freely alluded. Such an antecedent theology which "informed" each text could be called the "Analogy of [preceding] Scripture". Indeed, it could supply that elusive quality of "unity" which puzzles most theologians.

In using most of these articles, evangelicals (who, no doubt, will compose one of the largest groups of purchasers of these volumes, as they did of Kittel's *TDNT*) will be saddened to note the obvious absence and lack of interaction with some of the best contributions of their scholars. The first article on "father" is a good example of this phenomena. Nowhere in the discussion of "the God of the Fathers" does one find a reference to E. J. Young ("God of the Fathers," *Westminster Theological Journal* 3 [1940], 25-40 pp. or to O. T. Allis ("The Fear of Isaac," *Princeton Theological Review*, 16 [1918], pp. 302 ff; only the Alt-May-Cross majority view is presented. Evangelicals will now wish to read these sections in *TDOT* I, pp 10-11, 16-17, 42-44, 50-51, 54-55, 255-57, 279 along with Tom McComiskey's "The Religion of the Patriarchs: An Analysis of the God of the Fathers by Albrecht Alt," in *The Law and The Prophets: O. T. Studies in Honor of O. T. Allis* (ed. by John H. Skilton, Presbyterian and Reformed Pub., 1975, pp. 195-206) and the other evangelical literature.

Another conspicuous rejection of an Evangelical dialogue can be cited from page 85 when D. J. A. Clines's "The Image of God in Man," (*Tyndale Bulletin* [1968] pp. 55-103) does not merit any discussion, or even a mention.

On the other hand, Martin H. Woudstra's *The Ark of the Covenant from Conquest to Kingship* was included in an unusually fine comprehensive bibliography for *arôn* by Hans-Jürgen Xobel without any consideration of his challenges. Also Leon Morris's " *'Asham'* " (*Evangelical Quarterly* 30 [1958] pp. 196-210) rated a mere bibliographic citation.

Some users of this first volume will complain that a few of the articles verge off into descriptive analyses such as one usually associates with the discipline of the "Religion of Old Testament" (e.g. Cross's detailed discussion of El in the Ugaritic texts, pp. 244-53; cf. the brief discussion of Asherah at Ugarit, pp. 439-40). Others will object to a number of speculative statements derived from the less-than assured results of even a chastened literary analysis (e.g. p. 54: "Abraham's elevation to ancestor of all Israel could not have taken place until a time when Judah and Israel were closely connected and Judah was the dominant portion").

Others will wish that the less cumbersome system of transliteration, such as used by the Society of Biblical Literature, had been adopted, thereby saving us from another generation of viewing transliterated Hebrew words filled with "h" 's. Instead, the older system has now received a revived canonical status; while the typesetters may rejoice, philologists' eyes continue to curdle.

Special mention should also be made of the great theological contributions and summaries found in several of the other articles, e.g. *acharîth, aman* and *oth.* There are just too many fine features to document in this brief review.

The text is remarkably free of annoying typographical errors, especially when one considers the specialized format of the articles. But an occasional transposition, or the like, occurs, such as "monadic" for "nomadic" on page 199.

There is no doubt in my mind that this set, when completed, will increase our understanding of Old Testament Theology immeasureably. We could only urge the contributors and editors to reflect a less parochial scope in its bibliographies and discussions. With a judicious usage, all evangelicals will profit from the purchase and close of *TDOT.*

Walter C. Kaiser, Jr.
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, Ill., 60015.

NEW TESTAMENT

Life After Death. Paul's Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in I Corinthians 15. Part I. An Enquiry into the Jewish Background. By H. C. C. Cavallin. Coniectanea Biblica: New Testament Series 7:5. Lund, C. W. K. Gleerup: 1974. 301 pp.

Many who undertake an intensive study of a particular New Testament passage are so impatient to grapple with the text itself that they fail to pay sufficient attention to the conceptual background of the writer. Not so H. C. C. Cavallin. His stated intention is ultimately to provide a full-scale study of I Corinthians 15, but Part I (his doctoral dissertation at Uppsala University) bears the title *An Enquiry into the Jewish Background*. In this methodology he is following the tradition of G. Wagner with regard to Romans 6 (*Pauline Baptism and the Pagan Mysteries*, 1967).

