

## BOOK REVIEWS

*From Rationalism to Irrationality.* By C. Gregg Singer. Phillipsburg, New Jersey: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1979, 479 pp., \$14.50.

The theme of this book on the history of ideas is stated in the subtitle: "The Decline of the Western Mind from the Renaissance to the Present." Singer's thesis is that the irrationalism inherent in classical Greek and Roman thought was incorporated into humanist thought at the time of the Renaissance and has continued to characterize Western thought to the present day. Thus the irrationalism of the twentieth century is the logical and necessary consequence of all this and not the radical break with the past as is often thought. The first two chapters give a brief survey of classical, medieval, Renaissance and Reformation thought. The rest of the book is a detailed exposition of the major thinkers from the Enlightenment (beginning with Descartes) up to the present day. He shows that the history is continuous, each man being seen in the context of what has gone before and in the light of new challenges being faced.

Although much of the book deals with the major philosophers, Singer also examines the major thinkers in various disciplines of study. The two chapters on Darwin and the impact of Darwinism are very enlightening. He argues that evolutionary thought has made such a tremendous impact not because it has been proven scientifically but because it presents a new world and life view that is naturalistic. His exposition of John Dewey's philosophy and its impact on education in North America is a good example of how ideas affect practice.

Modern liberalism with its stress on human autonomy and freedom has shaped the social sciences in their recent rise to prominence. Another major argument of Singer is that ironically it is this liberalism that is pushing Western society toward totalitarianism. Its basic assumption is that man is inherently good, so it presses for increasing government involvement in all areas of life to force man to be good and to prevent him from engaging in evil acts. On the one hand it preaches the relativity of morals and law, and on the other hand it wants more and more government involvement in all areas of life.

The last chapter gives an outline of how Christian theism can provide an intellectual remedy for the modern sickness unto death. Singer is pointing Christian thinkers in the right direction as they (hopefully) apply the principles of Christianity to their respective areas of study. The value of this chapter is in showing that it can (and must) be done, and that it is intellectually defensible to do so (even though it may be very unpopular today).

This book is a valuable work of scholarship for thinking evangelicals. Many Christians and humanists have been concerned about the obvious decline of Western society. Singer has produced a careful, detailed exposition and evaluation of the leading thinkers who have produced the present state of decline. Of course there are details of the book that are debatable, but on the whole it is a very thorough analysis and an excellent apologetic tool against the blind optimism of modern humanists.

This book is a clear challenge to Christian leaders and thinkers who are not content merely to withdraw into the Christian community and await the second coming. Singer's final paragraph presents the challenge to Christians to be the salt of the earth and the light of the world: "Reconstruction of society will not be an easy task in either Europe or America. It will be a long and difficult process if it is done at all. To reconstitute the thinking of our day and direct it into biblical patterns of thought is a tremendous challenge for the most dedicated leadership possessed of the talents and wisdom necessary for the realization of such a goal. But it must be accomplished if Western man is to carry out the divine mandate

to build a Christian culture. To aspire to less is to be found unfaithful in the totality of our stewardship. To Christians of the West comes such a challenge and so great an opportunity."

Guenther H. Haas

Canadian Bible College, Regina, Saskatchewan

*The Role of the Augsburg Confession: Catholic and Lutheran Views.* Ed. Joseph A. Burgess. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980, 203 pp., \$13.95.

This book was published for the Augsburg Confession's 450th anniversary in 1980—a year marked by numerous Lutheran-Roman Catholic events, especially worship services. The volume itself presents several essays by Lutheran and Roman Catholic theologians on both sides of the Atlantic. The dust jacket promises a "stimulating discussion of the possibilities for catholic recognition of the Augsburg Confession." Lutheran Peter Brunner had suggested such a prospect in 1967. Among Roman Catholic scholars, Vinzenz Pfnür of Münster took the lead in promoting the idea (including writing a book-length comparison of the doctrine of justification in the "*Confessio Augustana*" [CA] with Roman Catholic theology of the day). His is the first essay, a statement that sets the tone for those that follow.

Pfnür's basic idea is simple: The true Lutheran Reformation teaching is not to be found in the early writings of Luther or Melanchthon but in the CA, which consciously corrects earlier exaggerations or errors on the part of the Reformers. Even the lengthier and more polemical Apology of the 1531 Augsburg Confession (Ap) backpedals from some of the early positions. Unfortunately, Pfnür continues, neither the Roman respondents at Augsburg nor the later Council of Trent quite perceived this. Instead their attention was riveted on the initial Lutheran bombasts. Moreover, Trent especially attempted to shed many of the nominalistic stances about which Luther was so incensed. Result, according to Pfnür: "The position opposed by Luther and Melanchthon was advocated neither by *Confutatio* nor by the Council of Trent, while, on the other hand, the Reformation positions found in the catalogues of heretical statements and rejected from the Council of Trent to the present do not occur in the teaching of the CA and Apology" (p. 15). In short, Pfnür claims that from a Roman viewpoint nothing is wrong with the CA and the Ap—and nothing ever was.

This facile revisionist thesis is of course most prone to attack on the ground Pfnür himself has covered extensively: justification. One need only compare Canon XI of Trent's Sixth Session with Ap IV 76-86 (Theodore G. Tappert, ed., *The Book of Concord* [BC], Fortress, 1959, pp. 117-119) or Canon XII with Ap IV 48-52 (BC 113-114) to see sharply pointed differences. Pfnür seems to be on more solid ground when he asserts that at the religious negotiations at Augsburg in August 1530 "one finds a consensus in the doctrine of justification. The forgiveness of sins is said to take place through the *gratia gratum faciens* (grace making graced) and faith formally and actually (*formaliter*) understood" (p. 14). True, Melanchthon and the Lutherans had come to terms with Eck and the Romanists on this formulation. But, as a subsequent essay in this collection indicates, Melanchthon's own accounting of the situation to Luther shows that heartfelt agreement all around was lacking: "I compelled Eck to confess that righteousness is correctly assigned to us by faith. But he wanted us to write 'that we are justified through grace and faith.' I had no objection—but then, that fool didn't understand the word *grace*" (p. 157, italics his).

Eck is not the only person to differ with the CA and those who stood behind it on the question of grace. Pfnür notes that Ap IV 116 speaks of "grace that makes us acceptable to God," and he adds that the Ap "thereby . . . excludes a one-sided, forensic understanding of justification" (pp. 14-15). In fact the Ap's contention is quite the opposite. Melanchthon says if anything is called *gratia gratum faciens* it ought to be faith, not love. Pfnür insists, however—and this is as old as the *Confutatio* itself—that part and parcel of the "right-



teousness that avails before God" is moral renewal (in his essay Lutheran Wolfhart Pannenberg points out that this is Pfnür's understanding, but he says nothing in criticism of it). This is precisely what the *sola fide* doctrine of the Reformers was intended to reject (see Ap IV 70, BC 116; Ap IV 73, BC 117; Ap IV 159, BC 129 for a sampler). The expression "faith justifies" means that faith obtains forgiveness and justification (Ap IV 45, BC 113; Ap IV 292, BC 152). "Because the righteousness of Christ is given to us through faith, therefore faith is righteousness in us by imputation. That is, by it we are made acceptable to God because of God's imputation and ordinances, as Paul says (Rom. 4:5), 'Faith is reckoned as righteousness'" (Ap IV 307, BC 154). Pfnür notes the latter reference, but he misses its point: that justification can be spoken of as a "making righteous"—as the Apology does—only by virtue of this imputation (cf. pp. 13-14).

The preceding is offered as a "case study" fairly representative of this volume's "make it fit" approach. Of course there is more than one way to smooth down the rough edges of an estrangement. One can chalk it all up to a huge misunderstanding, like Pfnür. Or one can suggest that there were issues between the Lutherans and Romanists at Augsburg but that they do not amount to much. This is the tack Pannenberg takes. In fact he maintains that he is merely echoing the CA itself. To be sure, the conclusion of the Confession's doctrinal articles says that "the whole dissention is concerned with a certain few abuses which have crept into the churches without proper authority" (BC 47). An intriguing explanation is offered in a later essay by Lutheran Robert Jenson, who quite rightly sees Pannenberg's argument as "astonishingly ahistorical" (p. 153). Jenson suggests that since one of the CA's objectives was to show Lutheran agreement with the ancient catholic Church "there was no need . . . for the Reformers to state their fear that their opponents did not share this catholic faith" (p. 155). While I do not agree with every detail of Jenson's presentation I think he is on to a master stroke of Melancthon, who "does not say that *in fact* the opponents agree in these chief articles of faith, or even that he thinks they *will* agree, but precisely that they *must* agree" (p. 155, italics his). For them to take issue with the truly catholic CA is to disavow their own heritage. That is precisely what they did.

Still another way to handle a disagreement is for both sides to give up their original stances and move to a compromise position. This technique is represented among the essays, too. Roman Catholic Harry McSorley claims that "in light of our present historical and exegetical knowledge, it must be said that in the CA, as in the teaching of the Council of Trent, there are inadequacies and even inaccuracies" (p. 143). A point by Lutheran Harding Meyer dovetails with this: "None of the Lutheran confessional writings possesses the character of an irreformable dogma. They continue to be—as they themselves express it—historically conditioned confessions . . . open to new insights which arise in new historical situations" (p. 79). He could not be more mistaken. The very section of the Formula of Concord to which he refers says: "All doctrines should conform to the standards set above [the ecumenical creeds and previous Lutheran Confessions]. Whatever is contrary to them should be rejected and condemned as opposed to the unanimous declaration of our faith" (BC 465). The Preface to the BC is especially desirous that future pastors be taught, along with the Scriptures and creeds, the Augsburg Confession "so that the pure teaching, and confession of the faith may be preserved and perpetuated among our posterity" (BC 12). The CA itself says: "Nor should we wish to bequeath to our children and posterity any other teaching than that which agrees with the pure Word of God and Christian truth" (BC 47). A theology constantly open to reinterpretation and readjustment may be consistent with the genius of Romanism, but it is utterly foreign to the Lutheran Confessions. The latter stand or fall as expositions of Scripture. They cannot teeter between the two while being fine-tuned by the enlightened theology of a critical age.

*The Role of the Augsburg Confession* offers other tantalizing fare. The relationship of the Augsburg Confession to the other Lutheran Confessions is brought to the fore by some essays, while others assume the ostrich posture at this point. The doctrines of the Church, the ministry and repentance present challenges to the harmonizers, because the formal

differences between the CA and the Roman version of these are even greater than Pfnür found with justification. Lutheran Jenson concludes his (otherwise) quite perceptive and helpful chapter with an opaque fanfare for the special hermeneutical character of the gospel as a mode of discourse, in which he tends to blur the proclamation of historical facts about Christ with the kind of legalism characteristic of the Middle Ages. But that is another issue.

In short, this book has much in store for the reader with open eyes. One option he will not find explored, however, is for one of the parties in the dispute simply to admit that the other was right all along.

Ken Schurb

Ft. Wayne, IN

*A Bonhoeffer Legacy: Essays in Understanding.* Ed. A. J. Klassen. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981, 382 pp., \$18.95.

The German Lutheran theologian Dietrich Bonhoeffer, who was martyred at the age of 39 only a month before the end of World War II, has captured the attention of modern thinkers for his pithy phrases like "religionless Christianity," "the man for others" and "cheap grace." His fragmentary writings are used to support such things as secular theology and the necessity for social and political engagement by Christians. The fascination that he holds for people today is evidenced by the continuing flow of books and articles on the man and his work and the existence of an International Bonhoeffer Society that sponsors meetings and is collecting oral-history material from those who knew him. Recently a film has been made on the life of Bonhoeffer with the noted ethicist and evangelical scholar, F. Burton Nelson of North Park Seminary, as the theological adviser.

The book under discussion is a representative example of the various directions in which Bonhoeffer scholarship today is going. This symposium was published on the 75th anniversary of his birth and contains contributions from 23 scholars on both sides of the Atlantic. The consensus is that he was a theologian whose thought was intimately related to the events of his time, but also he was ahead of his time and has had a great influence in shaping modern theology. The basic questions he raised are just as valid now as the day he penned them: "What is Christianity?" and "Who is Christ for us today?"

Eberhard Bethge, the biographer and personal friend of Bonhoeffer, sets the stage for the collection by pointing out that he saw Western religion as something that has little contact with the real currents of life in action. It is pure "inwardness," a "realm of metaphysics," and thus contradicts everything that the Biblical Christ is, does and desires. He believed that Christ is not restricted to specially reserved provinces of life and did not create the Church to be a stabilizer of the status quo or a special department for marginal zones of human existence. He sharply distinguished between true faith and religion, which he called the perversion of faith and a bastion of escape for dropouts.

The essays are divided into six themes, and in a brief review these can only be touched upon. With regard to Bonhoeffer's theological method and hermeneutic, Hans Pfeifer deals with his view of justification, Carl-Jürgen Kaltenborn traces Harnack's influence on him, Clifford Green reveals that in spite of his rejection of Freud he unconsciously adopted some psychoanalytic concepts, and Douglas C. Bowman raises the possibility that he may have been judaizing Christianity.

The strongest section of the book is the historical one. Geoffrey B. Kelly shows that Bonhoeffer held a Christian interpretation of history that affirmed that a Christian is addressed by the Word spoken in the concrete events of history and this in turn demanded the responsible decision to follow Christ regardless of the consequences for one's personal safety. Ruth Zerner examines Bonhoeffer's political ideas in what must be one of the best chapters in the volume. She explains how a Reformation and Teutonic heritage initially



shaped his conception of the state and how his Christology and sense of history modified this so that it became possible for him to be an active participant in the plot against Hitler.

Under the rubric of Christology and discipleship, John D. Godsey calls attention to Bonhoeffer's major legacies, the Christ-centeredness of Christian thinking, costliness of Christian discipleship and worldliness of Christian faith. Jørgen Glenthøj looks at the path between the poles of resistance and submission, and Rainer Mayer argues that he did not confuse God's transcendence with metaphysics nor the Christian faith with religion. In the category of Church and the world, John Wilcken comments on Bonhoeffer's ecclesiology, Henry Mottu notes his challenge to Christians today, Thomas I. Day specifies his understanding of the Christian community, and Ernst Feil treats his view of the world.

