

## BOOK REVIEWS

### OLD TESTAMENT

*The Gospel of Moses* (Samuel J. Schultz)

*A Reader's Hebrew-English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Ferris L. McDaniel)

### NEW TESTAMENT

*A History of Interpretation of Hebrews 7, 1-10 from the Reformation to the Present*  
(Bruce Demarest)

*Jesus and the Language of the Kingdom: Symbol and Metaphor in New Testament Interpretation* (Norman Perrin)

### CHRISTIAN WORLD VIEW

*No King but Caesar* (W. R. Durland)

*The Unraveling of America* (S. Monsma)

### PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION

*The Nature of Necessity and God, Freedom, and Evil* (A. Plantinga)

*Philosophy: A Christian Perspective* (A. F. Holmes)

*War and Christian Ethics* (A. F. Holmes, ed.)

### PASTORAL CARE

*Pastoral Counseling* (J. E. Adams)

### BOOK NOTES

### BOOKS RECEIVED

## OLD TESTAMENT

*The Gospel of Moses*. By Samuel J. Schultz. New York: Harper and Row, 1974, 165 pp., \$5.95.

Rarely does one find a discussion of both content and method of presentation combined in one volume on the OT. However, Samuel Schultz has shown us his classroom methodology and some of the highlights from his lectures on the OT to college students in the short scope of 165 pages. The need for such professional discussions has been further underscored by the appearance of a new journal from Britain entitled *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*, which lists as one of its five purposes the publication of "articles concerned with the teaching of the Old Testament."

Schultz argues that OT survey courses should start with Deuteronomy instead of the traditional beginning with Genesis, and that they should focus on the "essence of the written Bible": "Love God with all your heart and love your neighbor as yourself." With such an integrating core, the narrower strictures of pointing merely to law, history, or predictions can be corrected and viewed in balance, argues Schultz.

OT teachers will certainly applaud this type of adjustment, for our discipline has been dominated for too many generations by a barren historical-descriptive

type of analysis. The need of the hour is for a recognition of the text's canonical setting, its message as a whole and the buildup of theology as one moves diachronically throughout the pre-Christian era. The text has its own legitimacy apart from the continued progress of revelation in the NT, and the OT text also addresses us as a word which demands a response. Thus Schultz represents an earlier aspect of this new trend in OT studies.

This reviewer found small caveats as he read these pages. Contrary to page 13, there were other nations that had experienced God's deliverance similar to Israel's exodus (e. g. Syria, Ethiopia, and the Philistines according to Amos 9:7). And can we confidently assign all the first nine plagues to natural phenomena in the Nile valley, as Greta Hort has argued, apart from their miraculous timing and duration (pp. 15-16)? Was Cain's sin a failure to offer a bloody sacrifice, or was it rather that he came with an unprepared heart to offer a heartless and externalized worship (pp. 40-41)? Furthermore, was Isaiah 7:14 "veiled in somewhat ambiguous [!] language"? If so, what part was revealed and what part was garbled (p. 121)?

Nevertheless, these minor objections fade into insignificance when compared with the overall thesis of the book, which needs to be cried out from every lectern and pulpit of our land: "The demands in the gospel of Christ were basically the same as those in the gospel of Moses. Both began with a relationship of wholehearted commitment and exclusive devotion which was the basis for obedience" (p. 163).

Walter C. Kaiser, Jr.

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, Illinois 60015

*A Reader's Hebrew-English Lexicon of the Old Testament.* By Ferris L. McDaniel. Dallas: Published by the author (429 Blanning Drive, Dallas, Texas 75218), 1975, 125 pp., \$4.95 paper.

With this lexicon, the result of work done at Dallas Theological Seminary, McDaniel has sought to supply the Hebrew student with a tool equivalent to Morrison and Barnes, *New Testament Word Lists*, which also lists infrequent words along with a brief definition of the word in the context in which it occurs. This lexicon proceeds chapter by chapter through the OT, in the order of the Hebrew Bible, listing the relevant words in each chapter alphabetically. The definitions are based on BDB and checked against the 1958 edition of KB.

Two questions should be asked concerning a book of this kind. First, is it needed? Second, does it adequately fill the need? One would be tempted to answer the first of these in the negative since a student, in order to use the book, would need to have a fair knowledge of grammar. This is due to the citation of words without vowels and, in the case of the verbs, only by the root consonants. One would need a fair amount of grammatical competence in order to see that the participle in Genesis 27:12 is a *pilel* form of the root *tcc*. If the student is at such a stage in his grammar, he should be using the larger lexica anyway. If not, this work itself might prove a bit of a struggle, which could have been aided somewhat, for example, by a brief indication of the stem in which the verb occurs in the chapter.