With regard to those Jewish documents in the period c. 200 B. C. to A. D. 100 that refer to an after-life, the author asks four basic questions that are determined by issues he finds raised in I Corinthians 15. (1) Does the text speak about life after death, and if so (2) about the resurrection of the body, immortality of the soul or other alternatives, as (3) a return to earthly life or a glorified heavenly existence? (4) When does new life after death begin and how is it related to final judgment? As the basis for his analysis Cavallin quotes the most recent English translation available of the relevant passages, citing the original text wherever appropriate. The passages are grouped thus: The Hebrew Bible, Palestinian apocalyptic texts, texts from the Greek-speaking diaspora, early Rabbinic traditions.

Whatever iconoclasm or polemic may be present in the book arises incidentally and naturally; but the author effectively refutes several popularly held views, viz. that the after-life was a central theme in all Jewish thought in the apostolic era; that each document presents a harmonious or systematized eschatology; that Jewish literature of the period shares common anthropological presuppositions; that there is a uniform Jewish doctrine of the resurrection of the body; and that Early Judaism was characterized by grossly materialistic thoughts concerning resurrection and the post-mortem state. It is demonstrated that no rigid distinction can be drawn between Palestinian and Greek diaspora texts. Thus the motif of a Last Day when God's justice will be vindicated by his punishment of sinners and rewarding of the righteous constantly recurs in all types of texts (with the exception of 4 Maccabees and the Testament of Abraham). Or again, belief in a bodily resurrection is clearly expressed in texts from the Greek diaspora that are sometimes imagined to speak only of an incorporeal immortality. However, Palestinian sources lack any *emphasis* on the immortality of the discarnate soul.

Given Cavallin's ultimate goal of exegeting I Corinthians 15, it is no surprise that he often related his findings to this chapter. He isolates (pp. 89f.), for instance, the similarities and differences between I Corinthians 15 and 2 Baruch 49-51, where belief in a transformed resurrection body clearly comes to expression. He observes (pp. 207f.) that in Early Judaism it is the "fathers," especially the patriarchs, and not a single individual, who function as the firstfruits of the resurrection (cf. I Cor. 15:20, 23).

The bibliographies are comprehensive and up-to-date, while the indices (of some 57 pages) are exceedingly useful (although there is no

index of subjects) and clearly show the extent of Cavallin's research. A rather novel system of numbering paragraphs enables the reader quickly to locate a reference in the body of the work. Throughout the volume the documentation is superb.

Some earlier writers in the field (such as G. W. E. Nickelsburg [1972] or G. Stemberger [1972]) might well find a weakness in Cavallin's methodology. Why should Pauline issues determine the manner of discussing Jewish texts, many of which are pre-Christian? Other critics will doubtless point to additional issues of significance which arise in I Corinthians 15 and might have prompted further questions to ask of the Jewish literature, such as the extent of the resurrection (not to mention the matter of two resurrections and the millennium which some claim are discussed there). But Cavallin has succeeded admirably in his stated purpose—to elucidate the Jewish background of Pauline thinking.

M. J. Harris

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School
Deerfield, Ill. 60015

To the Hebrews: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary. (The Anchor Bible). By George Wesley Buchanan. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1972, 271 pp., $7.00. *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary.* By Homer A. Kent, Jr. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1972, 303 pp., $5.95. *Our Man In Heaven: An Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews.* By Edward Fudge. Athens, Ala.: The C. E. I. Publishing Co., 1973, 220 pp., $4.95.

With the appearance of the Anchor Bible commentary on Hebrews, the impetus to read the epistle against a Jewish background must surely have reached the nth degree. Since the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls varying tinges of Essenism have been divined in the epistle as the troubled quest for the identity of the recipients has been pursued. Now that fashion has been discarded, a setting is proposed for the epistle in orthodox Judaism. To one who thinks that there can be nothing novel in that, the reply is made: "Come and see!"