In Bonhoeffer's conception of religion and secularization André Dumas shows that religious Christianity makes things unreal, Larry Rasmussen determines what worship in a religionless age will be like, and James W. Woelfel scrutinizes his "reverent agnosticism" whereby faith is authentic when religiosity is dispensed with. Bonhoeffer's ethics constitute the last section. James T. Laney analyzes the contexts of interpretation, decision and action employed in his ethical thought, Tiemo Rainer Peters focuses on the "orders of preservation" and how the Church may intervene in society, Donald S. Bachtell examines the theological, Christological, ontological and existential characteristics of freedom within the Christian reality, William J. Peck factors out the enemy in his thought (the Devil, Satan and Antichrist in the iconic-mythic realm and Hitler and the "German Christians" in the political realm), Herbert Jehle provides a few personal reminiscences of his time with Bonhoeffer in the 1930s, and Marvin Bergman develops a strategy for teaching ethics and moral decision-making in light of his thought.

Such a symposium naturally has some thin contributions but by and large it is well conceived. Of course not all the Bonhoeffer devotees are included (right off hand I can think of three published scholars who are missing) and the editor (or is it actually the fault of the publisher?) neglected to identify the contributors. Still, it can be read with profit and it will be a good introduction to one of the major theological figures of our time.

Richard V. Pierard

Indiana State University, Terre Haute, IN 47809

*The Fire That Consumes.* By Edward William Fudge. Houston: Providential Press, 1982, 500 pp., \$19.95.

This book supporting conditional immortality seems to be more slanted toward raising questions about the traditional view than presenting solid arguments for the conditional view. The conditional view defines everlasting punishment as "utter extinction into oblivion forever" (p. xiii). The traditional view, of course, teaches unending conscious torment of the wicked.

If conditionalism be correct, then it must provide worthy interpretations of certain crucial Biblical passages that come almost immediately to mind. Thus if one wishes to cut through the peripheral (and often wordy) discussions of the many pages of this book to see whether a substantial case has been made for conditionalism, let him or her read the author's suggested exegesis of these passages: (1) 2 Thess 1:9, where eternal destruction is defined as a quality of destruction—i.e., extinction (pp. 46-47); (2) Matt 3:12, where unquenchable fire is understood to mean fire that cannot be stopped (pp. 157-158); (3) Matt 18:8-9, where eternal fire means that it neither begins nor ends with the present age, but does not indicate what it will do to those thrown into it (pp. 183-187); (4) Matt 25:41, 46, where "eternal" is understood to be a qualitative word, "though its quantitative meaning is not denied," and where we must not press the parallel between eternal life and eternal punishment lest we fall into a spirit of vindictiveness (pp. 194-196); (5) and Luke 16:19-31, where we are told that there is "no clear exegetical basis in Luke 16 for any conclusion concerning the end of the wicked" (p. 208).

In addition, one should note some of the exegetical straws necessary to be grasped to help support the conditionalist cause. They include (1) defining death as nonlife, though this does not mean nonexistence (p. 258); (2) emphasizing the symbols in Revelation so that the beast and false prophet are not individuals who are cast into the lake of fire; (3) yet acknowledging that Satan is an individual creature who will be tormented day and night for ever and ever (for which "there is no easy solution," p. 304—unless one is a traditionalist); (4) declaring that death itself will die because the lake of fire "clearly means annihilation and cessation of existence" (p. 307); and (5) insisting that God alone has immortality and people do not, even though a number of other attributes are predicated of God alone that have a counterpart in man (p. 52).

Certain general observations can also be made: (1) The spirit of the book is irenic. (2) So many citations may tend to obscure the real weaknesses of the crucial arguments. (3) The author says that we cannot accept the traditional view until we have answered the conditional view. But why is not the reverse true? Why should we accept the conditional view until the traditional arguments are answered (and, in my judgment, they are not in this book despite all the research that has been done)? (4) If the wicked are to suffer an unspecified length of punishment before being annihilated, is it not reasonable to expect that such a climactic event as that annihilation be stated somewhere in the many eschatological passages in the Scriptures?

Charles C. Ryrie

*The Worship of God: Some Theological, Pastoral, and Practical Reflections.* By Ralph P. Martin. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982, 237 pp., \$7.95 paper.

A central thesis of this book is that "no statement of the church's *raison d'être* comes near to the heart of the biblical witness or the meaning of church history unless the worship of God is given top priority. The church exists for this reason above all else" (p. 209). If Martin is correct in this, and I am inclined to believe he is, the Christian community would do well to reevaluate its commitment to the priority of worship and, if necessary, reform the structures through which it has traditionally proclaimed the excellencies of God. Building on a foundation established in an earlier work (*Worship in the Early Church*, Eerdmans, 1964), Martin provides us in *The Worship of God* with an agenda for just such a task.

The author defines worship as "the dramatic celebration of God in his supreme worth in such a manner that his 'worthiness' becomes the norm and inspiration of human living" (p. 4). This theocentric emphasis, expanded upon in the first two chapters, is without question the most forceful and edifying element in Martin's treatment. He then proceeds to apply this understanding of worship to those various activities that have assumed a central place in the corporate life of the local church (what he calls "the chief constituents of Christian public worship" [p. 171]). Included here are the function of praise, prayer, hymns and sacred songs, the offering (the focus of which is primarily, but not exclusively, financial), confession (the role of "creeds"), the sermon, and the two ordinances of baptism and the Lord's table. The final three chapters treat the role of the Holy Spirit in worship, unity and diversity in NT worship, and a suggested order of service that seeks to integrate the many elements previously determined to be essential to worship. In this he seeks to strike a balance between the extremes of solemnity and joy, form and freedom. Several of Martin's ideas are worthy of special note.

The fundamentally theocentric nature of worship is repeatedly stressed. Only in this way shall we be delivered from that "tyranny of subjectivism" (p. 5) that makes our experience and not God's glory the focus of worship. Indeed the worship of God may well be painful and necessitate sacrifice, commitment and self-denial. Furthermore "the role of the minister has to be seen in this light. He or she is a celebrant, not a cheerleader intent on whipping up enthusiasm or offering the people a psychological boost" (p. 5). Far less should the minister occupy the central role in the service, if as a result other believer-priests are



reduced to an "audience" of passive and inert receptors.

Martin's treatment of praise, although brief, is especially rewarding. The purpose of praise is not "to satisfy his [the worshiper's] needs or to make him feel better or to minister to his aesthetic taste or social well-being, but to express the worthiness of God himself" (p. 17). Thus praise is not an exercise "suspended on human feelings or governed by our emotional state. Even when the worshiper is low in spirit, he is bidden to raise up his head and contemplate the 'mighty works of God' done 'out there,' whether or not he 'feels' at that moment like entering upon a celebration of God" (p. 28). Likewise true prayer, be it in set liturgical form or more spontaneous, "succeeds" when it "melts into commitment and obedience; it fails when it is treated as a recital of our needs and an attempt to force God to act" (p. 37).

The discussion of the doxological function of creeds in corporate worship is excellent, but his attempt to integrate the sermon in worship is less successful. One is perplexed at this point: Is the sermon itself an act of worship or simply an element that prepares the believer for worship? Is there a difference between "ministry" and "worship"? How do they relate? These questions are not sufficiently answered.

Other problems arise in connection with Martin's chapter on unity and diversity in worship. He argues that the NT provides us with principles of worship but "not fixed, immutable practices" (p. 190). Furthermore, he detects four stages in the early Church that reflect diverse but complementary liturgical approaches: (1) "worship in the charismatic community" (the church at Corinth being the prime example); (2) "the reminiscing fellowship" (the model offered in Luke's writings, who therein sought to remind the Church of its charismatic beginning and "to stem the tide of rising ecclesiastical officialdom and institutionalism" [p. 204]); (3) "the organized church" (as seen in the pastoral epistles); and (4) "the 'spiritual' fellowship" (reflected in the Johannine gospel and epistles). Not all will find convincing this interpretation of ecclesiastical development.

Therefore, whereas it is not to be expected that one would agree with each of Martin's exegetical conclusions, he has certainly succeeded in stimulating thought on the subject as well as in exposing a number of prejudices that have for so long suppressed the corporate expression and weakened the theocentric focus of Christian worship.

C. Samuel Storms

Believers Chapel, Dallas, TX

*The Word of Truth: A Summary of Christian Doctrine Based on Biblical Revelation.* By Dale Moody. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981, 628 pp., \$24.95.

Dale Moody, dean of Southern Baptist theologians and senior professor of theology at Southern Seminary in Louisville, has presented us with a widely researched volume of systematic theology based on many years of classroom experience. Moody's attempt to present evangelical theology from a fresh perspective while interacting with current philosophical and scientific viewpoints provides interesting and enlightening reading. The book is marked by impressive surveys of various historical positions on each division of systematic theology. The outstanding contribution at this point is his knowledge of the often neglected Eastern Church. Yet one searches almost in vain for the positive contributions of American theologians like Edwards, Dwight, Hodge, Warfield, Boyce and Strong. In contrast to other recent evangelical attempts at systematic theology by Donald Bloesch and Carl Henry who so often interact with the American evangelical positions, one has to raise the question of why this void exists in Moody's writings. Moody's attempt to write theology "based on biblical revelation" means Biblical revelation based on the results of Biblical criticism. The breadth of the author's work is, however, quite impressive.

As one begins to work through this major contribution, it is quickly apparent that Moody has deep-seated convictions about certain theologian positions. This is obvious in his treatment of revelation and inspiration. He defines revelation not in terms of propositional revelation but in terms of the "I-Thou" encounter. Inspiration is defined in terms of the

Biblical writer and not the Biblical document. As many have suggested, we believe that these issues can have a "both-and" answer and do not have to be decided as an "either-or" issue. His position is a genuine misunderstanding of the evangelical position on inerrancy, which he claims is the result of a rigid dictation theory of inspiration. It is at points of this nature that Moody's neglect of the evangelical literature leaves his position lacking.

Moody maintains that the creation account must be understood within an evolutionary framework, accepting the source-critical theories of the early chapters of Genesis. Adam (in Gen 1-3) is not an historical person but a symbolic representative of every person. Moody's arguments are thorough. Of course his anthropology is conceived from a functional rather than an ontological point of view.

Another instance where Moody's writing is primarily polemical rather than constructive is his treatment of sin and salvation. Distancing himself from the Augustinian-Calvinistic positions, he denies original sin in favor of personal acts of sin. He fails, however, to discuss how these sinful tendencies develop in each person. Consistent with this view is his emphasis on human free will and rejection of Reformed teachings relating to election and effectual grace. One wonders how Moody can claim to follow the confessions of faith of James P. Boyce, the great Southern Baptist theologian in the last century. While appreciating Moody's creativity and acknowledging that Boyce's theology for the 19th century is not necessarily what is needed for the 20th-century person, I would think that there would still be some relation between Boyce and Moody.

The final step in Moody's soteriology is not unexpectedly an argument in favor of the possibility of believers losing their salvation and apostatizing from the faith. I am convinced that Moody's exegesis, though vigorous, is unacceptable. Moody's position will probably not be welcomed within the Southern Baptist Convention, which tends to overstress the eternal security of the believer. Moody's emphasis on perseverance can possibly bring about a balanced view of assurance among his constituency.

The author develops his section on Christology "from below" in a functional or dynamic way. He first examines the work of Christ before moving to the person of Christ. It is at this point that Moody may have overstepped the boundaries of orthodoxy. For those wishing to move the test of orthodoxy away from the emotionally-charged discussion of inerrancy to the basis of Christianity, which is Christology (a position gaining more and more acceptance), Moody will still be found wanting. He posits a view for the unity of the Father and the Son in terms of purpose and love, not in terms of being (consistent with this rejection of ontological treatments of other aspects of theology). Also, he falls short of acknowledging Jesus as the God-Man, recognizing Jesus as a man specially indwelt by the Spirit of God. If Chalcedon is the touchstone confession of historic Christianity, I fear that Moody's conclusions are questionable even though he calls his position "Chalcedon in a contemporary setting." His views should be compared with those of his former colleague, James Leo Garrett (cf. "Reappraisal of Chalcedon," *Review and Expositor*, Winter 1974).

His eschatology is a summary of a former work, *The Hope of Glory*. His conclusions are similar to those of George Ladd and George Beasley-Murray. Generally it is a nice survey of the European and American positions, with Hal Lindsey and the Scofield Bible the objects of Moody's wrath against dispensationalism. Moody is obviously unaware of advances within current dispensationalism. This section would have been quite outstanding if his arguments could have been more tolerant and objective.

The volume is a major contribution to the field of systematic theology especially among Southern Baptists, who have not had a writing theologian since Mullins and Connor. It will probably become a standard classroom work within Baptist circles, although it must be read with discernment and care. I trust the book will serve as a prompting to others to engage in genuine dialogue with Moody in the controversial areas, especially in Southern Baptist circles.

David S. Dockery

Brooklyn, New York



*One God in Trinity.* Ed. Peter Toon and James D. Spiceland. Westchester, IL: Cornerstone Books, 1980.

This book offers itself as a contemporary analysis of the historic Christian dogma of the Trinity. It is composed of a series of independent chapters, most of them originating from papers delivered during the conference of the British Tyndale Fellowship in 1978. Hence it should come as no surprise that the book carries a primarily British flavor in its outlook, including a final chapter on recent British theology. This last remark is meant in no way to cast a spirit of delimitation on the work, for there is a variety of ecclesiastical tradition among its contributors.

The editors' purpose, as stated in the introduction, appears to be twofold. First, they are seeking to make the doctrine of the Trinity more applicable to preaching and confession in the modern parish. Most would agree about such a need in the realms of practical theology, especially if it goes beyond the traditional liturgical usages. Second, Toon and Spiceland want to show that the trinitarian formulation is more faithful to the Biblical witness than either binitarianism or unitarianism. It is presumed that if the second objective is established the first will follow in its wake. Unfortunately, the reader may question whether the first objective is actually ever realized.

The opening chapters of the book are general in nature, addressing the meaning and formulation of the historic trinitarian doctrine. These, too, reflect the desire of the editors to commend a trinitarian view as expressed in the Nicene and Athanasian creeds (p. 172). Other essays are devoted to understanding the doctrine of the Trinity in its patristic origins, including an excellent survey of the *filioque* clause debate by Aladair Heron.

