BOOK REVIEWS

The Apostolic Fathers: A New Translation and Commentary. Vol. 1: *An Introduction.* By Robert M. Grant. New York: Thomas Nelson, 1964. Pp. xi plus 189 and bibliography. $4.00. Reviewed by John Warwick Montgomery, Professor and Chairman, Division of Church History and History of Christian Thought, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, Illinois.

English readers are here introduced to a projected six-volume translation of the Apostolic Fathers, of which Vol. 2 will contain First and Second Clement (ed. Grant and H. H. Graham of Virginia Theological Seminary), Vol. 3, the Didache and Barnabas (ed. R. A. Kraft of Manchester), Vol. 4, Ignatius of Antioch (ed. Grant), Vol. 5, Polycarp, the Martyrdom of Polycarp, and the Fragment of Papias (ed. W. R. Schoedel of Brown), and Vol. 6, Hermas (ed. G. F. Snyder of Bethany Biblical Seminary).

Vol. 1, by the general editor of the series and my former colleague on the University of Chicago Divinity School faculty, Robert M. Grant, might appear to be an objective background essay introducing the patristic texts which subsequent volumes will supply in translation. Unhappily, however, this is far from the case. Grant's *Introduction* is a piece of special pleading for a particular approach to the Fathers in relation to the New Testament. The Reformers' question, "Is true Christianity to be found in an ongoing, continuous tradition or in a book [the Bible] which provides a permanent norm?" is posed at the outset (p. 2), and Grant, opting for the former, resoundly raps the Reformers for holding to the latter. For him, no qualitative line can be drawn between the canonical New Testament and the writings of the Apostolic Fathers. Thus Grant adds to the mass of current literature which opposes Sola Scriptura by subsuming it under the general rubric of Tradition—a position whose ecumenical overtones are not difficult to see. Doubtless we should not be surprised at Grant's theological stance when we recall that Frederick W. Danker, himself hardly a thoroughgoing conservative, wrote of Grant's *A Historical Introduction to the New Testament* (1964): "This introduction to the New Testament might well be titled 'An Agnostic's Credo,' for one of its primary objectives is to demonstrate that there is much that we do not know about the historical circumstances surrounding the contents and the publication of the New Testament documents" (*Christian Century,* May 20, 1964).

Though there are values in Grant's patristic introduction (e.g., a useful history of the interpretations of the Apostolic Fathers across the centuries, with bibliographical data on the discoveries of their various writings), the discriminating reader owes it to himself to study this book in the light of such a treatment of canonicity as is provided by R. Laird Harris' *Inspiration and Canonicity of the Bible* (1957), where it is decisively shown (chap. xi: "The Patristic Test of Canonicity") that "the authors who are closest to the apostles make much of the fact that the apostles are far above them." Moreover, in contact with standard patrological reference works (Ouasten, Altaner, Cayré, et al.), one soon begins to question the necessity of yet an-

other introduction to the Apostolic Fathers; but perhaps the translations in subsequent volumes of Grant's series will provide *post hoc* justification for his book.

The Gospel According to Peanuts. By Robert L. Short. Richmond, Virginia: John Knox Press, 1965. 127 pp. Paper, $1.50. Reviewed by J. Edward Hakes, Chairman, Department of Bible and Philosophy, Wheaton College, Wheaton Illinois.

This little paperback is well worth reading, although, perhaps, not for the reason it was written. Short finds just too much in the *Peanuts* strip. He claims to discover elements of the thought of Kierkegaard (p. 8), St. Paul (p. 9), Shakespeare (p. 14), Barth (p. 33), Luther (p. 35), Pascal (p. 49), Calvin (p. 50), Golding (p. 51), T. S. Eliot (p. 79), and Jonathan Swift (p. 122, although in reverse!) in the episodes he has carefully culled out from the voluminous supply of Schulz' daily output of cartoons. Even Hegel (p. 103) and Van Gogh (p. 109) almost anticipated Snoopy, even though unwittingly! Short denies that he used eisegesis in dealing with the strip (p. 32), but the reader cannot help but be suspicious that he "reads into" the cartoons more than is there. He says that "there are lessons to be found in *Peanuts;* but just as in the parables of Christ, we are not always sure what these lessons are" (p. 28); yet he appears to be much surer about these esoteric meanings than seems justifiable. He just is not exegeting the gospel according to *Peanuts.*

Nevertheless the book deserves wide circulation among Christians and non-Christians alike, for it has a message which needs to be heard. It presents *the* gospel of Christ (although with some neo-orthodox overtones) in a most fascinating manner. Evangelistically-minded Christians can give it to their unbelieving friends as a means of presenting the message of God's redemption in a way that will be read.