Dr. Buchanan has reserved for the Conclusion those matters that normally appear by way of Introduction; but in order to characterize his position plainly we may summarize them right at the start. The epistle is regarded as "a homiletical midrash on Psalm 110." By a homiletical midrash is meant the application of an old Biblical text to a new situation, a process facilitated by such devices as reading prophecy in terms of contemporary events, typology, etc. The "new situation" to which Hebrews is held to be addressed is that of the imminent fulfilment of God's promise to Abraham that Israel would possess the land of Palestine. The eschatological fever which engulfed Judaism in the years leading up to A. D. 70, even prompting some Jews to move from the Diaspora to Jerusalem, did not leave Jewish Christians unaffected; and the epistle was written to a group of these, conjectured to be a monastic sect in Jerusalem, assuring them that Jesus' self-sacrifice was the perfect gift needed by God to affect the promise to Abraham.

Everything else in the epistle is construed in the light of this promise. Thus the Rest of chapters 3 and 4 is deliverance from Roman rule (p. 9), just as in the New Testament generally the Kingdom of God equals possession of Palestine (pp. 49-51); any attempt to sunder the two is denounced as an arbitrary and baseless separation of the spiritual and the political.

If the substance of the promise is political, it follows that the Leader must be a political figure—and so it turns out. The Son of God, whom the author equates with Jesus, is a king after the Old Testament Israelite pattern (p. 39), and the title as applied to Jesus implies neither divinity (p. 56) nor sinlessness (pp. 81-82). The Son of Man, who is equated in turn with the Son of God, is likewise a temporal messiah, a conclusion held to be implicit in Heb. 2:6 interpreted in the light of Daniel and Enoch (pp. 39-51). The net result of this is that Jesus is seen in Hasmonaean terms: a temporal liberator accorded the title Son of Man as Judas Maccabeus is alleged to have been in Daniel 7:13.

Such a conclusion necessarily has far-reaching implications for the understanding of the work of Christ in the epistle, inasmuch as any view which sees the atonement as the work of God in Christ is excluded by definition. Jesus' death is rather to be read in terms of those of the Maccabaean martyrs whose deaths as atonement offerings amassed credit and therefore forgiveness for the nation's sins (pp. XXV, 37). The priestly ministry of Jesus is to be read essentially *au pied de la lettre* of the Old Testament type. Jesus was perfect as the High Priest was perfect; like the High Priest He made atonement for his own sins as well as for the sins of others, in this way being perfected and made sinless; and in consequence of this perfect self-offering He is all that is needed by God to effect the promise made to Abraham (pp. 127-131, 253-255, 266).

This is the essence of Dr. Buchanan's interpretation of the epistle, and its individuality is self-evident. If he is right, we seem to be faced with two alternatives: either there was a gigantic misunderstanding in the first Christian generation whereby a purely temporal exchatology, faithfully embodied in Hebrews, was transcendentalized; or the Epistle to the Hebrews is not a Christian book. Which of these is nearer to the truth could be shown only by an alternative exegesis of the epistle, clearly impossible here. However, certain observations may serve to cast doubt on Dr. Buchanan's reconstruction.

As has been implied above, the foundation of Dr. Buchanan's schema is his view that the eschatology of the epistle is temporal: the fulfilment of the promise to Abraham means secure possession of Palestine; Jesus is a political messiah; the term of His priesthood—"forever"—is the messianic age when He would rule and officiate. But all is temporal; there is no transcendental dimension. But nowhere is this proved. There is indeed much impressive documentation (e.g. pp. 9f, 26f) to show that this was the prevailing view in contemporary Judaism, but that is not in dispute. The point at issue is whether Early Christian eschatology of the author of Hebrews in particular lacks a transcendental dimension.