The second half of the book focuses on the thought of specific personalities such as Barth, Lonergan, Moltmann, the process philosophers (notably Whitehead) and the Oxford and Cambridge theologians Wiles and Lampe. The presentation of this wide spectrum of theological method gives the reader a good introduction to the modern dialogue that exists concerning the Trinity.

Despite the seeming "dis-use" of this doctrine, as it is being overshadowed by other current theological controversies, we are reminded by this book of the continual need of its Biblical formulation and relevance.

D. H. Williams

West Side Baptist Church, Rochester, NY

*I Believe in the Creator.* By James M. Houston. Eerdmans, 1980, 287 pp., \$4.95.

This is not a book on the doctrine of God (his attributes, the Trinity, etc.) but about God as Creator, the nature of his creation, and how we should live if we really believe in God the Creator. Houston's basic thesis is that faith in the Creator is needed if man is to have a proper understanding of himself and his place in this world. Man's broken "covenant relationship with the Creator" results in the "dissolution of natural bonds within family, society and environment" (p. 29).

Houston begins with the statement: "The world we see is the mirror image of our hearts." If our hearts trust in the Creator we will be able to see the world as it really is. If our hearts are turned away from God we will see the world as "nature"—as that which is alien to man—and the landscape of our minds will become increasingly incoherent and meaningless. This way of looking at the world characterizes our contemporary culture and has produced both moral and environmental crises. Houston makes this point repeatedly throughout the book by quoting and discussing numerous contemporary writers whose works illustrate the loss of meaning and values in our society.

Houston thoughtfully examines the Biblical data on the subject of creation. He emphasizes the importance of the Word in creation, contending that *creatio per verbum* is a better

and more Biblical designation of God's creative act than *creatio ex nihilo* (p. 51, Appendix D). He does not attempt to relate the details of Genesis 1 to scientific data, believing that whereas scientific explanations deal with secondary causation the "language of creation," theological language, is that of divine, *fiat* causation (pp. 62, 246). Appealing to the "literary framework" understanding of Genesis 1, he suggests that the six days are days of revelation about creation, not days or periods of creation itself (pp. 58-59). On the question of the literary genre of Genesis 1 he suggests that the text is best understood by viewing its "polemical intent" to counter the magic and idolatry of ancient Near Eastern polytheism and to lead man to live a godly life before the one true Creator (pp. 62-66).

Houston deals with the nature of man, as God's image-bearer, in terms of man's stewardship or "sovereignty" over other creatures, his responsibility to God, and his "relational" nature with respect to God and mankind (pp. 77-80). In sin man, by wrong choice of freedom, irresponsibly asserts an inordinate sovereignty in revolt against God's rule, and this disrupts his relational being (p. 86).

Houston's emphasis on the Word is prominent in much of the book. Not just God's creation but God's providence is also by the Word (p. 110), and through the incarnation of that Word "the divine meaning and purpose behind creation is now revealed." Christ is "the centre, the rationale, and the clue of all reality" (pp. 128, 135). The emphasis of course is Biblically sound, but Houston sometimes appears to lead it on to a semi-Barthian stance whereby the doctrine of creation becomes dependent on Christology. Not only does he deny any valid arguments for God's existence (p. 57) but he seems to underrate the intelligibility and witness value of creation as general revelation apart from the saving grace of Christ (see e.g. pp. 55, 98-99, 155). Some of Houston's comments in the area of historical theology are unfortunate, such as his assertion that Augustine "excluded philosophy, that is, Greek thought, from Christian theology" and ignored the Fall "to dwell almost entirely upon redemption" (p. 168). Also, Houston shows a traditional Protestant reaction to Thomas Aquinas' nature-and-grace scheme, seeing it as paving the way for the secularization of science (pp. 168-169). Houston's indictment of modern man's exaltation of technology, resulting in "technocracy," is timely (pp. 40, 43, 161-62, 179), though sometimes it is overdone (e.g. "the evolution of the machine results in the devolution of man," p. 97). Just once I would like to see an evangelical theologian extol some of the benefits of modern technology.

Notwithstanding these criticisms, I found most sections of the book good and helpful reading. The latter chapters were especially inspiring, dealing with the way of life of one who lives by faith in the Creator. In the chapter "The Enjoyment of God's World" Houston develops a stimulating section on "holy humor." He refers to humor as an "attribute of our humanity and the rhetoric of God's grace" (p. 219). Humor can enable us to recognize our idolatry and the discrepancies of our human life and to seek the transcendent power that comes as grace (pp. 219-222). In the last chapter Houston presents a helpful analysis of the *chronos-kairos* distinction in Scripture and cogently shows the significance of time for human life on earth from the perspective of faith in Christ's resurrection and the prospective hope in the "new creation."

David W. Diehl

The King's College, Briarcliff Manor, NY

*General Revelation.* By Bruce Demarest. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1982, 320 pp., \$12.95.

There can be no doubt that Bruce Demarest has made an important addition to the current discussion of the matter of our general knowledge of God. We have here a survey of historic views going back to Augustine and the medievals as well as a particularly wide-ranging panorama of current positions. It is especially on this latter subject that the book shows special and commendable strength. Beyond the historical, however, Demarest also adds his own voice to the debate, both by way of critiques of specific positions throughout



the book and a carefully-argued concluding chapter.

Obviously in a 300-page book one cannot expect a complete and detailed coverage of the subject, and each of us will have our own top contenders for "most serious omission." My own would certainly be Immanuel Kant, who provided not only the epistemology, as Demarest states (p. 21), but also the finished position on revelation for nineteenth-century liberalism as well as its twentieth-century practitioners. Nevertheless Demarest does an admirable job of avoiding superficiality. Each of his subjects is discussed in remarkable depth with frequent quotes and good documentation.

Following a chapter of introduction and definitions, Demarest covers what he considers to be the foundational views of Augustine, Anselm and Aquinas. Thomas fares rather poorly in this chapter, although Demarest's criticisms have all been answered. Many readers will not be happy with his interpretation, nor with the sharp contrasts drawn to Augustine.

Chapter 3, which discusses the Reformers, is quite excellent. Of particular value is Demarest's argument for an acceptance of general revelation by both Luther and Calvin.

In chapters 4 and 5 Demarest discusses the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century developments. Certainly one of the strong points of the book is the excellent overview of Puritan views. This is an oft-neglected period among apologists, and *General Revelation* should spark much new interest. Chapter 6 discusses Schleiermacher, Ritschl, Troeltsch and Otto as high points in the development of nineteenth-century liberalism.

The following five chapters each focus on aspects of the twentieth-century theological spectrum. Demarest's helpful knowledge of Dutch Reformed positions adds a special dimension here. The chapter on neo-orthodoxy includes, beyond the obvious Barth and Brunner, a section on Hendrik Kraemer. Chapter 8, which traces the development of presuppositionalism from Kuyper and Berkouwer to Van Til, is worth the price of the book by itself.

Chapter 9 contains a somewhat amorphous collection of "neo-liberals": a surprising section on Toynbee, Tillich, Robinson and Hick are here. This is also where we find process theology. This last section is somewhat weakened by its excessive reliance on Whitehead. Demarest regards the position as empirical and experiential. I would argue that this is rather a one-sided view of Whitehead, but it also downplays the significant influence of Hartshorne, which is surely strongly rational.

The following chapter gives us a valuable overview of Catholic positions, Vatican I and II, as well as Rahner and Küng. Finally, there is another particularly valuable chapter on Third-World theologians, including, beyond the expected section on Latin American liberation theologians, sections on Asian and African views.

The concluding chapter gives us Demarest's own discussion of the relevant Biblical passages and a statement of position. This is a strong argument in favor of the affirmation of general revelation but within the confines of the Calvinist-Puritan mold. Especially prominent is his insistence on an intuitive "religious a priori" knowledge of God that underlies any natural theology. Both evidentialists and presuppositionalists alike will find Demarest's arguments challenging and helpful.

With all its obvious strengths there is a pervasive ambiguity in this book. Demarest wants to reject the validity of formal logical proofs of God's existence while accepting man's general ability to infer the creator by reasoning. Perhaps his most telling statement is this: "Whereas the Thomistic arguments in actual fact fail to prove the case, they are not entirely wanting in value. The proofs appeal to sufficient data or evidence to form a significant cumulative argument" (p. 39). Later we are told that they are "useful apologetic tools" (p. 240). This ambivalence is shown in some curious distinctions. Augustine used "proofs," "arguments," and "line of reasoning," but not "formal proof"—though he does "postulate" God as the most coherent explanation (pp. 28-29). While the Puritans are said to follow in the tradition of Augustine and Calvin (pp. 62, 244), and Demarest commends their "emphasis on the rationality and verifiability of the theist's position" (p. 72), they too, "by the discursive power of the mind, whereby one thing is inferred from another,"

reached conclusions regarding God's existence "to various degrees of certainty according to the strength of the evidence" (p. 65).

Clearly this distinction between reasoned arguments and formal demonstrations or proofs (p. 240) is important to Demarest's scheme. It is enough to place Thomas and subsequent Roman Catholic views on general revelation outside of the line of truth (p. 244). But what is this distinction? At one point he indicates that proper arguments are probable, corroborative and observational, not formally deductive (p. 240). Earlier, however, Thomas is rejected for being inductive, and Augustine is approved for arguing *a priori* rather than inductively (pp. 36, 28). Does he mean that proper arguments are those based on the prior acceptance of the "religious *a priori*," as his criticism of Thomas suggests (p. 38)? This, however, would make the arguments themselves circular, and Demarest criticizes Thomas for circularity (p. 39).

I must confess that I do not understand Demarest's distinction. If there is a discursively reasoned argument for God's existence that is known by all men, then it is perfectly legitimate for philosophers to put that argument into a formal mold. If it cannot be translated into a formal demonstration, then it is just a bad argument and has no apologetic value whatever. Whether or not Thomas himself correctly formalized such arguments is irrelevant, as is the fact that nonphilosophers cannot understand them in their abstract professional jargon. Either they are sound arguments or they are not.

These complaints should not detract from the undeniable value of this book. It will serve especially well in seminary courses on the subject. Perhaps Demarest's greatest contribution here is to reassert the real presence of general revelation to be accounted for and assimilated by apologists and theologians alike. In light of present detractors, that is certainly a welcome contribution.

W. David Beck

Liberty Baptist College, Lynchburg, VA

*Christian Ethics For Today: An Evangelical Approach.* By Milton L. Rudnick. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979, 150 pp., \$7.95.

America's moral malaise has been diagnosed as a nonterminal illness by the moral majority. A four-year prescription of moral politics has been mandated for the full recovery of the patient. Abortion, euthanasia, birth control, surrogate parenting, genetic manipulation, hostages, missiles, crime, drugs, fornication, homosexuality and divorce form the cultural heritage of problems to be faced. Surely survival in our age is predicated on right answers to ethical questions.

Milton Rudnick's book is a welcome addition to the minuscule literature available in Christian ethics. The work is an outgrowth of the author's perceived need for a textbook in ethics that is both comprehensive and comprehensible to students faced with ethical questions and issues. Existing textbooks are judged to be either superficial or too academically demanding for introductory courses offered to college students. In order to accomplish this purpose the book is broken down into ten chapters dealing with the corruption of man, motivation, external norms, internal norms, reasons, resources, failure, improvement, conscience and process. Each chapter is intended to teach the student the appropriate questions to be raised rather than offer solutions to particular ethical problems. Problems are dealt with as illustrations of theory put into practice. The stress in every chapter is designed to fall on the process of inquiry whereby each individual can learn to make his own ethical decisions. The strength of the book may well be this conception of the need for adequate theoretical content and process as the first step to moral decision-making. However, as is so often the case, the promise and the product turn out to be divergent.

Perhaps the most challenging exercise in reading the book is to deal with the tension between the author's announced position and the perception of how he develops his material. Rudnick informs us that he is a rule-deontologist with a contextualist bent (p. 10). There is a constant use of the words "sense," "feel," "impulse"—all of which causes one to



suspect that intuition or mysticism is highly appropriate in some aspects of ethical decision-making (pp. 56, 61, 85, 97). One wonders if the rule-deontology is not really limited to the clear imperatives of Scripture, and then a form of act-deontology operates in the areas not covered by direct commandments.

The case for the book being a comprehensive and comprehensible college textbook is seriously flawed by the lack of a discussion of the nature, classification, and order of values; the relationship of ethics to theology and philosophy; an historical perspective to give significance to present ethical issues; exegesis; primary sources; footnotes; indices; and a bibliography. Adult classes and discussion groups could use the book with great profit. The price of the book will unfortunately limit its popular use in the churches.

James M. Grier

Cedarville College, Cedarville, OH 45314

*Does God Exist?* By Hans Küng. New York: Doubleday, 1980, 839 pp.

*Does God Exist?* is a study of the meaning of belief in God in its totality. It is a theological treatise, but theology is broadly conceived by Küng as a cooperative venture of faith and reason; of theology, science and philosophy; of Church, culture and the socio-political realm; of Scripture, history and contemporary perspectives; of Protestant and Catholic traditions; and of thought (theory) and action (practice). Yet it is more than ecumenical theology. *Does God Exist?* is the drama of the people who have formed the heart and the mind of the twentieth century and who have shaped the questions of God's nature and existence. It is an empathetic presentation of the human beings who with "their doubts, struggling and suffering, their belief and unbelief" have wrestled with the problem of God—Descartes, Pascal, Spinoza, Kant, Hegel, Barth, James, Vatican I/II, Bloch, Augustine, Aquinas, Jesus, the Reformers, Nietzsche, Feuerbach, Marx, Freud, Chardin, Whitehead, Heidegger, and others too many even to mention.

Küng roots the various questions of God's nature and existence in the experiences of modern man—in his struggle for certainty, in his modern world view derived from science and philosophy, and in his atheism and nihilism. In the first section (A) of the book, "Reason or Faith?", the question of God is raised in terms of modern man's "almost desperate struggle with the problem of human certainty" and knowledge, as epitomized in Descartes's search for rational certainty and in Pascal's search for the security of faith. Küng, always a master at analysis and synthesis, concludes from his study of Descartes and Pascal that theology must correct its course as regards epistemology and develop a new paradigm for our knowledge of God. The new paradigm must include a stand against rationalism but for critical rationality; a new critical dialogue among theology, philosophy, science and the new world view; the acceptance of the rigors of science but the refusal to regard scientific methodologies as absolute; the affirmation of a Biblical faith that is intrinsically rational; and, above all, the acceptance of the unity and the truth of reality.