This brings us to the second question of whether this book adequately reaches the goals it claims for itself. In reality the title is incorrect, since the Aramaic portions of the Bible are also included. This raises a problem in itself since, due to the very limited amount of Aramaic, most of the words in these sections occur less than ten times, and so are included by the author. Thus the list

for Daniel 2 (49 verses) includes over 130 items, while that of Psalm 119 (176 verses) numbers less than 40. Many of these Aramaic terms are quite transparent, especially in unvocalized form, since they are common in Hebrew. This practice does stay within the parameters set out for the book as regards number, but one wonders whether it is altogether necessary to do so in all cases.

There are also some problems of methodology which should be mentioned. The reader is told that the definition from both reference lexica will be cited for a word if they differ, but he is not told that the BDB definition usually precedes a semicolon and the KB follows, although even this is not strictly adhered to. In relation to this, one wonders why the new edition of KB was not used, at least as far as it went. This would have at least included the first part (1967) and possibly even the second (1974). Also W. L. Holladay's lexicon (1971) was available, based in the main on the new KB and providing a much better English translation than that of the earlier KB.

The citation form of a given word has not been adequately thought out. For example, it seems odd that a participle of *gdl* (Gen 26) should be considered separately from the other forms of the verb, which occur over 100 times. Sometimes too much of a definition is given, e. g. *ʾkl* (Gen 40), "cluster of grapes," where "grapes" is not part of the meaning of the word itself but rather is explicit in the verse. Finally, even though this book is self-published, one hopes that a possible second edition might be proofread. On the first two pages alone were noted three misspellings in English and four in Hebrew, including *bhw*, the very first word in the Hebrew list.

In conclusion, while there might be a need for such a book as this in the eyes of some, the present work seems to fall short of meeting such a need.

David W. Baker

Tyndale House, 36 Selwyn Gardens, Cambridge, England

## NEW TESTAMENT

*A History of Interpretation of Hebrews 7, 1-10 from the Reformation to the Present.* By Bruce Demarest. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1976, 146 pp., DM 32.--

We are pleased to welcome another evangelical contribution to *Beiträge zur Geschichte der biblischen Exegese* (vol. 19), especially since we first appreciated this work in the form of a 1973 University of Manchester dissertation and sympathized with its agonizing completion and movement into print. The work is worthy of the honor of being included in this distinguished series.

Demarest has not written a popular or easy work. He has chosen a difficult text, Hebrews 7:1-10, and painstakingly traced its interpretation from the age of the Reformers to the present (fortunately, he removes the pain in this for the reader). Century by century, school by school he works from Erasmus and Luther on. In the final period he includes a valuable discussion of 11Q Melchizedek and its relationship to our text. This exercise is not only a feat of scholarship (requiring linguistic and bibliographic perseverance) but is also useful to the reader: In presenting the position of each exegete in his own terms, Demarest helps us to overcome the myopia of overlooking views that happened to be popular before our own century; and when he finally gives us his own interpretation of the text, he does so with both evenhandedness and depth of scholarship. Furthermore, in scanning the schools of Christian theology and

interpretation that have flourished since the Reformation, the study challenges us to examine our own exegetical presuppositions and theological systems.

Yet we must not overlook the weaknesses of this work. First, we would have enjoyed more interaction between Demarest and the positions he discusses. It is true that the positions criticize each other, and thus in the end his method of simply stating the views over against each other works out. But more interaction in the vein of Neill or Schweitzer would have been appreciated. Second, we are sorry that the editors of the series pressured him to reduce the scope of the study to only part of the work. We feel the book would have been more useful if the original breadth of his dissertation had been preserved.

This book, then, is a good example of this *genre* of literature, an encouragement for evangelicals to keep working in it. It is required reading for those interested in this part of Hebrews and should be purchased by all theological libraries. It will also be useful to those interested in the use of the OT in the NT. While not expecting a wide readership due to its limited scope and scholarly nature, we feel sure that those who read this work will profit from it.

Peter H. Davids

Trinity Episcopal School for Ministry, Sewickley, Pennsylvania 15143

✓ *Jesus and the Language of the Kingdom: Symbol and Metaphor in New Testament Interpretation.* By Norman Perrin. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976, xiii and 225 pp., \$10.95.

With hermeneutics ever more eagerly discussed, this book is well timed and is welcome not only as a survey of recent discussion of some central areas of the teaching of Jesus but also for its own contribution.

Those who are used to Perrin as the provocatively one-sided critic of the gospel traditions will recognize him in that role here too (e. g., in his belief that "there is a broad measure of agreement among the competent scholars" on his proposed criteria of authenticity [p. 4]—I wonder how he defines "competent"!). But conservative readers, if they can overcome their natural annoyance at being so blatantly ignored, will meet also a concern to allow the NT texts (once reduced to "critical" dimensions!) to speak for themselves, which should strike an answering chord. Perrin the interpreter is altogether a more congenial guide.

The book is unashamedly personal, focusing on developments in the author's own thinking since his previous publications and designed to highlight his new insights (with due credit to those from whom they are derived). Phrases like "enormously important" and "brilliant insight" are freely accorded to those who have helped him to his "now fuller understanding," which leads him to a "not unimportant restatement" (p. 36).