And the best part of the book to this reviewer is the first section in which Short makes a very convincing case for the "indirect communication" of the Christian message through the arts, including cartoons. *Peanuts'* creator is a Christian. He wants to preach through his art (p. 7). And with Short's assistance he does! If Schultz' "parables" need interpreting, Short is obviously the man for the job. Or, perhaps, Schultz is interpreting Short. But whichever way it is, it really makes little difference as far as the benefits of reading this book are concerned.

Thomas Cranmer's Doctrine of the Eucharist: An Essay in Historical Development by Peter Brooks, (The Seabury Press, New York, 134 pp., $3.75). Reviewed by Gregg Singer, Catowba College, Salisbury, N.C.

The Reformation in England as well as on the continent has continued to be a fertile field for historical investigation and Peter Brooks has proved this to be the case in regard to the continuing controversy surrounding the role of Cranmer in the reformation of the church in England. Specifically Brooks has investigated the development of Cranmer's doctrine of the Lord's Supper and while this treatise may not prove to be the last word on Cranmer it cannot be ignored by any future study of this controversial topic. The author skillfully uses the long neglected Commonplace books of

Cranmer in his effort to reach the development of Cranmer's doctrine of the Lord's Supper.

Although he willingly admits that Cranmer passed through a transitional period in his view of the Lord's Supper, Brooks refuses to concede that Cranmer ever taught the doctrine of consubstantiation, largely on the ground that modern Lutheran scholarship denies that Luther held the view commonly ascribed to him. He does, however, admit that during this transitional period in his development Cranmer was influenced by the theologians at Wittenberg during the years before 1546. Brooks however, argues that Cranmer's greatest affinity to Wittenberg resulted from his loyalty to the Scriptures and that basically Cranmer arrived at the doctrine of a true and spiritual presence of Christ in the sacrament as it was taught by Martin Bucer and John Calvin. By this same kind of reasoning the author denies that Cranmer ever held to a Zwinglian view of the Lord's Supper.

The author frankly admits that Cranmer was not one of the great theologians of the Reformation although he was undoubtedly a very good scholar, and his administrative duties interfered with his scholarly leanings.

This is a good book and throws new light on Cranmer's spiritual development. Brooks makes it quite clear that the dominant note in Cranmer's thinking was his loyalty to the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

His ecumenical leanings were most certainly not those of the contemporary ecumenical movement for he placed loyalty to the Scriptures above all else and his willingness to cooperate with Bucer and Calvin for unity in the matter of the Lord's Supper was based on his zeal for unity on this vital Christian doctrine on the high level of the position of the Scriptures rather than on tradition or convenience. Unity on this or any doctrine was not to be purchased at the expense of Biblical truth.

The Hermeneutics of Philo and Hebrews, by Sidney G. Sowers (John Knox Press, Richmond, Virginia, 1965), 140 pages and bibliography, $2.75. Reviewed by Richard N. Longenecker, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, Illinois.

Noteworthy is this first volume of the projected "Basel Studies of Theology" series, edited by the faculty of Theology at the University of Basel. The work was originally a doctoral dissertation prepared under Professors Oscar Cullmann and Bo Reicke, and reflects the *Heilsgeschichte* emphasis of the former and the literary criticism of the latter. In equal proportions, two matters are treated: (1) the rationalé and methodology of Philonic allegory; and (2) the convergences between Hebrews and Philo.

The first four chapters are extremely well done, and offer a trustworthy introduction to Philo Judaeus and allegorical exegesis. The last four chapters begin with the working hypothesis of Apollos' authorship of Hebrews, and argue that the conceptual and terminological convergences between Philo and Hebrews evidence that the writer of Hebrews was steeped in the tradition of the "Alexandrian school" — the many parallels cannot have been by chance. It must be carefully observed that Dr. Sowers is not arguing for an identity of exegesis between Philo and Hebrews. He frankly acknowledges the lack of allegory in Hebrews (and expresses his amazement that though the writer had a definite Alexandrian background his

product excludes Alexandrian hermeneutics *par excellence*), and indicates that often the exegetical practices employed in the epistle appear also in the Talmud, sectarian Judaism, and even in the other parts of the New Testament. What he is arguing is that "the exegetical conclusions reached by the Alexandrian school of Jewish allegorists are firmly in the writer's mind, and the results of their work can frequently be seen *behind* his argument. At times, as in chap. 11, the writer merely says things *in passing* which betray his exposure to the school's tradition, notions frequently having been worked out through allegory but whose original arguments and bases have now been omitted" (p. 137, italics mine). On the basis of these incidental convergences of thought and expression — not of exegetical methodology — Dr. Sowers concludes: "Until some source dating earlier than the letter is discovered . . . it seems best to hold fast to the conclusion reached by many, that the writer of Hebrews has come from the Alexandrian school which historically runs from the LXX through *Wisdom of Solomon*, Aristobulus, and the *Letter of Aristeas* to Philo" (pp. 72-73).