Küng contends that the most viable idea of God is one that takes very seriously the new understanding of reality (section B) as seen in the idealism of Hegel and the process philosophies of Teilhard de Chardin and Whitehead. This new understanding, which Küng distinguishes from the Protestant-biblicist, the Catholic-traditionalist, and the deistic-rationalistic views, sees reality as an all-embracing process of reconciliation in which God and the world are always related but never equated. In the new understanding two concepts are central: (1) God, as secular, is not above or beyond the world but in the world, and the world is in God; (2) God, as historical, is the eternal God who is alive and active in history. This understanding of God (a form of panentheism), unlike the Greek, medieval and rationalistic views of God, Küng opts, preserves the world view of modern rationality and the integrity of the Biblical message of God.

But why accept the new understanding of God? Are not the arguments of atheism, as represented by Feuerbach, Marx and Freud (section C), and the radical questioning of nihilism, as seen in Nietzsche (section D), so persuasive to modern man that no matter how

new the understanding of God belief remains quite unacceptable? The challenge of philosophical, scientific and socio-political atheism may be met, Küng urges, with a course correction by theology and Christian practice. Truth has theoretical and practical dimensions. Hence the truth of belief in God must be tested and verified in the theoretical area by theology and in the practical area by the Church. As theology must commit itself to a faith for which rationality is intrinsic and so engage the intellectual world, so the Church must commit itself to concrete man and the concrete Jesus and seek the emancipation of the "weary and heavily burdened" within the practical realm. Commitment and engagement, theoretical and practical, are thus the answers to atheism.

The challenge of atheism is severe, but nihilism, as seen in Nietzsche, is a more serious challenge. For nihilism radically questions the very possibility of either subjective or objective knowledge about not only God, reality and values but about everything. Nihilism negates both the subjective certainty of reason and faith and the objective certainty of science and first principles. It in effect is a doubt about the possibility of being certain or even knowing at all. Rather than meaning it avers that there is only nothingness and a "fundamental existential insecurity of human existence." And the question for modern man becomes not that of God's existence but "to be or not to be," "nihilism or . . . ?"

Against both nihilism and atheism, Küng argues, the knowledge of both reality (section E) and of God's existence (section F) dawns in the very process of fundamental trust in reality and in God—particularly in the God of Jesus Christ, the liberating God of the lost. When it is appropriate, Küng is not hesitant to profess his faith. But his faith is always a reasonable faith or, in Küng's words, a fundamental trust to which rationality is intrinsic. What we know and how we orient ourselves to our life, the world, reality and God are matters colored by what we fundamentally trust or mistrust. But the freedom to choose our fundamental attitude need not be an irrational, random choice. One alternative is not as good rationally as any other. Küng well states that there is an essential rationality to fundamental trust but not to mistrust. Fundamental trust seeks rational justification and is continually open to refutation. In other words it is falsifiable and, as such, it demonstrates its rationality. Fundamental distrust, however, does not show any reasonableness, for it cannot be shaken by arguments or evidence, as it always rejects its own rejection as meaningless. Fundamental trust in reality and God also demonstrates its rationality in practical reason. In the very act of trusting, the knowledge of reality and of God opens itself to me in my wholeness and life situation. As given to me this knowledge can be indirectly tested and verified against the background of our fractured lives and world. Three other elements form the rationality of trust: The hypotheses of meaningful reality and of God's existence can be established by (1) a critical comparison of theology, science, philosophy and modern thought as a whole; (2) a dialectical evaluation of each idea and view; and (3) the explanatory power of metaphysics and theism, especially as the hypotheses provide answers to the ultimate questions and as they provide a unity and a meaning for man and the world.

The last part of the book (section G), "Yes to the Christian God," presents the thesis that the God of Jesus Christ is the true God. Küng's defense of the thesis largely repeats the arguments of *On Being a Christian*. In contrast to the God of the philosophers and the views of the world religions, Küng argues for the essential rationality and superiority of the Biblical and Christian God—the living, personal, historically dynamic, creative and liberating God. The God of the Bible and Christian faith is more concrete and coherent and, hence, more rationally justifiable than any other view. The argument at this point is strong and includes the broad range of standard theological themes and categories.

Whoever would read *Does God Exist?* embarks on a thoroughly ecumenical study of theology, philosophy, science and the modern world view. But, most significantly, the reader struggles with both the human drama and the theoretical rigor of the modern revolution in the understanding of God. It is must reading for Christian and modern man.

F. Louis Mauldin

University of Tennessee at Martin



*Unconditional Surrender: God's Program for Victory.* By Gary North. Tyler, TX: Geneva Press, 1981, \$9.95.

Gary North's new book is the clearest presentation now available of reconstructionist optimillennialism. Sadly, the new exodus of Jesus is conspicuously absent from the "scenario." North sees the cross, "a forfeiture of dominion," as only a legal necessity. He proposes an ethical program unaffected by the incarnation: We are to imitate Christ in his ascension but not in the nonviolent subdue-less way of his cross. North's simplistic proof-texting is a good example of the autonomy and dominion of the theonomic system over inductive Biblical exegesis.

Not wishing to be always opposing two positions to each other, North writes that he wants "a third alternative" (p. 6). Yet he continually makes either-or assumptions. For example, opposing "neutrality" to "OT law," he writes: "If we argue . . . that we are prohibited from exercising godly rule in terms of the Old Testament, then we have placed ourselves, in principle, under the dominion of Satan and his pagan kingdoms" (p. 80).

The suggested dilemma shows North's ignorance of Anabaptist ethics: (1) Agree that no institution is "neutral" or value-free. (2) Do not agree that the old covenant is now binding on people in this age. (3) Follow the suffering-to-dominion way of Jesus, but without imposing the sermon on the mount on pagan kingdoms. (4) Live with our state (United States) like Jesus and his disciples lived with their state (Rome). I challenge North to find anything in the new covenant that says that the great commission involves establishing a "Christian" law-order. As he admits, no such institution was available in the primitive Church.

While there is no room here for a full discussion of the death penalty, it is instructive to see the shallow way in which North argues for such a punishment: (1) He quotes Acts 25:11 ("I do not refuse to die") and infers from the silence Pauline approval; (2) he sets up a straw man by suggesting that the death penalty is criticized always and only "in the name of evangelism" by Arminians who think everybody has a "right" to be converted (p. 76). The penalty can be opposed for other reasons. John H. Yoder argues from Genesis 9, for example, that executions were religious in nature and that there is now no other expiation but Jesus.

In light of the extensive exegetical analysis of "covenant theology" done recently by Jon Zens ("Studies in Theology and Ethics," *Baptist Reformation Review*, 1981), North's discussion on "covenant" is really inexcusable. He gives no evidence of ever having even read Zens' analysis. This is again a manifestation of an either-or mentality: Either read Rushdoony or Zens, but do not read both, and never let an examination of texts and contexts distract you from your programmatic system.

What did the ministry of Jesus do? According to North it "was supposed to improve men's comprehension of God and God's dominion assignment. He established a better covenant, we read in Hebrews 8 and 10; He didn't abolish the concept of a covenant and a covenantal law-order" (p. 113). First and most importantly, the "better covenant" was a different covenant. The reconstructionists still do not understand that "covenant" is not a theological abstraction but an historic event. Second, Christ abolished "a covenantal law-order" if one means by that a sacralistic order that includes unregenerate citizens. Christ's covenantal order is not essentially legal but rather imitative. The new covenantal order assumes that Christians will continue as citizens in a non-Christian-composite-political-situation. North writes that the "struggle between the two kingdoms is for (dominion of) the whole world" (p. 127). Christ said, "As thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I sent them into the world" (John 17:18). The order is for cross-bearing, not a "co-extensiveness" that legislates Sabbath regulation on non-Christian minorities. (Since policing bedrooms for sexual immorality would be difficult, I assume that theonomists would shift their attention to basketball courts on Sunday.)

North follows Meredith Kline's lead in saying that baptism and communion are potentially signs of covenantal curse. Thus he defends infant participation in the Lord's Supper

(pp. 114-121). He also hints that rebellion would be legitimated when taxation is "confiscatory" if we can get local elders and magistrates to "recommend resistance" (p. 141). What North needs to do now is to list criteria to specify when such action would be justified in the United States. I challenge him to do that from the new covenant. Strangely, North even fails to delineate standards to let us know when to approve a nuclear war. This is most curious since he writes that "the modern state has advanced its claim of total sovereignty by two strategies: war and welfare" (p. 134). North takes his time in condemning welfare; he says not a word to suggest the sinfulness of the American military buildup. Apparently fear of Russia validates the American "defense" pyramid.

The final section of *Unconditional Surrender* reveals an important presupposition of the reconstructionist system of thinking: the "continuity of victory." While premillennialists and amillennialists believe that the kingdom will only be finally manifested by discontinuity (Jesus coming again, breaking into history), North thinks that everyone will be brought under "dominion" before Christ returns. What he fails to reckon with is the new exodus of Jesus: The way Jesus suffered to enter glory is such a radical departure (from the Canaanite invasions, for example) that the new covenant community must rethink the way it thinks ethics. We can no longer derive our politics from an inductive reading of the facts of history; we must hear Christ. (For more on the new exodus see J. Zens, "The Startingpoint of Christian Obedience," *Baptist Reformation Review* 9/2, pp. 6, 24.)

I find North's comments about the Passover particularly interesting: "Leavened bread was representative of the good life in Egypt . . . so God required them to celebrate a discontinuous event, the overnight deliverance from bondage. They were to take no leaven with them." What North fails to see is that the cross of Christ was also an event of discontinuity. The cross was not a gradual offensive but a cut into history that has delivered the new covenant community from old covenant law (not its curse only) to the new way of Jesus. Jesus has fulfilled the promises. He did it in a surprising way that we did not anticipate: at the cross.

But wait a minute, North writes (p. 189): Satan will accuse God with the fact that men did not have dominion in history as God had wanted. I see a different scenario: "No, Satan," God will reply. "It is you who are wrong. You are mistaken in your preconceived notions of what dominion means. You thought you could beat me if the world you had in your so-called dominion could kill Jesus. You expected Jesus to be a Zealot; you thought maybe he would be a reconstructionist. But he would not even let his disciples fight. He died, and the third day came. Then, Satan, bow and tell me who won." The path to dominion is the nonviolent way of Jesus.

To see how we are to live in the flesh we have to understand how Christ lived in the flesh. At the cross God provided himself a propitiation and legal satisfaction, but there God also defeated Satan and the world's powers. Jesus cut a new covenant; he also showed us his way of victory. North's way is "continuity of victory." He bases this on the wheat-tares parable so misused by Augustine, the Catholic Inquisition, the Reformers: The "wheat" apparently are to set up a Christian state for the "tares."

For a conception of the kingdom from a new covenant perspective I would recommend Donald Kraybill, *The Upside-Down Kingdom* (Herald Press, 1978). Kraybill writes about conservative and pietistic Sadducees; about liberal Pharisees, detailed in their application of Mosaic law; about Cromwell-like zealots who rebelled violently against Rome's confiscatory statism. Then Kraybill writes about the way of Jesus. Later he lists "detours" by which we escape our responsibility to be like Jesus. Since Kraybill writes from an Anabaptist system of things, I warn again about either-or assumptions. North's discussion of the free-market economy, for example, is not antithetical to Kraybill's chapter on the Jubilee.

Mark McCulley

Brethren Theological Seminary, Oakbrook, IL



*The Divorce Myth: A Biblical Examination of Divorce and Remarriage.* By J. Carl Laney. Minneapolis: Bethany House Publishers, 1981, 160 pp.

This book by the assistant professor of Bible literature at Western Conservative Baptist Seminary sets forth what is probably the ablest defense of the "no-divorce-or-remarriage" position written by a modern, English-speaking Protestant. In the introduction Laney says: "My book uniquely shows how the clear teaching of Jesus, 'What therefore God has joined together, let no man separate,' is not contradicted elsewhere in the Bible. I will also explain how the 'exception clause' found in Matthew's Gospel would have been understood in the contemporary Jewish setting" (p. 13). Laney traces the Biblical teaching on the subject from Genesis to Titus, answers objections to his view, and gives some practical suggestions to counselors. Writing in an "intermediate" style, the author presents clear arguments that are likely to become the standard for those who want to defend such a position and a challenge to those who reject it. This reviewer places himself in the latter camp.

One of the ironclad laws of reviewing is that it takes longer to correct a mistake than it does to make one, and with the consistency of Laney's argument it would take the proverbial book-of-greater-size to adequately respond to his work. Thus I shall try to center my review on the main point and arguments of each chapter.

In chap. 1, Laney argues for the permanence of marriage from the words "cleave" and "one flesh" in Gen 2:24. He gives three instances where he believes that "cleave" implies permanence. None are convincing. In fact one, the cleaving of Israel to the Canaanites (Josh 23:12), clearly proves the opposite. The prophets repeatedly call the adulterous Israelites to break off their cleaving to the peoples of the land and their gods (cf. Jeremiah 3). And as to "one flesh," Laney does not seem to appreciate the difficulty of interpreting these words, which appear only once in the OT (in combination) and are virtually only quoted in the NT. Analogy becomes Laney's principal support. His likening marriage to the production of a physically unified child from its two physically independent parents (p. 22) is Biblically and philosophically questionable. And the appeal to the analogy of Christ's relationship to the Church (p. 25) is exegetically suspect insofar as the text of Eph 5:32 never mentions permanency and the mystical-union concept is specifically limited to the Christ/Church relationship. It is slanted reasoning indeed that jumps at an inferred concept of permanence in Ephesians and argues vainly against an implied analogy of impermanence in Jeremiah 3. It would seem to this reviewer that Laney is not about inductive exegesis but is simply trying to prove his *a priori*. And of course Laney argues that anything less than an interpretation of permanency would conflict with Scripture elsewhere (e.g. the analogy in Rom 7:1 ff.) (p. 26). This sort of appeal merely begs the question at that point.