As to the former, Paul clearly distinguished between "the present

Jerusalem" and "the Jerusalem above" (Gal. 4:25-26), claiming citizenship in the latter; and—lest one be charged with Paulinizing Hebrews—the author of Hebrews appears to have thought in terms that were not dissimilar. Dr. Buchanan disputes this, holding that "the heavenly Jerusalem" (Heb. 12:22) "is a reasonable and respectable ascription for a city that contains the temple which links earth to heaven" so that "it is no longer necessary to spiritualize 'Zion, the city of the living God' " (p. 161). If that is so, one can only wonder why the author of the epistle proceeds in the self-same context (12:18-29) to contrast the "heavenly Jerusalem" (Heb. 12:22) with the mountain that could be "touched" (v. 18, using an intensive verb); why, further, he describes his readers as having already come to Mount Zion and entered into fellowship with the angels, the assembly of the firstborn, the "spirits of just men made perfect" and Jesus Himself, and not merely as looking for the coming of the heavenly city; and why, finally, he contrasts God's earthly warnings at Sinai with His heavenly warnings which will shake not only the earth but heaven, removing "what has been made" (v. 27) so that the unshakeable kingdom may remain.

If this exegesis is sound, then Dr. Buchanan's reading not merely of this passage but of the entire epistle is rendered dubious. For what the epistle is then seen to be is a summons to march on to the land of spiritual inheritance and not to return to a material Judaism, which was about to be overthrown. This summons could be issued with assurance, because Christians already have a priest, sacrifice, an altar, a city. But if the focus of the epistle is the transcendental realm, it follows by parity of reasoning that the Pathfinder into that realm must Himself be a transcendental Person; no "Near Eastern king of New Testament times" (to quote Dr. Buchanan's description on p. 51) is likely to suffice. This surely is the very first point the epistle is concerned to make; and one can only say that if the intent of 1:1-8 is to show that "the Son was the firstborn, the apostle of God, the reflection of God's glory, and the stamp of his nature ... but ... not God *himself*", the author has adopted a very curious way of going about it, ascribing to the Son, as he does, one attribute and function after another—creation, providence, worship, eternity—normally reserved for divinity. Without doubt early Jewish Christology had its distinctive emphases; that they are aptly summed up in such a statement as the foregoing quotation is highly questionable.

For these reasons it is difficult to see Dr. Buchanan's commentary as advancing in any significant way the understanding of Hebrews. This is not to say that it is not a work of scholarship; on the contrary, the knowledge of the Jewish background of the themes of the epistle is exemplary; it is in the use of this, so much more ingenious than convincing, that the commentary falls down and seems destined to become a monument to a lost cause. (It should be added that the accompanying translation reflects the preferred interpretation at significant points and should be read with that in mind.)

By contrast, the other two commentaries under review, though less pretentious and without the panoply of learning of the first, come much closer to the mind of the author. *Our Man in Heaven* neatly sums up the

central focus of the epistle. After a brief Introduction the author expounds the epistle chapter by chapter, showing awareness of the main issues and familiarity with scholarly discussion over the last 100 years. The book has a commendatory Foreword by Professor F. F. Bruce.

Dr. Kent's volume is directed to the average Christian reader in the belief—only too well-founded—that, while a few purple passages are well-known, the message of Hebrews as a whole is little understood. Introductory matters are touched on lightly—a feature common to all three works under consideration—and the author then provides his own literal translation, followed by commentary. The actual commentary is one hundred pages longer than Mr. Fudge's, and to that extent more satisfying. A notable characteristic of the work, besides lucidity and sound scholarship, is the readiness to give fair play to interpretations other than that favored by the author, a feature that is well illustrated by his handling of 4:1-13 (the "Rest" passage) and the Warning Passages.

What the author of Hebrews said of one of his heroes may truly be said of himself: "though dead, by his faith he is still speaking." Anything that aids the hearing of his voice today is to be welcomed.

A. R. G. Deasley

Canadian Nazarene College
Winnipeg, Man. R3T 2P7, Canada

THEOLOGY

The Approaching Advent of Christ. By Alexander Reese. Grand Rapids: Grand Rapids International Publications, 1957. 328 pp. $5.95.

Evangelicalism is deeply indebted to Kregel (=Grand Rapids International) Publications for its timely reissuance of Alexander Reese's heretofore almost unobtainable but classic polemic against pre-tribulationism. As W. R. Crews, president of Grace Bible College and Seminary, Georgia, writes in his forward, Reese's goal was "to refute the views he held and propogated from his youth. This he does in a masterful, scholarly, and exhaustive way." In 1962 the present reviewer described Reese's work as "Pre-tribulationism's most detailed refutation" to date (*The Imminent Appearing of Christ*, p. 185). It had, indeed, furnished the impetus for such "post-trib" authors as George L. Rose (1943), Alexander Fraser (1955), Norman Douty (1956), and George Eldon Ladd (1956)—not to mention more recently Robert Gundry (1974) or Dave MacPherson (1974).