Dr. Sowers' treatment of convergences clearly demonstrates that there are many conceptual and terminological parallels between Hebrews and Philo, and this, coupled with the exclusive citation of the LXX and the quality of Greek in the epistle, necessitates that the Hellenistic orientation of the epistle be considered seriously in any discussion of provenience. But the claim that thus it can be "confidently asserted" that the author of Hebrews had an early preparation in Alexandrian circles cannot so easily be made. That these are true geneological parallels, and not merely analogical, cannot be determined without additional consideration of: (1) the extent of such concepts and expressions in early Rabbinic Judaism (i.e., before the remolding of Pharisaic traditions by Rabbi Judah), in Essene circles, and among the populace of Palestine (as introduced by the widely-read *Wisdom of Solomon* and the *Letter of Aristeas*); (2) the possibility that topics and expressions of an epistle are partially determined by the recipients' background and interests; and (3) the wide-spread use of amanuenses, the degree of freedom they possessed, and the effect of such practice upon modern literary analysis of ancient conceptual imagery and expression.

This work by Dr. Sowers is a significant treatment of a limited, though highly important subject. No New Testament scholar can afford to ignore it. Its weaknesses lie in the areas of too narrowly restricting its investigations, outstripping its evidence by its conclusions, and failure to interact in detail with alternative suggestions. While the Judaic studies of Bónsirven and Daube are cited in footnotes, no attempt is made to relate their studies to the presentation (in fact, weakness in this area is displayed throughout; a glaring example being the association of the *Testament of Levi* with Pharisaism on page 59n). Little interaction is had with the positions of Wm. Manson and E. Kasemann, both of which stand in opposition to Sowers' presentation and each of which is treated in twelve lines or less. Yigael Yadin's "Qumran Hypothesis" is dismissed in less than five lines of type, even though his article seems to have furnished the original impetus for the work at hand. And Roller's thesis of the prominence of amanuenses in the Hellenistic age, together with Albright's frequent insistence on the importance of this in any determination of language and style, are not even mentioned.

Maker of Heaven and Earth: by Langdon Gilkey (Doubleday and Co., Inc., Garden City, N.Y. 1965), 378 pages, $1.45. Reviewed by Gordon H. Clark, Professor of Philosophy, Butler University, Indianapolis.

The aim of this book is "to reinterpret the idea of creation so that it is not just an irrelevant dogma inherited from a prescientific and prehistorical past, but a symbol which points to the profoundest understanding . . . of human life" (pp. 13-14). In pursuing this aim the author shows the bearing of the doctrine of creation on other doctrines, so that in a sense the book becomes a reinterpretation of a large section of Christian thought. The reader must observe, however, to what extent the reinterpretation preserves or does not preserve thought that is Christian.

In opposition to some theologians, Edgar Sheffield Brightman, for example, who say that "goodness is more fundamental than power" and "there is nothing worthy of worship in power as such," and who therefore posit a finite God, Dr. Gilkey writes, "Through God's redeeming works we know that he is supremely righteous and supremely loving. But when we ask *who* is supremely righteous and loving, the answer comes in terms of God's original activity, creation . . . The transcendent 'Godness' of God, what gives him deity and so ultimate significance to our lives, is most directly manifested to us through his creative activity as the transcendent source of all being and of all existence" (pp. 83-84). In particular the author objects to those who are so enamoured of personal categories that they deny any relevance at all to ontological concepts in speaking of God (p. 86, footnote).

These lines in themselves sound Biblical; but when he refers to the idea of creation as a symbol of human life and assigns mutually exclusive spheres to science and religion, one begins to wonder if he has preserved any of the old idea of creation or has substituted something wholly other.

The first chapters of Genesis, he asserts, are fables and nothing else: the story is Babylonian mythology. The point of the fable, i.e. the doctrine of creation, is not "about" science; and hence science cannot object to it. Science investigates origins and causes; it asks, what state of affairs preceded this one; but science does not ask about the origin of reality as a whole. Therefore science and the creation fable cannot conflict. There have been conflicts in the past only because religion and science were confused with each other.

Science, and only science, can give information. Religion reveals no facts. Therefore the notion that the universe began at a moment, since it is a cosmological fact, cannot be a religious truth (p. 314). Creation therefore is a myth, something beyond all questions of fact: "the myth of creation does not refer to a particular event . . . any more than the myth of the Fall tells us about a first human being" (p. 317).

If we want facts, let us rely on science. By all means let us have no facts in religion: particularly the fact of creation. This last sentence is not a verbatim quotation.

Metaphysics as well as science should also be kept separate from religion. "Philosophy seeks to resolve the problems of *thought,* not necessarily of *life* (p. 36. italics his, as if thought and life were antithetical). Philosophy thus drives toward the goal which the mind demands, the goal of complete

intelligibility . . . . The theologian, however, is more apt to be wary of such demands for total coherence . . . the incoherent and paradoxical, the intellectually baffling . . . character of our experience reflect not merely our lack of systematic thinking but also the real nature of creaturehood" (p. 37).