The search for permanence and the denial of the right to divorce and remarry must deal with Deut 24:2-4, where the Law permitted and regulated divorce and remarriage (d/r). Laney's treatment here (chap. 2) and elsewhere (pp. 108 ff.) is strained. Laney admits that d/r are permitted and that they are never called adultery but stresses that the Law did not institute divorce and that d/r are contrary to God's original plan. What he does not explain is why or how a holy God can permit such contrariness judicially. For example, premarital sex is a behavior that is acknowledged by Scripture and regulated (e.g. Exod 22:16), but such fornication is identified as a wrong and the Law does not presume to tell the fornicator how to commit it with judicial sanction. Perhaps this objection can be answered, but it is not even considered by Laney. It would seem that if Laney is right about permanence, then Deut 24:1-4 is poor legislation on another count. If the first couple are permanently joined, why is it not rather right for the wife to return? Why is it an abomination for the first husband to take back the woman who has really only been joined to him (and not the subsequent husbands)? Why does God prohibit the moral and permit the immoral? I suggest that this text is more difficult than Laney realizes.

The forced divorces of Ezra 9-10 are also made to conform to the *a priori*. Laney's solution seems to be to see how often the word "unique" can be applied to the text. Support

for this conclusion is essentially the threat of contradiction of 1 Corinthians 7 (p. 41). But he fails to see an important distinction between Ezra and Paul—namely, that Paul was dealing with those who were married as unbelievers, while Ezra was dealing with those who apostatized by marrying unbelievers.

Chapter 4 on Malachi is marred by another failure to draw an important distinction. Whereas Malachi is inveighing against treacherous divorce, Laney fails to see this and has him speaking for God against all divorce. Nor does Laney seem to take himself seriously, for in chap. 6 he argues that a man divorcing his wife for incest is not guilty of sin. And if Laney is right about Malachi, one could surely suggest to God that God was unwise in choosing the “metaphor” of divorce to apply to himself in Jeremiah 3.

The pursuit of permanence causes Laney to leave off following the analogy of Scripture (or at least a chronological approach) when he comes to deal with the gospels. He argues for the interpretive priority of Mark/Luke to Matthew, so that he considers Mark 10 before Matthew 5. Adopting what might be called an “ethnic calculus,” Laney argues that Matthew was writing things appropriate to Jews while Mark/Luke were writing things appropriate to Gentiles. Mark/Luke give the straight teaching; Matthew records an apparently obsolete, Jewish exception. Laney shows no awareness of the possibility that Mark/Luke could be giving the general rule and Matthew the exception. Instead he argues that Mark is more detailed than Matthew (p. 52). One wonders at the basis for this conclusion. Truly, Mark includes material not found in Matthew, but then Matthew has the exception clause and eunuch material as well as 5:31-32. So the reverse is probably true. The reason that Mark leaves out the exception clause (which was spoken on the occasion) is because the context of the divorce discussion in Mark is one of “be at peace with one another” (Mark 9:50). I presume the reason that Matthew includes the exception clause is because his context is one of discipline (Matt 18:15 ff.), and divorce for unrepentant unfaithfulness is a species of such discipline as both Matthew (1:19) and the OT (Hosea 2) understood to be the divine reproof in a society that refused to practice capital punishment for such an offense. Laney’s attempt to bolster his pursuit of permanence by interpreting in a once-for-all sense the aorist tense of “joined” (p. 56) shows an out-of-date understanding of the aorist.

Chapter 6 (on Matthew’s treatment of d/r) is a microcosm of the book’s arguments and their weakness. Laney gives four basic interpretations of the “exception clause”: (1) It includes “adultery”; (2) it is limited to unfaithfulness during the betrothal period; (3) it is limited to unlawful marriage with Gentile idolaters; and (4) it is limited to marriage within the prohibited relationships of Leviticus 18 (pp. 67-77). The author argues that the last is the best. The second and third he dismisses quickly. Betrothal unfaithfulness is dismissed insofar as the text is dealing with marriage, not betrothal (p. 70)—which is strangely insensitive on the part of someone who has noted that the Jewish betrothal was as binding as marriage (p. 69). Option three is denied as inconsistent with Paul (p. 71). This criticism has been spoken to above.

More space is devoted to rejecting option one, which is the primary alternative to Laney’s own view. He gives five objections to including “adultery” within the meaning of *porneia* in Matthew (while admitting that it is lexically possible to do so elsewhere). (1) Option one contradicts Mark and Luke. Response: An exception is not properly said to contradict the general rule. Laney’s reasoning would imply that Peter contradicted his first epistle (2:13) when he uttered the words recorded in Acts 5:29 (spoken to two different audiences and recorded in two different books). (2) It contradicts the clear teaching of Matt 19:6 (“What God has joined, let no man separate”). To this it can be pointed out that a divorce grounded on adultery does not separate the couple; the adultery does. Adultery is breach of covenant. (3) It does not rise above the teaching of the Pharisee Shammai, which is contrary to the Matthew 5 context. Response: The context should not be taken to imply that every teaching of every Pharisee was wrong (cf. Matt 23:3). Further, Laney fails to see that even if Jesus’ teaching was more liberal than that of Shammai as to grounds of divorce, his teaching was still more strict than that of Shammai in identifying illicit divorce as



the sin of adultery. (4) It contradicts Paul in 1 Cor 7:10-11. Response: Wrong. Jesus allows divorce as a disciplinary action taken by the innocent party, while Paul is directing his admonition to the person who divorces without proper grounds. (The guilt is evident in his use of the term "reconcile," which is never Biblically used of an innocent party.) (5) "Adultery" is not the normal translation of *porneia*. Response: Correct. If Jesus had used *moicheia* he would not have been as easily able to include, as grounds for divorce, other kinds of *porneia* (e.g. homosexuality, bestiality, and Laney's own alternative—incest). The short of it is that Laney has not really been able to deny any of the alternatives to his own posture.

In defending his own option (four), Laney provides ample support for concluding that incest is a possible meaning of *porneia*. Who denied that? But he is unable to show that his position is exclusive. Nor does an exclusive option four make any sense. In the first place, incest was not a peculiarly Jewish problem—it certainly was not in Leviticus 18, where it is identified as a Gentile abomination (how does this fit Laney's "ethnic calculus"?). Secondly, incest is not a matter of some nonmoral "holiness code," as Laney implies—there is a great gulf between Leviticus 17 and 18. Incest is tied to the other abominations in Leviticus 18, one of which is adultery (v 20). In other words, any attempt to tie the "exception clause" to Leviticus 18 will be an argument for option one unless, with Laney (and perhaps F. F. Bruce as well—p. 72), you arbitrarily stop your reference to Leviticus 18 with 18:18. Nor will it do to appeal to the use of *porneia* in Acts 15, implying that there it is tied to ceremonial matters in Leviticus 17-18. In fact the appeal to Acts 15 proves the reverse. If James' order (v 20) had been left to stand, a case might be made, but the council's reordering of the elements puts *porneia* back in its Leviticus 18 positioning, where it is obviously a moral matter if taken in the context of vv 1-5; 24 ff.—verses that Laney totally ignores.

Laney's treatment of Paul's writings is similar to his work with the priority of the gospels. He ignores the chronological order of Paul's teaching on the subject, dealing with Romans 7:2-3 before 1 Corinthians 7. Though arguing on an illustration, Laney feels that this verse presents an open-and-shut case. After all, does it allow for an exception? No; marriage is until death. Response: Given the nature of the discussion at hand, Paul logically could not have included divorce in the statements. The husband (the Law) could not be divorced, because divorce can only be done on the grounds of an act of sin. But the Law cannot sin (v 7). In fact the Law cannot die, so Paul reverses the analogy and discusses how that in the context of Law (v 1)—which permitted divorce and remarriage (Deut 24:1-4)—we are guilty of a capital crime and are executed vicariously in Christ. Being dead to the Law we are able to be joined to Christ. Nor could Paul have used divorce as an analogy with regard to our sin and punishment. If we were only divorced, then—most literally—if we were to repent we should be reconciled to our husband the Law, which will not do theologically. Again, notice that it is the guilty party that is being discussed. This line of reasoning does not preclude the OT use of "divorce and remarriage" in an analogy of repentance, for in that case it is the Lord, not the Law, that is the Husband.

I have already commented on Laney's interpretation of 1 Cor 7:10 ff. His effort in regard to v 15 is to limit it to undesired legal separation. This in spite of the fact that "legal separation" is a modern idea not practiced in Corinth at the time, and more importantly in disregard of the fact that the woman's responsibility by OT Law was not the positive requirement to have sex with her husband but rather the negative one not to have it with anyone else. Thus if she is free from her marriage bond she is *ipso facto* free to remarry (in the Lord). Laney on 1 Cor 7:27 ff. is a study in contextual screening. He makes much of the fact that the verb "released" implies a state of freedom. He then concludes that this is referring to virgins because the overall context is to virgins. What he ignores is that the most immediate context speaks of the already covenanted who are seeking release (and whom he admonishes not to seek release), which accords with Paul's pausing in his earlier admonition to marrieds to address singles who may be contemplating marriage (vv 8 ff.). In truth, it is the state of being unmarried to which Paul refers in v 27c but, contrary to

Laney, Paul's word choice would include any who have (validly) arrived in that state—namely, by the death of the spouse, by divorce, or virginity. I would argue, then, that at least two times in 1 Corinthians 7 Paul has permitted d/r and that vv 10 ff. do not deny that right to the innocent party. What then do I make of v 39? In context it seems an admonition to the wavering virgin and her father to take the matter of marriage seriously, because it is “for keeps.” In other words it is the “language game” of exhortation, where the commitment of the potential spouse is not an issue, but the commitment of the girl and her father is in question. With permission to remarry in v 15 it is most reasonable to interpret v 39 as pedagogical overstatement, underscoring the need to plan for permanency in the marriage. (I am unconvinced, as yet, by the arguments of S. K. Elliott, C. C. Ryrie, and others that it is the fiancé rather than the guardian of the woman to whom vv 27 ff. are addressed.)

In chap. 8 Laney denies any official functioning in the work of the Church to the divorced and/or remarried person. The “husband of one wife” clause prevents the d/r, while “above reproach” eliminated those only divorced (p. 98). As to the former, it must be said that the Greek makes it clear that it is the character of the man that is at issue, not the number of his wives. As to the latter, Laney cannot show, without assuming previously unsupported conclusions, that the treacherously divorced or those who righteously divorced their spouses are not above reproach. He gives only his own suggestions. His appeal to the precedent of the OT priest's inability to marry a divorced woman (uncharacteristic for a dispensationalist) fails to mention that the high priest could not marry a widow and that priests could divorce their wives. It is fitting that Laney should end his exegesis thus, for his posture as a whole succeeds in making the divorced and remarried a class of outcasts like the Ammonites and Moabites (Deut 23:3). And how uncharacteristic of Paul, a man complicit in murder—yet forgiven to serve—to prohibit those treacherously divorced from serving!

Space does not permit treatment of Laney's applications of his theory, though I believe that the above argumentation shows that the theory itself, at least as Laney argues it, is deficient and therefore should not be applied. One does wonder why, however, Laney does not admonish those who are divorced and remarried (and *ipso facto* committing adultery) to stop committing it (i.e., divorce) as a “fruit of repentance,” rather than merely telling them to confess the sin and maintain the marriage (p. 148).

I regret being so negative. But in the spirit of our Society (i.e., debate) I feel that this important subject needs more forthright discussion. I believe that Laney's motives are the same as my own. I believe that both of us wish to be true to God's inspired, inerrant Word, being neither more strict nor more lenient than it is. The reader shall have to decide which if either of our views lives up to our motives.

William F. Luck

Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, IL

*The Gift of the Holy Spirit Today.* By J. Rodman Williams. Plainfield, NJ: Logos, 1980, xii + 158 pp., \$6.95 paper.

The Reformed theologian J. R. Williams once suggested that the charismatic movements of this century in some ways represented a rediscovery of “a dimension of the Holy Spirit's activity that had been long overlooked” (*Reformed World* 31 [1971] 346). Now in *The Gift* we have a mature statement of how, in his opinion, this overlooked dimension may be worked out in both practical and theological terms within Christianity today—i.e., how the gift of the Holy Spirit can be appraised against the background of NT and contemporary Christianity.

Williams wants to consider exactly what the dimensions of the Spirit can be when given to believers. He detects five motifs from NT backgrounds about such experience(s): that God gives his Spirit abundantly though sovereignly, that there is an aspect of suddenness and forcefulness, that the Spirit comes to take possession, that those to whom God gives his



Spirit are enveloped with his presence and power, and that recipients of the gift are inwardly pervaded. These motifs provide a context for understanding the phrase "being baptized with the Holy Spirit," which in Williams' view vividly depicts the idea of being totally enveloped in the reality of the Spirit so that life should take on a fresh quality of divine nearness, interiority and intimacy. The origin of this baptism is from Jesus, and this is one reason for the phrase's continued use today, although it has had little use in Church history.

The response to receipt of the gift of the Spirit is mainly in the praise of God. Here the close connection between tongue-speaking and transcendent praise is developed, praise that goes beyond ordinary capacity to render it. It is the sense of God's abundant presence that "evokes a breaking forth in praise expressive of the occasion. Ordinary language, even music, may be inadequate to declare the wonder of God's gift" (p. 29). Here the reviewer notes that the most recent study of such phenomena (in a Christian context) is at least consistent with Williams' understanding of this so-called praise function. Cyril G. Williams, *Tongues of the Spirit* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1981) 213 ff., finds that inarticulateness is not identical with absence of meaning. Rather the function of language is not restricted to conveying meaning, for it can also be used to express a relationship or create ties of union (like in Williams' transcendent praise). Glossolalia may thus serve as an example of this deep and important aspect of language, which goes beyond mere communication. Williams sees the ultimate response to the gift of the Spirit as the praise of God in a language provided by the Spirit that has intelligible content. He makes a sound case for his unwillingness to divorce tongue-speaking from intelligible content, since presumably speech to God and motivated by God will be intelligible to God.

The purpose of the gift is enabling power to carry on the ministry of Jesus in word and deed. There is not much said here about the suffering or rejection that can accompany such ministry. This missionary function of the gift of the Spirit, which may have been uppermost in Luke's mind, is not stressed as much as the praise function. Various effects of the gift are pinpointed from NT texts and, fairly enough, from observations in current Christendom. Here Williams detects five motifs that bridge the gap between the early and contemporary Church: an extraordinary sense of the reality of God, a fullness of joy, an assurance of God's act of salvation, a boldness in speech and action, and a deepening of fellowship with God.