Reese's argument centers about the timing of the resurrection of the saints: in essence, "Where is the resurrection, there is the rapture" (cf. p. 154). His specific variety of post-tribulationism is then revealed by the title to his volume, *The Approaching Advent of Christ*, i.e., not imminent (see ch. XV), but potentially "in our generation" (p. 231). His very opening chapter concludes with an excursus on the seventy weeks of Daniel 9, in which he adopts Sir Robert Anderson's chronology and uncritically accepts the theory of an "indetermined interval" (p. 31) between the sixty-ninth week (the coming of Messiah) and the

seventieth. He fails, that is, to consider the traditional view that even as vv. 25-26 form an elaboration on v. 24, so v. 27 forms an elaboration on v. 26, explaining how the Messiah's "putting a stop to sacrifice" (v. 27) elaborates on His being "cut off" (v. 26). And once Reese commits himself to the concept of an as yet unfulfilled seventieth (7 yr.) week which must precede Christ's second coming, then an "approaching" advent is the most he can entertain.

J. Barton Payne

Covenant Theological Seminary
12330 Conway Rd.
St. Louis, Mo. 63141

CHURCH HISTORY

The New International Dictionary of the Christian Church. Edited by J. D. Douglas. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974, 1074 pp., $24.95.

The publication of *The New International Dictionary of the Christian Church* is an important event if it fulfils the publisher's claim of being "a comprehensive one-volume reference work which traces the development of the Christian Church from a sound historical and evangelical perspective".

Evangelical Christians have become accustomed to composite works of scholarship in the last couple of decades, which also represent the re-establishment and development of the trans-Atlantic alliance which was such an important element in nineteenth-century evangelicalism. The prime instigator on the British side in such works has been James Douglas, who proved his capabilities beyond a shadow of doubt in *The New Bible Dictionary*, and who brings all his acquired expertise to his position as editor of the present volume. In addition, Dr. Douglas is by training a church historian, having worked under the late Matthew Spinka of Hartford.

Many of the excellences of the volume are patently obvious. The range of articles compares most favorable with those in the Oxford and Westminster Dictionaries, and in some areas, as we shall see, far surpasses them. Such comprehensiveness, we trust, is not only an indication of good scholarship, but a recognition on the part of evangelicals of the vastness and variety of the church of Jesus Christ. Patristic and mediaeval subjects are given extensive coverage, so that Fathers, Councils and Popes are all very much in evidence. Reformation concerns naturally secure a considerable amount of space, but this is true on the Catholic as well as the Protestant side. Not only are the Puritans and the major figures of the Evangelical Awakening in evidence, but the nineteenth-century German biblical scholars as well. Fascinating information on little-known aspects of continental pietism is included, as well as a series of valuable articles on Finland alone. Although it is unfortunate that all third-world contributors are western expatriates, they nonetheless cover the field. Even Canada, which so often gets lost in the shuffle, is well served.

Not only is there a broad range of articles, but many of them approach standards of excellence. Donald Tinder on the American Baptists, Paul Helm on some of the major philosophical theologians, Calvin Seerveld on Art, David Wright on the Early Church, Timothy Stunt on some of the Restoration movements, and Skevington Wood and Donald Dayton on aspects of the Wesleyan heritage, to name but a few, are certainly worth the money. This standard, however, is not only limited to major articles; the unsigned eighteen-line contribution on the Christian and Missionary Alliance, for example, is a marvel of knowledgeable lucidity.