The book focuses on two areas of discussion. First is the teaching of Jesus about the kingdom of God, an area where Perrin's name is already well known. Here he has one main new insight to offer: "Kingdom of God" is not a concept, or an idea, but a *symbol*. Moreover, it is a "tensive symbol" (a phrase derived from Philip Wheelwright); i. e., it does not have a one-to-one relationship with a single referent but can have a wide range of meanings or points of reference. Its function is to evoke the ancient Jewish "myth of God active in history on behalf of his people." ("Myth" is carefully defined on pp. 22-23 as including both fact and fantasy, which is reassuring; but one wonders how many people use it in that sense.) "Kingdom of God" cannot therefore be tied down to one definition or

one state of affairs. It is the attempt to so restrict it that has led to endless confusion in its exegesis since Weiss.

This is a welcome emphasis, even if one might demur at some of the terms used; the search for one-to-one reference in OT prophecy as well as in Jesus' eschatological teaching is still a major cause of unnecessary Christian bickering, not least in evangelical circles. The resultant exegesis of Matthew 11:12 (p. 46) is particularly helpful in getting behind the competing one-point interpretations to the real meaning. But this approach can also be used to evade, apparently, the plain sense of the presence of the kingdom in Luke 17:20-21 (p. 45): "It means that the symbol of the kingly activity of God on behalf of his people confronts the hearers of Jesus as a true tensive symbol with its evocation of a whole set of meanings, and that the myth is, in the message of Jesus, true myth with its power to mediate the experience of existential reality." I think I find Luke easier to grasp!

The second area studied is the parables. Here Perrin is less concerned with his own contribution than with surveying the developing discussion, particularly in America. This section is a valuable guide. True, it could give the impression that since the so-called new hermeneutic no one outside America has studied the parables. But the American debate is important and has found an able interpreter in Perrin, himself a member of the SBL Parables Seminar. If he is decidedly free with his superlatives, particularly with reference to the contributions of Funk and Crossan, he is not uncritical.

The discussion focuses on the literary character of the parables as metaphor rather than simile and the recognition that they have a performative and not merely descriptive or prescriptive function. The progressive refinement of these insights since the launching of the new hermeneutic makes a fascinating story. Its result is that the parables have been "undomesticated." Instead of cozy homilies, they have been found to be "almost impossible to live with," as disturbing as works of Picasso or Stravinsky. "One cannot live everyday on the boundary of human existence in the world, and yet it is to this boundary that one is constantly brought by the parables of Jesus" (p. 200). Overstated, perhaps? But a truer assessment of the devastating impact of Jesus' parables than the homely "earthly story with a heavenly meaning" approach on which most of us were brought up.

"Structuralism," the brave new word in Biblical studies, is subjected to a not-too-kindly criticism. Perrin regards its contribution as generally right, but "extremely disappointing to the interpreter" (p. 180; cf. pp. 174-175). One might add that a discipline that can coin technical terms like "*actantiel* grid" would be well advised to learn from the simple language of the parables!

In conclusion, Perrin refuses to summarize the message of Jesus because it is characteristically presented in symbol and parable, which resist translation into propositional statements. Characteristic these forms of speech may be, but that does not make them exclusively authentic nor deprive Jesus of the right to make propositional statements. The verdict is dangerously reminiscent of Bultmann's pronouncement on what is "characteristic" of Jesus and his consequent reluctance to accept anything else as authentic. Perrin has rightly, and very valuably, alerted us to the importance of symbol and metaphor in Jesus' teaching; but there is more to Jesus than that.

Not, perhaps, an "enormously important" book, but a useful introduction to some important themes in contemporary NT scholarship which have a lot to offer to the serious interpreter of the teaching of Jesus.

R. France

Department of Christian Religious Studies, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Nigeria

## CHRISTIAN WORLD VIEW

*No King but Caesar.* By William R. Durland. Scottdale, Pa: Herald Press, 1975, 181 pp., \$5.95.

Carrying the subtitle "A Christian Lawyer Looks at Christian Violence," this work, by the chairman of the department of philosophy and religion, Purdue University, is designed to acquaint religiously-oriented people with the causes of violence and propose a solution to their problems.

Beginning with the Scriptures, Durland traces the tension between violence and non-violence through the Bible and the teaching of the Church fathers to the present. His conclusion is that while "Caesar" may demand unquestioning obedience as proof of one's loyalty, the Christian's highest allegiance is to Christ, the Prince of peace. This seemingly simplistic thesis is then enlarged on and applied to various problem areas. The conclusion reached by this Roman Catholic author is that Christians should return to the non-violence of the NT era and concern themselves with witnessing.

But what of the specifics? In his chapter on "Violence or Nonviolence?" Durland draws together the threads of thought he has presented in his book. He indicts the "institutional church" for not having preached a proper message and shows how *secular* leaders have frequently led the way in promoting change by non-violent means. He speaks in glowing terms of the late Martin Luther King, but fails to record that wherever King went violence followed (after he had withdrawn). However, by referring to King's speeches and writings he presents a view of the social reformer not generally encountered by readers of the newspapers of his time.