Williams appears keen to illustrate that the Spirit is given to believers and is properly to be received by them. This experience so carefully designed by God for believers is not to be brought into automatic coincidence with other rites. The well-balanced treatment afforded the overall role of the believer in relation to the Holy Spirit is the strength of the book. The notes only sometimes cite other positions while offering a wealth of detail to students mainly in charismatic material, although one is surprised not to find mention of Stanley Horton, *What The Bible Says About The Holy Spirit* (1976), or of I. H. Marshall, "The Significance of Pentecost," *SJT* 30 (1977) 347 ff.

Williams concludes confidently with the controversial observation that "perhaps the greatest mistake in this area is to presuppose the gift of the Holy Spirit. The mystic may presuppose the gift of the Spirit in his meditation, the sacramentalist may presuppose the same gift in the occurrence of baptism and/or confirmation, the evangelical may likewise presuppose the gift of the Spirit in the experience of forgiveness and salvation. Each, in different manner, by the very presupposition, bars his own way to the reception of the gift. However, if the presupposition can be removed, there may be a new readiness for and openness to the gift of the Holy Spirit" (p. 152).

We are offered here the sober and well-reasoned reflections of an important scholar on both the exegetical and experiential domains concerning the activities of the Holy Spirit. *The Gift* provides a solid stepping-stone to further research and dialogue as well as presenting a challenge to Christians today of all presuppositional persuasions.

Paul Elbert

132 Holgate Dr., Luton, Beds. LU4 OXD, England

*Genetic Engineering: Threat or Promise?* By Lawrence E. Karp. Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1976, 235 pp.

Lawrence Karp is associate professor of obstetrics and gynecology at the University of Washington School of Medicine in Seattle. He defines genetic engineering as "the art or science of making practical application of the knowledge of the pure science of genetics." A basic reason for writing the book, according to the author, is to dispel some of the unfounded fears of a *Brave New World* circulated in the popular press and to show how genetic engineering could produce a wide range of benefits for humanity. "In a sense," he writes, "it is a how-to book, a manual to help the layman understand the nature and implications of current and future developments in Genetic Engineering" (p. xii). Among the potential benefits that the author foresees are breakthroughs in preventing birth defects; the alleviation of genetic disorders, heart disease, and even cancer; and new means to feed the millions of hungry people around the globe.

After an introductory chapter explaining basic genetic concepts and definitions, succeeding chapters discuss genetic counseling, eugenics, genetic screening, genetic therapy, prenatal diagnosis, artificial insemination, sex determination, *in vitro* fertilization, parthenogenesis, cloning, and the possibility of the synthesis of life from nonliving matter. Readers having little background in the life sciences will need to study carefully the introductory chapter in order to follow the often quite technical discussions.

The author does not appear to bring Christian convictions to bear upon the various ethical issues discussed. He sees no difficulty in principle with such practices as artificial insemination by donor (AID) for single women, selective abortion for a wide range of prenatal disorders, and experimentation on pre-born humans obtained from abortion. Operating with a humanistic and utilitarian ethical framework, the author sees little or no place for appeals to divine revelation in ethical discussions.

In spite of such a problematic ethical framework from an evangelical point of view, the volume is a valuable source of scientific information, and those who teach in the area of bioethics would find it to be a useful reference tool. A glossary provides a handy reference for technical terms. Medical illustrations enhance the text. Other texts on human genetics are suggested in an extensive bibliography.

John Jefferson Davis

Gordon-Conwell Seminary, South Hamilton, MA

*Is the Bible Sexist?* By Donald Bloesch. Crossway, 1982, 128 pp., \$5.95.

June 30, 1982, marked the end, at least for now, of a hard-fought campaign for the Equal Rights Amendment. Churches had begun to grapple with issues raised by ERA votaries, of course, even before the ERA push formally began. Without question the role of women in the Church will continue to be debated, just as ERA itself seems to be not a matter settled but a demand deferred. Bloesch's study contributes to a Biblical appraisal of feminism and to a Biblical response to the issues feminism has raised for the contemporary Church.

Bloesch's treatment is brief (less than 100 pages of text) but well done. The average church member will find it heavy going here and there, but the perceptive and tenacious layperson will be stimulated and not stymied in working through the book. Academicians, on the other hand, will appreciate Bloesch's relative clarity and simplicity—relative, that is, to the literary quagmires through which academicians so often must slog—and will likewise be gratified by the wealth of bibliography in the extensive endnotes.

In the book as a whole Bloesch seeks to set forth a scriptural via media between classical patriarchalism and ideological feminism. This convention-defying goal is reflected on a small scale in the foreword, where Bloesch does what almost no one undertakes formally these days: He defines his terms. Here he also characterizes himself ("a biblically qualified patriarchalist, through I am not wholly comfortable with it," and "a man who is *for*



women") and declares that the whole of Scripture is the authority of his study (pp. 11-12).

Chapter 1, "The Present Controversy," traces the parameters of the book. The feminist-patriarchalist controversy is dividing the Church. The traditional patriarchalist is wrong, but the feminist in Bloesch's estimation also exceeds what is written since "authority in the feminist perspective is rooted primarily in human experience, particularly feminine experience, not in Scripture" (p. 19). Bloesch attempts to bring order out of the current doctrinal chaos with the proclamation "that neither feminism nor patriarchalism, as traditionally conceived, does justice to the deepest insights of the biblical revelation" (p. 22).

The next two chapters are closely related. Chapter 2 is a survey of "The Man-Woman Relationship in the Bible." It centers on the Bible, to be sure, but it is unfortunately more expositional than exegetical. In giving women their Biblical due, the tendency here is to go too far in rectifying past masculine overreadings of some Scriptures (e.g. Eph 5:22; pp. 28-31) and underreadings of others (e.g. Gal 3:28; p. 32). The flaws are not major, but sufficient to make NT specialists squirm. Chapter 3 continues to canvass the Bible for pertinent data, this time attempting to answer the question "Women Ministers?" Bloesch also gives examples from Church history of how women have been Church leaders. This chapter is the weak point of the book. I agree with Bloesch that "because the movement for women's ordination today is so closely tied to secular ideology, and is therefore not always solidly anchored in biblical imperatives," it is not advisable to give "an unqualified yes" to women's ordination (p. 56). What bothers me here is a one-sided reading of some Scripture passages that seems, evidently out of deference to feminist sensitivities, to distort what the Bible actually says.

Three examples may be cited that typify but unfortunately do not exhaust these interpretive miscues: (1) Bloesch approvingly cites Phyllis Trible's view that the OT cultic procedures, male-dominated and for that reason abhorrent to the modern feminist, made women "inferior participants, obeying rules formulated by men" (p. 41). The idea that the Aaronic ordinances in Scripture are mere human formulations does not square with what Bloesch says about Scripture's God-givenness elsewhere. (2) While one can sympathize with Bloesch's desire for Protestants to quit denigrating Mary just because Catholics venerate her, it is going too far to term her position as "preeminent over that of the apostles themselves, who were at the most heralds and ambassadors of grace" (pp. 42-43). This may be a defensible dogmatic postulate, but it is hardly a Biblically-derived one. (3) It is an overstatement or worse to claim: "It is incontestable that the churches under his [Paul's] jurisdiction accepted female as well as male leaders" (p. 44). That Phoebe (Romans 16; see p. 44) was a leader on par with Paul and his missionary fellows is by no means critically "incontestable."

But such problems, while troublesome, do not in the end nullify the basic arguments of the book. And Bloesch fares much better in the next two chapters. In "Revising the Language About God" there are some fine reflections on the real matters at stake in the movement to inclusivize Christian nomenclature. Here Bloesch is at his best, rightly tracing changing linguistic tastes to a loss of appetite for orthodoxy. Not that every person crying out against sexist language is a closet heretic: The problem is that the changes called for by (even Christian) feminists are often part of a larger and concealed agenda that is hostile to historic Christian theology and anthropology. Pantheism, gnosticism and process theology provide the theosophical base for much of the current rhetoric in the dispute over the Bible's allegedly sexist language. "The debate over sexist language is ultimately a debate concerning the nature of God" (p. 66). Bloesch continues: "The desire to revise the language of Scripture almost always leads to a revision of the Biblical witness itself" (p. 76). This segment of the book is well worth pondering. It suggests that Bloesch's answer to his title's question is finally "No," although he is well aware of (and deplores) the sexist fashion in which Biblical language is even today too often employed.

Bloesch concludes with "A Biblical Alternative" that he terms "covenantalism." It is

neither a feminist nor a patriarchal position. It "stresses the interdependence of man and women and the subordination of both to the will of God" (p. 104). Particularly worthwhile is the "typology of male-female relations" that Bloesch constructs and his use of Sweden as illustrating the unsatisfactory social conditions that radical feminism aids in effecting (pp. 99-104).

This book is certainly not the last word on the issues it treats. It will provoke feminist reaction and will draw fire from hardcore male-exalting traditionalists. But as a succinct, balanced and sympathetic analysis of the issues raised by ideological feminism for evangelical Christianity, this is among the finest works to date.

Robert Yarbrough

King's College, Aberdeen AB9 2UB, Scotland

*Productive Christians in an Age of Guilt-Manipulators: A Biblical Response to Ronald J. Sider.* By David Chilton. Tyler, TX: Institute for Christian Economics, rev. 1982, 310 pp., \$4.95.

The publisher has gone out of his way to make this book a perfect mockery of Ronald J. Sider's *Rich Christians in an Age of Hunger: A Biblical Study* (InterVarsity, 1977). When standing side by side, Chilton's work may easily be mistaken for Sider's. (This I did four times during the course of the review.) From the quality of the paper to the color of the ink to the style of the print (inside and out), the two are twins.

It does not take long, however, to discern that one is in fact the antithesis of the other. Although the books share certain features (evidently to satiate the author's and publisher's appetite for ridicule), some changes were deemed necessary. For a beginning, the food pictured on the cover of Sider's book was replaced by placards such as "Tools Are For Fools," "Feed My Wolves," "Take A Canaanite To Lunch," "The State Is Great" and "Shut The Eye Of The Needle."

The book is dedicated to Pat Robertson, a "productive Christian," and carries a 30-page preface by ultra-conservative economist Gary North, president of the Institute for Christian Economics. North's preface sets the tone for Chilton's 310-page rebuttal (Sider's work is 253 pages).

According to North, those of us who accept Sider's thesis are "naive Christians" (p. 24) who are "in error [and] are morally required to repent" (p. 26). "Naive donors . . . to InterVarsity and to the Christian colleges and seminaries that promote Sider's books in the classrooms . . . will answer for much on the day of judgment" (pp. 27-28). But despite Ronald Sider's and IVP's help, according to North, Satan is going to lose and we will then have "that most godly of economic arrangements: *rich Christians in an age of hungry socialists*" (p. 28).

Unfortunately Chilton picks up where North leaves off. Advocates of Sider's thesis have been "conned" (p. 183) by this "mark of hell" (p. 34) that has been diabolically (p. 219) and satanically (pp. 271-272) conceived by an ignorant or evil (pp. 197, 201) "Fool" (p. 43), a "Hitler" (p. 92), a "Marx" (p. 108), a "socialist demagogue" (p. 191) who "wants to manipulate the church" (p. 183). Why? Because "*Ronald Sider wants power*" (p. 186). He knows that "if he can control the church, he will be well on his way to controlling the world" (p. 182). And furthermore, Sider's distortion of Scripture "is actually helping to bring 'famine on the land'" (p. 213).

Anyone familiar with the *laissez-faire* doctrine of 18th-century Scottish economist Adam Smith knows where Chilton is coming from. Combine this with monetarist ideology and hyper-Calvinist amillennialism and you have the mindset necessary to create *Productive Christians*.

For Chilton, God has given governments only two rights: the right to punish its criminals, and the right to defend its people (p. 188). Tax-financed foreign aid, medical care, education and welfare are un-Biblical (pp. 114, 266) and tantamount to theft. The Bible prohibits price controls (p. 194), inflation (p. 69) and property taxation (p. 63), but it permits



slavery (pp. 87-92): "The abolitionist movement was . . . antichristian humanism" (p. 99), and Charles G. Finney, who was at the heart of the movement, was a Pelagian heretic (p. 101).

Chilton does not discuss the whos and hows of deciding the extent to which government may protect its people. If medical care is prohibited, does this mean that childhood inoculations are outlawed? If public vaccinations are exempted from Chilton's prohibitions, what is the reason or motive? Would it not be because the unvaccinated child poses a threat to Chilton and not because of Chilton's concern for the child's well-being? Such motivation seems purely selfish: "I am concerned with your health only to the degree that it affects mine."

According to Chilton, "The 'Third and Fourth Worlds' are suffering under the judgment of God" (p. 119). And if we allow our government to help them "we will be cursed" (p. 119). He says nothing of the 120 million Christians in Africa.

Exegetes reading Chilton will learn that what Jesus really meant in Matt 5:5 was that the "industrious meek shall inherit the earth" (p. 65). Actually, scholarly exegesis is scarce in *Productive Christians*. Consider Chilton's use of 1 Thess 5:21. In refuting Sider's condemnation of deceptive and lusty advertising techniques Chilton responds with this verse, saying, "We are responsible for testing everything" (p. 154).

Those who enjoy homiletics will not be disappointed by Chilton. Here are two choice samples: "You'll never read of an Old Testament prophet calling for rent controls, minimum wage laws, or guaranteed jobs. They never demand that the government print more money or expand credit. They did not plead for foreign aid, national health care, or restriction of profits" (p. 204). "Amos never appealed to socialism or statism for the answers. He never said that it was wrong to make a profit, or unjust to have possessions. . . . He did not try to incite envy by comparing the incomes of rich and poor and then *assuming* that the wealth of the rich was unjust. . . . He did *not* ask that foreign aid be sent to those heathen nations that were about to become impoverished through God's judgment on their ungodliness. And, most emphatically, he did not request state intervention into the market" (pp. 211-212).