It is in the area of evangelical history, however, that the most signal contribution is made. Just to see T. T. Shields and "Sam" Shoemaker resting cheek by jowl on the same page is surely enough to whet any Christian appetite, however jaded. The famous evangelists are dealt with—not too stimulatingly one might add—but they have already had their reward in a surfeit of books. But here we have all the lesser lights from F. W. Jones, Sam Jones, W. P. Nicholson, Charles E. Fuller, and Tom Rees. Even the evangelistic songleaders are included: Sankey, Alexander and Rodeheaver. The popular Bible teachers are also present: Barnhouse, Ironside, Campbell Morgan, and Graham Scroggie. The British philanthropists such as Thomas Barnardo and J. W. Fegan have their place in the sun, as do the American educators Charles A. Blanchard, Lewis Sperry Chafer, and E. J. Carnell. Even the most strident premillennialists such as A. C. Gaebelein and W. E. Blackstone are accounted for, while we have it "warts and all" with the inclusion of John Kensit, the embodiment of the unedifying side of English evangelicalism (referred to colloquially as "the hot-prots" or "the protestant underworld".)

In spite of these excellent features, there are, inevitably, a number of weaknesses. Many of the biographies are mere descriptions, whereas we need expositions of the thought of these persons so their qualifications for inclusion in such a dictionary will be explained. In the article on Archibald Alexander, for example, we need to know not only that he was the first Princeton Seminary professor, but that he was the founder of the "Princeton School" and what it taught. The relation of Isaac Backus to the American Revolution must be probed, while we need to know why Charles Finney was such a watershed figure in the history of American Christianity. Could we not also have something about A. J. Gordon's views on healing and the baptism of the Spirit?

Some of the topical articles are also disappointing. In reading the few lines on the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions one would never gain an inkling that it was the greatest American missionary society of the nineteenth century. The articles on the Scripture Union and the Keswick Convention do not even suggest at their unparallelled importance in the maintenance of conservative evangelicalism in Britain throughout this century. How badly we need a history of the doctrine of inspiration, but what we are given is of no help whatsoever. And when you ask a Baptist pastor from a few miles south of Belfast to write on Roman Catholicism, it does not require a prophet

to surmise that you are not going to get the most sympathetic treatment, even of Catholic Pentecostalism!

Bibliographical references are not a strong point, particularly compared with the Oxford. Although one gathers that some may have been omitted for lack of space, it is a decided weakness. It is also a pity, as in the discussion of Fundamentalism, to have Sandeen's excellent and provocative volume listed, but nowhere in the body of the text to have his ideas, and the debate they have engendered, referred to.

It also seems a pity to give almost half a page to the singularly unimportant Scottish Bereans. And to include J. N. Figgis, while admitting with candor that his influence hardly survived his death, leaves much to be desired.

While there are a few articles that might well have been omitted, there are others, in the opinion of the reviewer, which should not. Rufus Anderson of the A.B.C.F.M., whom R. Pierce Beaver has described as *"the most influential American mission statesman"*, is a sad loss. So are the Tappan brothers, with their unique place in America's benevolent empire, so akin to England's Clapham Sect. If we have Chemnitz and Gerhard, where is Quenstedt to round out Lutheran orthodoxy? The Turretins, with their inspiration of the Hebrew vowel points, and so much more, need to be here. And so do the early nineteenth-centruy American evangelists, Nettleton, Dow, and Caughey. And what about Phoebe Palmer, whose bringing to birth of the Holiness revival would seem to outclass the contribution of the two clergymen included who share the same surname? At least a nod in the direction of William Gadsy and the Strict Baptist would help to round out the picture, as would an entry for John Sung. And if Hans Küng can be included in the vigor of life, what about Watchman Nee who has just passed on?

Of errors, either of content or typography, there seem to be few. The latter category, however, does finally introduce a new contender for that often-debated title, "the last of the Puritans", in the person of Philip Wharton, whose almost ante-deluvian longevity carries him from (1613-1969)! Perhaps in the same category comes the statement that the Kaiserswerth order of Lutheran deaconesses has 28,000 members, which raises visions of their seventy-two houses being packed in a way that would make sardines blush. Perhaps the author had a particularly rarified ecclesiastical usage in his mind when he described Richard Baxter as a "Latitudinarian"; if so, it needs to be explained, for although he was a man of many views, that is not one normally associated with his name. It is good to have the old antagonists Cocceius and Voetius once again in tandem, but it is a little disconcerting to have Clouse describe the former as "a German theologian", and Jellema, perhaps with pardonable ancestral pride, as "an able Dutch Calvinist theologian". (Have there ever been any other kind of Dutch Calvinists theologians?) The article on the Gurneyites also tells us that Joseph John Gurney, on his return to Britain in 1840, collaborated with Wilberforce, Clarkson, and others for the abolition of the slave trade. The problem is, however, that Wilberforce by this time had been in his grave for seven years, while the abolition of the trade had been accomplished thirty-three years