From this premise, Durland proceeds to analyze the danger that would face civilization if the violence of our time were to succeed. The dilemma is seen in the adoption of violent measures to curb violence. "Does violence really succeed?" Durland asks. "The National Commission on Causes and Prevention of Violence published their official report in June 1969 asking that question. Their findings indicate that when those who use violence are sufficiently dedicated, they will be successful in achieving their aims. Those in government hold essentially the same belief, that is, that sufficient use of public violence will deter private violence. Both the right and left, the liberal and the conservative, the radical and the reactionary, the church and the state, black and white have favored violence on the grounds that it succeeds" (p. 150).

The problem is that we end by destroying ourselves, and history has shown the fallacy of such an attitude. Pope Urban II, the actions of the Visigoths, Henry VIII, the Boer War, Hitler's stratagems, and even the events that led up to Wounded Knee are used to prove the author's point. These historic sidelights are then followed by a series of examples to show how non-violent coexistence has worked in the past. Of course, adopting a pacifist stance in the Mau Mau uprisings of Kenya (now Tanzania) in the 1950's did not always pay off.

It is to be regretted that the concluding section of this admirably researched chapter reads like a tract on pacifism. The scholarly stance is, in large measure, set aside for a polemic. And the tabulating of pacifists in the hope that their names will bolster the writer's argument does little to convince readers of the validity of his position. In spite of this weakness, *No King but Caesar* is a well-researched, stimulating "tract for the times."

Cyril J. Barber

Rosemead Graduate School of Psychology, Rosemead, California 91770

*The Unraveling of America.* By Stephen Monsma. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1974, 228 pp., \$4.95 paper.

In Shakespeare's *Pericles*, one fisherman says to his comrade, "Master, I marvel how the fishes live in the sea." "Why, as men do aland," his comrade replies, "the great ones eat up the little ones." Such cynicism has often characterized the evangelical response to politics. Thus Monsma's concern for political involvement is certainly a welcome sign.

However, Prof. Monsma, chairman of the political science department at Calvin College, leaves much to be desired in his "Christian" approach to politics. The core of his philosophy is the "biblical view of man," and from this golden mean he can attack the undue pessimism of the right and equally unjustified optimism of the left. Yet Monsma, like so many other evangelical thinkers, fails to recognize that the sweeping generalizations of Biblical anthropology must be combined with concrete political acumen. He deals concretely with a few major issues, but only skims over many more.

A major portion of Monsma's time is spent criticizing the American political philosophies: conservatism, liberalism, and the radical left, in both their foreign and domestic programs. I take issue with two of his major criticisms. One, to associate the concept of limited government only with political conservatism is historically inaccurate. As one recent observer said, "The outs in America have usually backed states' rights; the ins, centralization." Two, to chide modern liberals for believing in man's basic goodness is to discount the enormous influence of Reinhold Niebuhr. Even neo-conservative P. Viereck concedes that a "Burkean temperament" exists in American liberalism that disdains such "ineffective abstractions" as the perfectibility of man.

Finally, Monsma is guilty of oversimplification. For example, to say that Barry Goldwater's 1964 presidential defeat demonstrates the political infeasibility of conservative ideals is premature, to say the least. Monsma's "progressive realism," which incorporates such elements as an organic concept of society, a belief in progress, and the right to foreign intervention, is based more on common sense than on Christianity. (Monsma himself leans politically toward the left.) Also his weighty textbook style and unnecessary repetition impair the readability of this obviously introductory text.

Ken Bazyn

264 W. 22nd St., Apt. 2C, New York, N. Y. 10011

## PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION

*The Nature of Necessity.* By Alvin Plantinga. Oxford University Press, 1974, 255 pp., \$14.00. *God, Freedom, and Evil.* By Alvin Plantinga. New York: Harper & Row, 1974, 112 pp., \$3.45 paper.

One commentator on Plantinga's last book, *God and Other Minds: A Study of the Rational Justification of Belief in God* (Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1976), said that it "is the most important contribution to the philosophy of religion that has appeared in several decades." It is hard to measure up to success like that, but I believe that *The Nature of Necessity* will do it. Admittedly, the scope of this work is both broader and narrower than *God and Other Minds*. On one hand, it is a brilliant introduction to and defense of a doctrine known as essentialism. Until very recently Anglo-American philosophy has been dominated by a belief that necessity applies only to propositions. Thanks mostly

to Saul Kripke's work in modal logic these assumptions are being re-examined. Plantinga states with additional vigor some of Kripke's conclusions concerning the concept of necessity as distinguished from the linguistic concept of analyticity and the epistemological concepts of the a priori and a posteriori, among others. He attempts to smooth the way for interpreting necessity as true in all possible worlds and *de re* modality by first showing that the main philosophical objections are confused and, second, by presenting a way of explaining *de re* modality by giving *de dicto* equivalents. He also answers the so-called problem of transworld identification. His discussion of unactual objects and proper names is perhaps his most original contribution to philosophy of logic. His distinction between predicative and impredicative propositions will, I believe, be at least as useful as Donnellan's distinction between the attributive and referential use of definite descriptions. On the other hand, this work is narrower in the sense that only two topics in the philosophy of religion are discussed—the problem of evil, and the ontological argument.