One must pause to take this in. The lack of coherence and intelligibility is not the result of our poor thinking, as if we were students who could not get our geometry correct. Unintelligibility is rooted in ontology: it is a characteristic of the real nature of things created. From which we may infer that God made a mess of things when he created them.

Therefore "we will misunderstand the deeper facts of our life if we seek to understand everything too clearly."

Apparently intellectual confusion is a spiritual asset. By it we are, are we not?, more conformed to the image of God who created the incoherent world. By all means, let us not understand anything too clearly! Let us keep clarity, as well as facts, out of religion.

At the beginning of the following chapter the author blandly assumes that "In the preceding chapters we have tried to understand the meaning of the Christian doctrine of creation" (p. 319). It is good of him to tell us so, for we would not have guessed it otherwise. He asks, "Why does Christian theology hold to these clearly paradoxical anthropomorphisms?" To which he replies that all language about God is analogical.

But, first Christian theology does not hold to these paradoxical anthropomorphisms. Christianity has always held that creation is a fact and that the Fall is a fact. Hence a theory of analogical language to do away with these facts is unnecessary. Furthermore, if coherence is bad, and if religion contains no facts, how could one select a proper analogy? The author admits that the problem of theology is to select the best analogies, the most appropriate symbols, the most illuminating descriptions (p. 324). But if we have no positive knowledge of God to begin with, we have no ground for judging what is most appropriate or illuminating.

Not only is there no knowledge by which we could see that one analogy is appropriate and its contrary is not, another reason makes all analogies equally appropriate and unilluminating. The author tells us, "Whatever we say of him [God] must be affirmed and denied at the same time." For example, God is holy and God is not holy; he is creator and he is not. This explains why those excellent religions, Brahmanism and Zen Buddhism, abound in paradoxes. But instead of this being a recommendation for Christianity to follow, as the author apparently assumes, a Biblical position would deploret the conclusion and deny the premise.

Finally, at the end of the book, the author asks, Do myth and paradox leave us in total ignorance? Must there not be some direct and unsymbolic knowledge? Yes, there is, he says. God is directly known in Christ as holy love. "Thus the personal recreative love of God in Christ, not the ontological power of God in general existence (cf. pp. 83-84, 86, quoted above), is the one unsymbolic and direct idea of God that Christians possess" (pp. 359-360).

Strange, is it not, that if metaphysical being and cause are symbolic, if Creator and Lord are only analogical, and if "we can never regard personal symbols about God as literally applicable," the term love, the very

personal term love, is unsymbolic, direct, positive knowledge. This unsatisfactory and inconsistent defense of the new doctrine of creation leaves us with the conclusion that mythological theology is indeed mythology.

Ernst Fuchs, *Studies of the Historical Jesus.* Naperville, Illinois, Allenson, 1964, 228 pp. plus index, $4.50. Reviewed by Carl F. H. Henry, Editor of Christianity Today.

This monograph in the *Studies in Biblical Theology* series is a highly polished mirror of the post-Bultmannian mood. Professor Fuchs insists on the indispensability of historical affirmation about Jesus of Nazareth, yet he does so only as aspects of the *kerygma* or apostolic faith. There are valuable exegetical insights along the way, and a creative vigor in the handling of New Testament teaching, but the work reflects the extremely critical views, and particularly the reluctance to insist on historical revelation as such, that is so highly objectionable in existential exegesis. Fuchs is a colorful contender for his alternative, and the essays gain added interest through the window they provide on the "in-fighting" between and among Bultmannians and post-Bultmannians.

ANNOUNCEMENT

ETS's 17th annual meeting will convene in Nashville, Tenn., on Monday, December 27, 1965, at Free Will Baptist Bible College. Sessions will extend into Wednesday, Dec. 29; and those who wish may stay on for the SBLE meetings, which convene the same day. Here are some ETS highlights:

Tuesday morning, Dec. 28: entirely devoted to the topic, "Biblical Inerrancy Today," with Pres. John Walvoord of Dallas moderating. Panel participants: Kenneth S. Kantzer, R. Laird Harris, Harold Lindsell.

Likewise, the whole of Monday evening the 27th is committed to a single crucial topic, "Frontier Issues in Contemporary Theology, from the Evangelical Perspective." Carl Henry, editor of *Christianity Today* will moderate a panel of leaders in their respective fields. Panel members: Arnold C. Schultz, Berkeley Mickelsen, John Montgomery, Roger Nicole.

Gordon Clark has announced that his presidential address on Tuesday evening will center upon the inerrancy of Scripture. Start planning now to share in these significant sessions.