Perhaps the worst fault of *Productive Christians* is its failure to consider Sider passages that completely undercut Chilton accusations. For instance, on p. 71 of *Rich Christians* Sider states that "we must oppose the view that God never uses the rich, powerful people. He has and he does." On p. 73 he writes: "Actually our texts never say that God loves the poor more than the rich." Even more notable is Sider's statement that "much recent social action has been ineffective because Christian leaders called the government to legislate what they could not persuade their church members to practice voluntarily" (p. 205). Chilton rebuts Sider's gleanings of principles of caring and sharing from Acts 4-5 even though Sider explicitly states that "giving was not compulsory (5:1ff). Nor were all possessions turned over to the community. The imperfect verb tense . . . suggests repeated acts of sharing whenever there was a need rather than one automatic transfer of all possessions to a common purse" (*Cry Justice*, pp. 97-98).

The caustic, vituperative tone of *Productive Christians* is distasteful and unbecoming to one calling himself a Christian. Yet both North and Chilton are moved to defend the ridicule and sarcasm in the book (pp. 25-26, 37). Moreover, North uses these unfortunate elements to construct a failsafe for the work: "Those who have followed Sider in error are morally required to *repent*, whether or not Chilton's style is 'fair.' And if they do not repent, then they are hypocrites, because *it is not Chilton's style that offends them; it is his conclusions*. His style may serve as a convenient excuse; the real reason for not accepting his conclusions has to do with the *substance* of his critique" (p. 26).

Having said all this, I must confess that reading *Productive Christians* was beneficial: It drove me back to Sider, whom I had gradually and complacently forgotten. For this, I am grateful to Chilton.

Robert W. Graves

831 Richard St., Marietta, GA 30060

*Triumphs of the Imagination: Literature in Christian Perspective.* By Leland Ryken. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1979, 262 pp., \$5.95 paper.

Leland Ryken's work is a useful tool for understanding the importance of literature. In it he addresses perennial objections to literature as an art and a discipline. He suggests answers that demonstrate a thoroughly Christian mind and literary critique. To review the content of his book and to focus on several of his major ideas will give a better view of the significance of his study.

Ryken divides his study of literature in Christian perspective into eight chapters and a final bibliographic essay. These chapters develop his central idea that literature is "for the Glory of God and for fun" (p. 9).

In "The Necessity of Literature" Ryken summarizes the conflict that set literature (and the creative arts) against Christian tradition. His central intention in this chapter (and book) is to offer an apologia for literature as a creative ability with which God has endowed man. After a brief but illustrative discussion of the Bible's use of literary texts he addresses the question "Is literature necessary?" He believes that literature "does two things: It presents human experience for our contemplation, and it offers itself as an object of beauty for our artistic contemplation" (p. 26). After offering five reasons why these functions are important for man's wholeness and education he determines that "an education is complete and generous when—and only when—it equips people to spend a meaningful evening at home, or to fill their leisure time with enriching rather than mindless pursuits, or to adorn the mansion of their mind and imagination with noble furnishings" (p. 32).

"Literature and the Quest for Beauty" is Ryken's most theoretic chapter. It is, however, necessary to his argument. For Ryken, literature fills one of the orders of creation—beauty. And he shows, too, that the Bible itself is concerned with beauty. He proposes a theology of beauty with its source in God's creative acts and with an emphasis on enjoyment and pleasure as God-ordained. On this basis Ryken analyzes the artistic beauty of poetry and narrative. Even though it provides specific examples, this portion of his argument seems to interrupt his careful reasoning about beauty. In his conclusion, however, he reasserts his ideas of the relevance of beauty.

Ryken's study of beauty validates his interest in "The World of the Literary Imagination." He affirms that imagination yields truth and makes possible "a world having its own identity and its own integrity" (p. 77). His chapter outlines the importance of literary archetypes, and he shows that literature takes the complexities of life and simplifies them in a "world made up of recurrent images, events and character types known as archetypes" (p. 84). The dualistic world of the literary imagination reveals another facet of his concern with imagination. Ryken discusses as well the necessity of literary conventions to the understanding of literature and affirms that the imaginative world "is nothing less than a window to human nature and the real world" (p. 98).

To determine whether literature is useful, Ryken asks whether it teaches truth. He suggests that its truth is consistent with "reality and human experience" (p. 102) and provides "a variety of world views for the reader's analysis" (p. 102). His subsequent discussion of world views and his analytic questions for discerning world view are useful material for students and teachers alike. In the chapter, too, Ryken analyzes Hawthorne's *Scarlet Letter* to show how human experience, world view, and values combine in a piece of imaginative writing.

Ryken next argues for "A Christian Approach to Literary Criticism." He weaves throughout the chapter an effective argument for literary criticism that proceeds from Christian—Biblical—presuppositions. This chapter may be Ryken's strongest statement in a wholly provocative book. He observes that "it is legitimate for Christian scholars or journals to concentrate on the distinctive interest of the Christian faith in the literary criticism they publish, but such criticism should never be the whole of what Christians do as readers or classroom teachers" (p. 125). By surveying "Christian" criticism of *Macbeth*,



Ryken deftly shows what this criticism should (and should not) be. His chapter concludes with an examination of literature and belief and a call for Christian readers to take seriously their beliefs.

For anyone who teaches courses in "Christian literature" Ryken's discussion of this literature is useful. He sees Christian literature as something more than pietistic devotional books. He believes that "Christian vision in literature will be characterized by the presence rather than the absence of such realities as God, sin, redemption, and God's revelation in both Word and Son" (p. 135). From an overview of various works he recognizes that "the levels of involvement with Christian faith include the use of Christian allusions, the embodiment of inclusively Christian themes and the embodiment of exclusively Christian concepts" (p. 164). In addition he offers ideas on the essence of a Christian writer and concludes that "the Christian writer is, ideally, the speaker for the Christian view of things in the world of the arts" (p. 173).

Some books offer readers space for leisure skimming; others demand that they investigate all corners and byways. Such a book is Ryken's, and his ideas on "Modern Literature and the Christian Reader" demand thorough investigation. He finds that modern literature enables readers to recognize man's depravity, to see life as it really is, and to learn the values of the modern age. He believes that "it is not the contact with such literature that contaminates but the reader's response to it" (p. 180). After studying Biblical realism he suggests that literature delighting in sin, pornography, profanity or obscenity and sacrilege should be repulsive to a Christian mind. Yet Ryken knows that "the presence of profanity or obscenity in a book does not mean that the book as a whole is depraved in its viewpoint. These things are part of the 'object' and should be kept distinct from the subject matter or theme" (p. 185). His chapter suggests four questions to help readers determine personal response to modern literature, extends his earlier discussion of world view to an evaluation of modern views, and provides a brief annotated bibliography of works on modern literature from "biblical," "Christian" or "religious" presuppositions.

Ryken always takes the Bible seriously, and his chapter "The Bible and the Study of Literature" emphasizes his concern for scriptural authority. He agrees with Northrop Frye that ignorance of the Bible handicaps one's understanding of literature. He sees the Bible used "to identify and interpret allusions in literature" (p. 201), to define the substance of Christian belief, to provide a source for statements or aphorisms appropriate to interpretation of a work, and to answer questions of literary theory. He also sees the Bible as "the great repository of archetypes in western literature" (p. 211).

A bibliographic essay concludes Ryken's thoughtful book. He reviews works useful in the journey toward Christian literary criticism and notes works that take the wrong tack and lead to dangerous shoals in its development. Sometimes his annotations are brief. At other times he offers nearly a summary of a book. Perhaps a uniform treatment of the texts would be more appropriate. He criticizes particularly works that supplant theological analysis for genuinely Christian criticism, and he reminds his readers that literature is not a religious experience.

Ryken's book is worthy reading for students, teachers of literature, and all others sensitive to literature as knowledge and pleasure. Ryken avoids fluff. The book is earnest, well written, and addressed to the important questions. The chapter on aesthetics is important but may need some revision in the structure of the argument. The discussion of world view in modern literature should be linked to the initial study of that material. Ryken's book is readable, teachable. It challenges the Christian community to the task of thoroughly Christian criticism.

David G. Lalka

Columbia Bible College

*A Genre for the Gospels: The Biographical Character of Matthew.* By Philip L. Shuler. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982, x + 131 pp., \$14.95.

Though Biblical scholars have attempted to ascertain a suitable genre for the gospels, few have successfully confronted the attendant literary issues. This comes as no surprise, since literary scholars themselves often sidestep the complex specialization of literary criticism. Shuler therefore is at a recognizable disadvantage when he argues that Matthew is encomium biography.

In chap. 1, "The Problem Under Consideration," Shuler discusses the shortcomings of five seminal predecessors: C. W. Votaw, K. L. Schmidt, Moses Hadas and Morton Smith, and C. H. Talbert. Though accurate in his brief summaries Shuler fails to explore sufficiently Votaw's difficult distinction between popular and historical biography and to note Schmidt's circular argument defining *Hoch-* and *Kleinliteratur*, instead relying upon others' critiques. This appeal to authority, however, may be prudent considering the residual strength of Schmidt's position. After concluding correctly that the aretalogical argument fails because of the absence of clear examples, Shuler emphasizes what he calls Talbert's convincing argument that the gospels are "dominated by myth" (p. 20). Too bad Shuler did not have access to David Aune's devastating "The Problem of the Genre of the Gospels: A Critique of C. H. Talbert's *What is a Gospel?*" in *Gospel Perspectives II* (Sheffield: JSOT, 1981) 9-60.

In chap. 2, "A Genre for the Gospels," Shuler commences building his own case. he accurately describes a genre as a "pattern implicit in the contents of a text and its affinities with other texts whose contents mediate similar patterns" (p. 25). Note the apparent ambiguity, however, whether he considers genre a descriptive or prescriptive term, when he cites Wellek and Warren on the timelessness of genres (p. 25) in apparent contradiction to his earlier statement about the importance of finding a distinct category of laudatory biography in antiquity (p. 24).

Shuler recognizes further that genres evolve dynamically (but reference to T. S. Eliot's "Tradition and the Individual Talent" is missing). It is not so simple, however, that since "new genres are not created in a literary vacuum . . . they cannot be *sui generis*" (p. 27). Without ontological status, genres serve as relational categories, it seems to me, and how far one wants to press the analogy determines how unique any literary piece is.

Shuler, expanding his definition, insists rightly, I believe, that "genre transcends the analysis of form" (p. 28) to "encompass a variety of forms, motifs, and themes" (p. 29). And citing the synoptic problem he "rejects the idea that source dependence automatically means genre dependence" (p. 31). Shuler believes instead that "genre criticism must admit the role of the author's intent in the construction of a literary text" (p. 32), a particularly ambiguous assertion. To determine authorial intent he suggests using form, redaction and genre criticism. Besides the circular argument concerning genre criticism and the imprecisions of form and redaction criticism, Shuler does not broach the fundamental question: Is authorial intention discoverable, and if so is it worth discovering?

In considering a specific genre for the gospels Shuler wisely posits that the gospels must be treated in their current forms and the genre should explain most of the gospels' contents. He also insists, however, that "the gospels were apparently not primarily conceived for the purpose of conveying historical information" (pp. 36-37). Shuler seems to believe that the gospels, while containing historical information (which he never specifies), maintain only an incidental relation to ancient historiography. I am uncomfortable with this loose regard for the historicity of the gospels and would desire a clearer definition.

Shuler asserts that the gospels have roots in "*epideictic oratory* and, more specifically, the *encomium*" (p. 37), citing examples from ancient authors who, according to Shuler, distinguish between strict history and the exaggerating encomium. Must we categorize all literature as one of these two, or is this a false dichotomy à la Schmidt? Shuler claims to have discovered a literary genre in existence at the time of the gospels, but he admits that



the ancient literature itself, using various words he interprets as meaning "encomium," does not employ a single nomenclature. And when the oratorical form of encomium was being taught, Shuler relates, the encomium was one of three rhetorical modes, called by Quintilian *genera*. In genre study we cannot possibly have a valid classification without a consistent division, one Shuler never provides.

Shuler specifies two literary techniques—amplification and comparison—common to all encomia. Can comparison and amplification be the most important techniques, when most ancient literary forms utilize them? His broad criteria are perhaps helpful for finding sweeping similarities among works but not for describing a useful generic category.

In chap. 3, "Genre Examples," Shuler provides literary evidence of his genre, relying however on works only vaguely similar to the gospels, such as Isocrates' *Helen*, Philo's *De vita Mosis* and Tacitus' *Agricola*, several of which are themselves notoriously problematic for classification, like *Agricola* and Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*. Shuler's examples all feature famous men—kings (earthly), soldiers, philosophers and statesmen—but not men famous in the same way Jesus was. Perhaps Apollonius is closest by profession, but the story of his itinerant ministry is quite different from Jesus'. The content of Shuler's examples is also quite different from the gospels'. For example the hero's death is avoided, treated in short compass or, in Apollonius' case, resolved by presenting several hypotheses.

Shuler concludes the chapter by asserting that he has defined the encomium based on a "body of literature characterized by a common pattern of constituent elements and shared conventions" (p. 85). The most that Shuler can claim for his evidence, I think, is that he has designated an overly broad, not highly instructive, literary category based on vague technical features. I hesitate to use the term genre for such a sweeping classification.

In chap. 4, "The Relationship of Matthew to Biography," Shuler at last addresses my major interest. Disappointingly, it is the briefest chapter. Shuler begins by attempting to justify the gospel author's conspicuous absence by citing *Papyrus Oxyrhynchus* 1381 and noting examples of the defacing author in ancient literature, although his case for encomium has been built on examples of highly self-conscious writers. He even quotes Graham Stanton's claim, with Bultmann, that at this point the gospel writers do depart from Hellenistic biographers (p. 91).

In his examination of Matthew, Shuler describes in some detail chaps. 1-4 (genealogy through temptation) and 26-28 (death and resurrection), but the similarities between encomium and gospel are only superficial. For example, Shuler argues that Jesus' temptation by Satan parallels "others in encomium biographical literature who were praised because their vocational choices were not altered by other tempting possibilities (for example, *Agricola* resisted fame, Moses, his royal inheritance in Egypt, and Demonax, wealth)" (p. 96). After skipping his ministry, Shuler treats Jesus' death. That Matthew as well as the other gospel writers sees Jesus' death and resurrection as critical mitigates severely Shuler's comparison with encomium. Shuler's treatment is marred also by his insistence that these events are amplified or exaggerated.