The bulk of this work is devoted to topics related to modal logic and philosophy of language and is, consequently, a bit arid and difficult at times. Even so, Plantinga makes it about as clear and lively as can be. The "cash value" of it all comes when he relates it to these two issues in philosophy of religion. He restates his famous free-will defense against the argument from evil. Not only does he masterfully show that all attempts to derive a contradiction from a set of premises which include "God is omnipotent," "God is wholly good," and "Evil exists" fail; but he goes a step further and shows them to be consistent. The notion of possible worlds is relevant here, since what lurks behind the argument from evil and lends it a measure of plausibility is the idea that possibly an omnipotent God could have created a world different and morally better than this one. He shows that the supposition that an omnipotent God could create any possible world he pleases is false.

The ontological argument directly involves his discussion of negative existentials. As previously, he rejects the standard objection to the ontological argument—that existence is not a predicate. But he nevertheless rejects arguments based on the notions that existence or necessary existence is a perfection because they involve *inter alia* the supposition of possible but non-existent objects. Instead, he presents a modified version of the Hartshorne-Malcolm argument that he claims is both valid and sound. The argument, however, is not a proof of its conclusion since its major premise—"Maximal greatness (omniscience, omnipotence and moral perfection in all possible worlds) is possibly exemplified"—while rational to believe, is not known to be true.

The smaller book, *God, Freedom, and Evil*, is mainly a less rigorous statement of the arguments in *The Nature of Necessity* without the benefit of his extensive discussion of relevant topics in philosophy of logic and philosophy of language. Also included are discussions of other a-theological arguments drawn from verificationism and the belief that God's foreknowledge is incompatible with human freedom.

These works mark a noteworthy shift in opinion from *God and Other Minds*. In that work he argued that the ontological argument fails but offered an argument to show that belief in God was no more nor less rational than belief in other minds. Now he believes that the ontological argument is sound but is curiously silent about his former analogical argument. This may be an unfortunate shift. Hume thought that the ontological argument appealed only to those of a "metaphysical head," and Plantinga himself remarks that to the unsophisticated the argument is at first sight "remarkably unconvincing." Plantinga's *tour de force* shows just how deep and philosophically complex the

issues raised by Anselm's little argument are. This, however, does little to allay the suspicions of Hume and the unsophisticated when so much hangs on so little.

T. Pence

Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana 47907

*Philosophy: A Christian Perspective.* By Arthur F. Holmes. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1975, 54 pp., \$1.95.

Since the very beginning of the Christian Church, the relationship between human reason and divine revelation has been a significant problem for both Christian theology and western philosophy.

Arthur F. Holmes, chairman of the department of philosophy at Wheaton College and author of *Christian Philosophy in the Twentieth Century* (Craig Press, 1969) and *Faith Seeks Understanding* (Eerdmans, 1971), wrote a short yet clear "introductory essay" to this issue in 1963 entitled *Philosophy and Christianity*. After more than a decade, he presents a revised edition under the title *Philosophy: A Christian Perspective*.

The new edition adds a chapter to the original three—"Christians in Philosophy" (pp. 41-50)—and brings several modifications to the lexicon and content of the original text. Particularly, the author prefaces the presentation of the essence and purpose of philosophy with a brief survey of the "foundational questions" of philosophy (p. 11). Most of the additions are explanatory, but some tend to bring the essay up-to-date without producing a real deepening—e. g., the short reference to analytic philosophy (p. 13), the mere mention of L. Wittgenstein (p. 14) and of "Sartre and Marcuse" (p. 17), and the hasty critique of Paul Tillich's "existential theology" (p. 30).

After having set forth the nature of philosophy, Holmes reduces its functions to "an intellectual conscience for society" and "the development of a guiding world view" (p. 16); and he disregards the implications of, on one hand, analytical or neo-positivistic and, on the other, structuralistic conceptions for the analysis of the theological language. The author eludes the problems set by the demand of critical verification of the truth claims of Christianity and does not face the tendency for abandoning them if they result devoid of evidence or show inadequate evidence.

Instead of the traditional antithesis of faith vs. reason or theology vs. philosophy, Holmes speaks of relationship between "the Christian faith" and philosophy or between Christianity and "pagan culture" (p. 31). But is Christian faith the dialectical pole of philosophy? In reality, philosophy is not opposed to it; generally, it opposes one of its theological formulations, which are never exempt from cultural or philosophical presuppositions. An exegesis—or even a simple reading—of the Biblical texts implies and cannot avoid some sort of "preliminary notions" or presuppositions; if the reader ignores or denies on principle these notions, he simply substitutes them arbitrarily (and often unconsciously) by other preliminary notions, such as those supplied by tradition or common opinion (see G. E. Ladd, *The New Testament and Criticism*, Eerdmans, 1967).