previously! Finally, it appears that the statement, "German Baptists, see Church of Brethren", is open to a couple of questions. Although the reference may be technically true, I believe it to be misleading, for many people today think more readily of the North American Baptist Conference as the German Baptists. And when one turns to the singular "Church", he finds it after the plural "Churches".

In spite of the few minor criticisms that have been offered, this is an eminently worthwhile and serviceable volume, well fulfilling its claim. Our thanks are due to "Jim" Douglas for once again placing the whole church of Jesus Christ deeply in his debt.

Ian S. Rennie

Regent College
2130 Weswood Cr.
Vancouver, B.C., VGT IWG, Canada

PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION

Philosophical Anthropology. By Michael Landmann. Translated by David J. Parent. Philadephia: Westminster Press, 1974, 256 pp. $7.50.

Neither philosophical anthropology nor its major exponents are familiar to English speaking philosophical audiences. Nevertheless, the concerns of philosophical anthropology will not be foreign to students of systematic theology, since both philosophical anthropologists and theologians seek to discover the ontological structures that distinguish man from the rest of creation.

This translation of *Philosophical Anthropology* is an attempt to introduce the subject to a wider audience. Landmann's book is a general and historical introduction that has gone through three editions in German. This would seem to recommend it as a good introduction that has gone through three editions in German. This would seem to recommend it as a good introduction to this contential school, but it has some flaws. Like many books that go through various editions, *Philosophical Anthropology* has been only superficially updated since it first appeared in 1955. Thus Landmann's book is rather dated. In the foreward to this edition Landmann only mentions in passing the relation that philosophical anthropology has to structuralism, the Frankfort school, and the Yugoslavian *Praxis* group.

Philosophical Anthropology is more than just an introduction, however, since Landmann presents his own theses about human nature and culture. In this regard it has nothing to recommend it. It is a shoddy piece of philosophy.

Landmann does not believe that there is an ideal culture or man that past and present instances are more or less approximations of. Standards of cultural evaluation are all intrinsic to a culture, and it is inadmissable to judge a culture by the norms of another. Similarly, the one immutable feature of human nature is to have no nature. Man according to Landmann is "primordially incomplete" and has only a functional energy to design cultures and himself.

Landmann has two apparent methods of establishing these conclusions. He obtains his relativism from observing the variability of man and culture and concludes that each type is equally as valid as the other. This is, of course, a gross nonsequiter. The second method is equally absurd. Landmann's theses are incompatible with biblical anthropology; but his only argument is that the biblical image of man has been eclipsed in western civilization largely by the impact of Copernicus, Darwin, and cultural relativism. The argument seems to be that if it is no longer fashionable, it must be false. Apparently it is sufficient for him to note, for example, that although Christianity says man was made in God's image, Feuerbach reversed the terms. Feuerbach's argument as a proof for the non-existence of God is notoriously bankrupt. To cite Feuerbach and suppose that it is an argument is incredible. But either this is Landmann's method of argument or he has none. I don't know which is worse.

The question "What is man?" is one of increasing importance now with the possibilities of genetic engineering, cloning, and test tube babies. Landmann never raises this aspect of the question. In 1955 these things were perhaps too remote for consideration. What Landmann's anthropology would say if it addressed this question is chilling to ponder. How could he be anything but excited over these new cultural and human (?) prospects?

In sum, this is a good but dated general historical introduction to philosophical anthropology. But as a piece of philosophy it lacks something.

T. Pence

Dept. of Philosophy, Purdue University
West Lafayette, Ind. 47907