In fact, one of the main functions of philosophy is that of helping the believer to become aware of the presuppositions and preconceptions that contaminate his Christian faith in its theological articulation. This critical function has to be exercised also in regard to the ideas of Christianity and pagan culture; we cannot use these ideas as referring to two monolithic realities, but we have to acknowledge the presence of "pagan" elements in today's Christianity

and of Christian tradition in our culture. His basic concern for the relationship between Christianity and culture and for the use that Christians can make of ideas outside of Christian theology makes the general lines of his approach to the problem doubtful.

Holmes' intention is openly apologetic. He writes from "a Christian perspective," trying to demonstrate that Christians are more useful to philosophy than philosophers are to Christianity. However, his popularization (or, sometimes, oversimplification) of problems runs the risk of doing a bad turn to the understanding of the contemporary debate on this issue. For example, according to Holmes Christianity is a species of the "genus religion" (pp. 20 f.) and its uniqueness (or "Differentia") lies in the fact that it is a "revealed religion" (but other religions claim the same); the character of "religion" assigned to Christianity is not discussed and the important distinction between "natural religion" and "religion" is only mentioned. No reference is made to the views of Barth, Brunner, and Bonhoeffer and their critique of religion; these theologians are also excluded from the "suggested further reading" that ends the booklet.

Finally, Holmes asserts that "there is no one Christian philosophy" (p. 41) and thus he is able to avoid the *gefährliche Kurzschlüsse* of a Christian philosophy and to maintain a wisely balanced position: "Christianity is not a philosophy" (p. 38), but the Christian perspective is very relevant for philosophical quest.

Massimo Rubboli

Institute of Philosophy, University of Perugia, Perugia, Italy

*War and Christian Ethics.* Edited by Arthur F. Holmes. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1975, 356 pp., \$7.95.

Professor Holmes of Wheaton College has collected this anthology of excerpts from philosophers, ancient and modern, surveying their attitudes toward war and the ethical questions aroused by participation in military conflict, both for individuals and for societies. Intended primarily as an undergraduate reader, this collection brings together extracts from mainly well-known sources, especially in the Christian tradition, but here conveniently linked to the various theoretical issues faced in shaping a Christian criticism of war. The brief introductions serve to link the arguments of the sources quoted and give guidance for further reading.

"Must a Christian only do good and love, and kill no one, nor do anyone harm?" is a question that has exercised Christians both before and since Martin Luther discussed it in a letter to his soldier friend, Assa von Kram. Even before the promulgation of Christianity as the state religion of the Roman empire, the early Church fathers questioned the legitimacy of serving as soldiers of the king and wrestled with the divided loyalties between Church and State thereby imposed. The extracts from Luther and Calvin are here balanced by Menno Simons' appeal for non-violence. The 17th century is represented by Francisco Suarez' discussion of the laws of war, the necessity for limits on human brutality and the right of rebellion against an unjust tyrant, and by the well-known passages from John Locke's treatise *On Civil Government*. By the 19th century, the specifically Christian arguments were overlaid by secular opinions. Kant's idealism was challenged by Hegel's belief in the supreme virtues of courage and sacrifice on behalf of the organic state. Surprisingly, no extract is given from any Marxist writer, and the 20th century is represented only by four American authors: Lyman Abbot, Reinhold Niebuhr, Robert Drinan and Paul Ramsay. It would have been useful to include at least some of the thinking of Europeans,

who, in this century, have struggled to find answers to the ethical demands both of pacifism and of war. William Temple and Charles Raven both had as profound an influence as Niebuhr on the English-speaking community, while it is odd that no contemporary German, not even Bonhoeffer, is as much as mentioned. Although this anthology would appear to have been sparked by the ethical dilemmas of the Vietnam war, it is a pity that the editor did not continue his catholic principles of selection to include a broader segment of contemporary opinion.

John S. Conway

Department of history, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, B.C.

### PASTORAL CARE

*Pastoral Counseling*. By Jay E. Adams. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1975, 155 pp., \$3.75.

One of the dreary wastelands of theological writing is the pastoral care literature. J. Y. Hammett, in a recent review, documents the foundations of the "CPE" movement in the heady liberalism of the 1920s: strong on the potential and future of man, weak on theology, with an inadequate view of the Bible (*JPast Care* 29 [1975], pp. 86-89). Various syncretisms have flourished and floundered. The psychoanalytic movement gave way to the interpersonal movement, which in turn has surrendered the field to a variety of humanistic (i. e., existential) psychologies. These are given a religious lacquer, but the grain beneath is plainly visible. Today it is not unusual to discover the Bible interpreted by such philosophically deep and subtle psychologies as "transcendental analysis" or "primal therapy."

Into this wasteland one would welcome a scholarly, systematic, Biblical introduction to pastoral psychology and counseling that would grapple at once with human complexity, psychological research and Biblical truth. One would hope that a centre such as Westminster Theological Seminary, legendary for its defense of Biblical authority, its erudition, and its evangelical commitment, would produce such an introduction. But Jay E. Adams, professor of practical theology there, will probably not write the volume we await. *Pastoral Counseling*, the second volume in his series, *Shepherding God's Flock*, is a severe disappointment—although scarcely unexpected after *Competent to Counsel*.

Adams' work is superficial—excruciatingly so. He betrays little evidence of scholarship; his many footnotes refer to his other works. He betrays little appreciation and only superficial knowledge of modern schools of psychology. He offers little theological exercise, operating reflexively from a standard Reformed position. His understanding of human predicaments is unsympathetic; his elaboration of *nouthesia* into a school of pastoral counseling is a model of eisegesis.

The inadequacies of Adams' method, combined with an enthusiastic, dogmatic style, lead him into infuriating oversimplifications and claims, as unsupported as they are arrogant. Robust nonsense intrudes itself in text and footnote, such as the astonishing statement that the nouthetic counselor "will tackle nearly any problem that previously might have been referred to a psychiatrist probably with a significantly higher rate of success and certainly in much shorter periods of time" (p. 11, note). His comments on the problems of women and their counsel should turn satisfied and tranquil matrons into raging

feminists. His notes on the seductiveness of females are appalling; his comments on menstrual mood changes, simpering. Updike's *A Month of Sundays* is a useful antidote to Adams' *femme fatale* theory.

The book has a little strength. The chapter on "The Shepherd's Equipment" (a filing system and an office) is useful to the novice. The exercises throughout for students and pastors would be helpful. His comments on "Mutual Ministry in Counseling" are suggestive. On the whole, however, it is hard to state a suitable audience for this volume. Perhaps a captive class of first-year seminary students with no background in the humanities or social sciences, or life, will buy this book. But this seems a rather restricted audience.

I have wondered why Adams' work is so unsatisfying. I suspect there are three reasons. The first is Adams' rhetoric. He confuses opinion for fact (as in his treatment of various psychologies) and derision for argument (as in his treatment of various therapies). Then, Adams is inadequately reflective. Despite his insistence that his nouthetic method is drawn from Scripture, the language and ideas of Mowrer, Glasser and Szasz are as unconcealed as they are unacknowledged. A third difficulty is Adams' hermeneutic. He reduces the Bible to a guide to loving God and one's neighbor: "The Bible is the textbook for counseling since it contains all the principles necessary for learning to love God and one's neighbor"—a sort of celestial problem-solving manual. The Westminster divines had another—and higher—view: "The Scriptures principally teach what man is to believe concerning God and what duty God requires of man."

Cheek by jowl with an inadequate view of Scripture is a reductionist view of truth. "Extra-Biblical data, therefore, are either unnecessary, irrelevant, or contrary to those data provided by the Scriptures." So narrow a view of truth ignores the secular data incorporated by the Holy Spirit into Scripture and neglects the fundamental incarnational principle in divine revelation and working.

J. Ernest Runions

Carey Hall, 5920 Iona Dr., Vancouver, B. C. V6T 1J6

## BOOK NOTES

*Dictionary of Symbols and Imagery.* By Ad de Vries. Amsterdam and London: North-Holland Publishing Company; New York: Elsevier Publishing Company, 1974, 515 pp., 100 Guilders.

This dictionary is similar in scope to Roget's *Thesaurus*, but it deals with symbolism rather than English vocabulary. It is not a critical dictionary or encyclopedia of symbols; rather, it collects all sorts of meanings and uses of symbols from ancient to modern times, in Western (European and Near Eastern) literature, art, religion, mythology, folklore, astrology, psychology, and even nursery rhymes. The collection is both eclectic and eccentric—and, naturally, it is incomplete, since it is the work of a single author. The entries will often strike the reader as very strange indeed, because they attempt to combine so many different fields of study and do not attempt to offer guidance concerning the truth or falsehood of particular ideas.

However, if the dictionary is used like Roget's justly famous volume and not regarded as something that it is not, it will be found to be extremely useful to those who are concerned with the history of religious symbolism, art history, literature, the Bible as literature, etc. It is the place to begin one's study of a particular symbol or image, rather than the place to find the definitive discussion of the subject. From de Vries' dictionary one should turn to the standard encyclopedias and reference works and, above all, to the primary texts.

This work should be added to all institutional libraries.

It would have been helpful if it had a table of abbreviations. Many of the abbreviated references are obvious, but others are not. The inclusion of brief bibliographies also would have been helpful, though this would have added considerably to the size.

W. W. G.

*The Greek New Testament.* Edited by Kurt Aland, Matthew Black, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce M. Metzger, and Allen Wikgren, in cooperation with the Institute for New Testament Textual Research, Münster West, third edition. London: United Bible Societies, 1975, 980 pp.

This third edition of the UBS Greek NT differs from the first and second editions in important matters, and scholars should see to it that they update their usage of the UBS text accordingly. While the difference between the first and second editions consisted in changes in the evaluation of evidence for the variant readings (the A, B, C, D ratings), the third edition contains "a more thorough revision of the Greek text" (p. viii). The review of evidence behind the third edition was undertaken by Martini and involved numerous suggestions from Aland. As a result, over 500 changes have been incorporated into the new edition.

Other differences include minor corrections in text and apparatus, some changes in evaluation of evidence, a rewritten index of quotations (eliminating allusions and listing quotations in NT and OT order), and changes in punctuation.

One new development marked by the appearance of this edition is that it contains a text identical to that of the 26th edition of the Nestle-Aland NT. The UBS edition and the Nestle-Aland edition will each continue to have different apparatuses with different emphases reflecting somewhat the different readerships that they are designed to serve.

It is worth noting that the third edition of the UBS text has a previously-published companion volume, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (ed. Bruce M. Metzger [1971]), that discusses the readings chosen in this edition.

Larry W. Hurtado

Regent College, 2130 Wesbrook Crescent, Vancouver, B. C. V6T 1W6

*Jeremiah, Meet the 20th Century.* By James W. Sire. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1975, 116 pp., \$2.50.

This book contains twelve topical studies based on Jeremiah's life and message with the aim of guiding the reader in his understanding of the prophet's message—first to Jeremiah's contemporaries, and second to modern readers. The themes include the call of God, the authority of God's Word, Christianity and politics, discouragement, and hope. Throughout, Sire notes the parallels between Jeremiah's day and ours, such as moral decay, political corruption and spiritual rot. He places emphasis on the application of Jeremiah's message to the modern reader, urging action based on an understanding of the message.

The guide is not a commentary, yet it shows acquaintance with scholarly work. Sire acknowledges that problems arise concerning the organization and dating of various parts of the book but concludes that in the passages studied "there should be few unresolvable problems of serious consequence" (p. 89). His answers to difficulties are concise and sound. "Notes for the Leader" give more guidance on some difficult problems. A good feature of the book is its policy of referring the reader to other sources for fuller treatment of problem areas.

One's understanding of Jeremiah is facilitated by the appendices which include a structural outline of the Book of Jeremiah, a chronology of Judah (639-581 B.C.), and a list of the kings of Judah.

The book is a helpful study guide that will find much use in Bible study groups.

Stanley K. Riegel

Golfview, Station Sq., Lumphanan, Aberdeenshire, Scotland

*IATG. International Glossary of Abbreviations for Theology and Related Subjects.* By Siegfried Schwertner. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1974, 360 pp.

This work—the initials *IATG* are taken from the German title—is an attempt to standardize abbreviations used for journals, series, commentaries, and even publishers' trade names, which are used in bibliographical references in theological writing. It includes approximately 7500 titles, which are abbreviated, where possible, by capital initials. Thus, as we would expect, *The Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* becomes *JETS*, its predecessor the *Bulletin* is listed as *BETS*, the monograph series as *METS*.

One would think that 7500 titles would be nearly complete, but this is definitely not the case. One reason lies in the fact that too much is included. Do we really need an abbreviation for Harper Torchbooks (*HTB*), Fontana Books (*FB*), Facet Books (Biblical series: *FB.B*; historical series: *FB.H*), or *International Who's Who* (given the unlikely abbreviation *IWIW*)? A further reason lies in the fact that the author has worked largely from printed sources rather than from the books and journals themselves and has not, in fact, had access to even some

of the basic catalogues of the major libraries (e. g., Library of Congress, British Museum). Thus the result is a very tentative first draft rather than an authoritative listing.

Within a very brief period of time I was able to find the following journals which have been omitted from the *IATG: Christian Scholar's Review* (and its predecessor, *The Gordon Review*), *Colloquium*, *Journal of the Christian Brethren Research Fellowship* (though the Occasional Papers of the *CBRF* are listed), *Studia Biblica et Theologica*, *Themelios*, *Theologischer Beiträge*, and *Theological Students' Fellowship Bulletin*. I am sure that anyone else could do the same in his own sphere of interest. Further, while there are no abbreviations for the standard European translations of the Bible, there are the misleading entries: *AV*, *EV*, *RSV*, and *RV*—not what you would think at all, but obscure journals that most people in the English-speaking world will have never heard of or be likely to refer to. The omissions, sometimes misleading or inappropriate abbreviations, and the likelihood that it will be a long time before one can assume that there will be general agreement on uniform abbreviations, mean that each new monograph or reference work will still have to include its own list. However, the author has performed a real service for the scholarly community and has given us, above all, a check-list of journals and series that will doubtless be of value to the student or researcher who is either attempting to trace the proper title lying behind an elusive abbreviation or who is compiling his own table of abbreviations for his own work.

Schwertner's work should be included in all institutional theological libraries.

W. W. G.