Regarding the purposes of Matthew's gospel Shuler finds two related to encomium: "to state clearly the identity of Jesus as the 'Son of God'" (p. 103) and "to inspire emulation of the Messiah's activity" (p. 105), though he admits an evangelistic purpose not present in encomium. Shuler further undermines his argument by noting a Jewish milieu for Matthew's gospel, an important recognition calling into question his presupposition of a strictly Greco-Roman genre. Shuler concludes by saying that application of his genre to the other gospels awaits further research (though his dissertation, the source of this book, treated the synoptics).

Shuler, for all his efforts, illustrates the difficulty confronted by Biblical scholars doing literary criticism: Often they are negligent of its theories and methods. For example, in defense of the dynamic nature of genre he blithely juxtaposes such divergent critics as Wellek and Warren, and E. D. Hirsch.

Shuler also fails to distinguish between genre and technique. Shuler's concept of genre, despite his reasonable theoretical foundation, becomes a mechanical exposition of primarily two technical features (amplification and comparison), neglecting more significant though admittedly slippery stylistic qualities like tone. This highlights the importance of definition. For example, Aristotle defined four basic genres. These may prove helpful in labeling the gospels as more tragic than comic (or the reverse?), but we need more precise categories to distinguish between the Greek tragic hero and the Jesus of the gospels. And what if we discover that, for example, Mark may best be described as redemptive tragedy, Matthew as biography, Luke as history, and John as myth?

Shuler's brief but incomplete answer to the question of the genre of the gospels provides an hypothesis which may eventually prove extremely helpful. But what is needed now is a clearer attention to literary issues, since the question of the genre of the gospels is after all primarily a literary one.

Stanley E. Porter

Los Alamitos, CA

*A New Concordance of the Bible*. Edited by Abraham Even-Shoshan. Jerusalem: Kiryat Sepher, 1981, 1242 pp., \$30.00 (Hebrew).

Students of the Hebrew Bible have already been well served in the past by concordances edited by S. Mandelkern (1937) and G. Lisowski (1958). Now they can be even better served by the *New Concordance* edited by Even-Shoshan, which in most ways has superseded the earlier works.

Like Mandelkern, the *New Concordance* lists each entry under specific parsing. The chief advantages of this concordance over Mandelkern's include the following: (1) There is full vocalization in the verses cited; (2) headings at the top of the page are simpler and much easier to use; (3) pausal forms are distinguished; (4) specific parsings listed beside the verse allow the eye to scan the page more quickly for a specific form. The chief advantages over Lisowski's concordance: (1) the text is printed, not handwritten; (2) individual forms are collected; (3) the size and weight is about ten percent less while quotations are slightly longer.

In addition, there are a number of unique features to this concordance. (1) Each occurrence cited is numbered. One can see at a glance that the preposition, *lê*, is used 4360 times in Hebrew and 65 times in Aramaic. (2) Under each root is a concise list of all the words derived from that root. (3) Each entry is defined in Hebrew under general categories of meaning followed by references to verses where those particular categories apply. For example, *mûsâr* is defined first as a rebuke, warning, or punishment for an evil act, followed by the numbers of 48 verses where this meaning applies and, second, as fetters or bonds, followed by two places where this meaning applies. Those without modern Hebrew can still note the verses grouped together under the same definition category, which is helpful in word studies. (4) With many entries there follows a list of Biblical synonyms. For example, twelve words are listed as having a meaning similar to *'ādāmâ* ("ground"). While not exhaustive, these lists are helpful where included. (5) There is usually a list of other words frequently found in connection with the entry, along with verses where these actually occur. For instance, phrases like "man . . . and beast," "son of man," "innocent blood" with nouns, or associated prepositions and objects with verbs are conveniently summarized before the listing of verses. (6) The *qere* is always entered but the *ketiv* is either placed alongside in parentheses or else indicated by a circle to show that the text itself reads differently. (7) There is a 21-page history of Hebrew concordances (Hebrew).

The major weakness of the *New Concordance* is the use of Hebrew for definitions and lack of an English introduction to the features of the concordance. The publisher ought to include a separate English introduction and list of abbreviations. Another weakness is that space-saving measures have required some listing of references without quoting the text.



Furthermore, Lisowski's concordance is better suited for finding all entries within a book and the subject or object of the verse.

Despite these weaknesses, the *New Concordance* is now the single most useful concordance of the Hebrew Bible. It is well conceived in content and graphics and is beautifully printed. We warmly commend it to all students of the Hebrew Bible.

J. M. Sprinkle

Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, OH 45220

*The NIV Interlinear Hebrew-English Old Testament. Volume 3: I Chronicles—Song of Songs.* Edited by John R. Kohlenberger, III. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1982, 601 pp.

The third in a projected series of four volumes, this book maintains the distinctive features that characterized the first two. The complete text of the *NIV* is printed in the outside margin, and the Hebrew text, following *BHS*, is spaced out so that a very literal English may be printed underneath each Hebrew word. The *ketiv-qere* variants are included in the footnotes. The ordering of the books follows the Greek (and English) versions. The series is useful for students and for ministers with only an elementary knowledge of Hebrew, but like similar helps it must not be abused by those who think interlinear English translations provide profound insight into the semantic range of Hebrew words and syntax.

D. A. Carson

*A Harmony of the Words and Works of Jesus Christ: From the New International Version.* Edited by J. Dwight Pentecost. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1981, xx + 183 pp., paper.

The two dominant features of this harmony: (1) It is based on the *NIV*; (2) its order and structure obviously tie it to Pentecost's companion volume, *The Words and Works of Jesus Christ*, also published by Zondervan. For the first feature we may be grateful, but the second is as much a limitation as a strength. For Bible colleges that use the companion volume as a standard text, this *Harmony* will doubtless prove very welcome; for institutions that find such an approach in need of more critical interaction with other approaches to the gospels, the *Harmony* will prove of little use. It contains none of the critical essays found in some other English-language harmonies (e.g. the old standard by A. T. Robertson or the recent harmony based on the *NASB*, not to mention more sophisticated ones) and fails to establish a rationale for the general approach and structure that are adopted. For instance, the *Aland Synopsis*, in Greek or English, provides the parallels to each passage from each gospel. This results in repetition but does not prejudge historical, chronological, literary and theological issues in quite the same way this volume does. The *NIV* deserves a more comprehensive volume.

D. A. Carson

*Chronological and Background Charts of the New Testament.* By H. Wayne House. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1981, 156 pp., paper, spiral binding.

The charts in this book are divided into four sections. The first, titled "General Material," includes eighteen charts on such topics as Literary Classification of the New Testament, Early Patristic Quotations of the New Testament (total counts, but no references), Liquid and Dry Measures, Sermons and Speeches in the New Testament, Old Testament characters in the New Testament, and more. The second section, under the title "Backgrounds to the New Testament," includes chronological charts on such topics as the Structure of Roman Society, The Roman Military System, Graeco-Roman Deities, First-Century Procurators of Judea, The Seleucids, The Reckoning of Passover, and a list of Rabbinic

Writings. The third section of the book offers nineteen more charts on "The Gospels," covering such topics as Suggested Solutions to the Synoptic Problem, Contents of Hypothetical Q, Contrasts Between the Synoptics and John, both a Chronology of the Ministry of Jesus and An Alternate Chronological Table of Christ's Life, and lists of Nature Miracles and of Healing Miracles. The final section, "The Apostolic Age," concludes with fifteen more charts. These include The Kerygma of the Early Church, Paul's Missionary Journeys, Theories Concerning the Authorship of Hebrews, Interpretations of Revelation, and a pair of charts setting forth the Northern and Southern (*sic*; most literature prefers "North" and "South") Galatia theories.

The author has brought together a fair bit of useful material. Occasionally I wondered why certain charts were included (is it helpful to be given a transliteration of the Greek headings of the books of the NT as printed in modern Greek New Testaments?), or what principle of selection was operating when critical theories to do with North and South Galatia or the authorship of Hebrews were schematized but nothing similar was done for, say, Jude or James or John or Philippians. Although House has sought to be fair to the points of view he presents (and they are almost always exclusively evangelical options, others being excluded), his charts vary considerably in quality. Perhaps this is to be expected from the nature of the material he is attempting to schematize. But some charts, at least, are so reductionistic that it is arguable that the material in them should never have been presented in this form. It is one thing to list the procurators of Judea or the emperors of Rome; here you are either right or wrong. It is another thing to list the books of the Apocrypha—without observing that the list was not standardized in the first century. It is still another to present one chart on "The Reckoning of Passover" (based on Hoehner's work), with a footnote to Jaubert, without any mention of half a dozen other theories. But weakest of all are charts with titles like "Books of the New Testament Classified Doctrinally." The theme of Matthew, we are told, is "Jesus the Messiah as King"; of John, "Jesus the Messiah as Son of God." Kingsbury would not be pleased; more important, reductionism becomes actual distortion, and the chart is unhelpful at numerous points.

In short, this work is useful for beginning students of the NT but should be used with care.

D. A. Carson

*Approaches to Old Testament Interpretation.* By John Goldingay. Downers Grove: Intervarsity, 1981, 188 pp.

*Approaches to Old Testament Interpretation* takes its place with a whole new genre of OT volumes that have appeared since the publication of A. H. J. Gunneweg's *Understanding the Old Testament* (Westminster) in 1978. (See now S. M. Mayo, *The Relevance of the Old Testament for the Christian Faith: Biblical Theology and Interpretive Methodology* [University Press of America, 1982].) It is a most stimulating and provocative volume. Its footnotes and bibliography alone are worth the price of this jam-packed treatise, which covers the topics of OT Biblical theology, Law, history, typology and canon.

Goldingay concludes that there may not be a single correct key or center to OT faith. Rather, it resembles understanding a battle or a person or a landscape instead of the layout of a well-planned town. Thus there are many starting points, structures and foci competing for the honor of being the center or *Mitte* of OT theology.

Such a conclusion only repeats Gerhard Hasel's multiplex approach and confuses the topics, issues, persons and events of the OT for a proper consideration of its theme or goal. To conclude that this is OT Biblical theology is to mislabel a collection of OT *topoi* as OT theology. How can claims to divine revelation and deliberate continuity with past writers of revelation be preserved in such a hodgepodge? It strikes this reviewer that some of these conclusions are more a failure of nerve in the face of heavy modern criticism with its deci-



sion that truth is multiple, plural and existential rather than single and often propositional than it is anything else.

Goldingay's strongest and most suggestive chapter is on the Law (chap. 2: "The Old Testament as a Way of Life"). In a marvelous discussion of norms, contexts and specificity or particularity, Goldingay concludes that "the fact that God's commands are specific to men in a particular historical context does not exclude the possibility that they are the concrete expression of some principle" (p. 53). There are few discussions of the Christian's use of the Law as penetrating as this one, even if it extends only 28 pages.

The chapter on history makes some of the same good points we have been hearing of late against the stress on God's acts to the detriment of God's word. Such an overreaction, cautions Goldingay, replaces *sola scriptura* with *sola historia*.

Goldingay's treatment of the problems of typology, allegory and "fuller sense" are less satisfying. Cautiously, Goldingay would allow the whole of Scripture to interpret the parts and the Christ event in the OT to set the "fuller sense" than the less complete exegetical version of the OT. The re-interpretive process is not alien to the thought of the OT for Goldingay.

This reviewer, however, remains unconvinced. What is it that belongs to the whole that cannot be found in the legitimate progress of the parts of Scripture—unless it be a fullness of disclosure on the same topic? And while there is escalation or heightening in the NT fulfillment of OT types, the OT must offer a clue that the person, event or institution is a type awaiting its NT antitype. All claims to retrojected fuller senses from the NT to the OT are devoid of one basic requisite: They must be "written" (*graphē*) in the OT to be part of the authoritative consideration of revelation. Everything between the lines or infused from later history is either to be attributed to that later text alone or declared missing from both texts and therefore to be non-Scriptural (i.e. nongraphic). Goldingay maintains the same tone in this last chapter on canon and midrashic genres of interpretation, although he does attribute alleged examples of NT midrash more to a search for application of Biblical texts. Here again too much concession seems to be given to the modern consensus that the NT simply uses the interpretive methods (i.e. Jewish midrash) of its day. The only way to settle this debate is to exegete each NT passage that interprets the OT. In our research on a large number of these passages we have found that all claims for midrashic *pesher* or *sensus plenior* interpretations are incorrect. After all, what apologetic force would such improvisations of OT text have for the Jewish audiences to which they were beamed? The Church must look at this problem much more closely before it follows the academy's results on this question.

All in all, I highly recommend this most creative piece of scholarship. It will remain as a landmark in the history of OT scholarship.

Walter C. Kaiser, Jr.

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

*The Creative Word: Canon as a Model for Biblical Education.* By Walter Brueggemann. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982, 176 pp., \$8.95 paper.

Walter Brueggemann has attempted to make a statement at the interface of two disciplines: his own field of OT, and education. In particular he operates on the thesis that the process of formation of each of the three parts of the canon has a distinctive contribution to make to our understanding of the educational process. In focusing on the process of canonization he diverges from the approach of Brevard Childs, who emphasizes the end product, the canon as we currently find it.

Brueggemann suggests that different educators in the community of faith are drawn to different parts of the canon as matters of personal preference. Thus conservatives tend to emphasize the Torah with its authoritativeness. Social critics, radicals and revolutionaries are most likely to be attracted to the prophetic canon. Humanistic psychologists, interested

in human potential and actualization, are drawn to the wisdom literature.

The Torah gives a substantive knowledge. It is that which is settled and permanent. The mode of education here is that of arousing questions in the mind of the student, to which the answers then are given. The prophets, however, speak a word that is not normative and not known in advance. It is disruptive of the consensus. The wisdom literature emphasizes ethics focused on the providential ordering of life with God. Each of these parts of the canon has its own mode of knowledge and its own substance. Each uses its own specific mode of education. Yet there is one common factor: obedience to the "thou" experienced in these differing ways.

Brueggemann has given us a new way of understanding the OT canon and of organizing the Church's task of education. While the limitation of this to the OT is in order for an OT specialist, the title of the book is broader than its contents. The emphasis in the final chapter on obedience is one that is both Biblical and needed.

Evangelicals will object to some of Brueggemann's conceptions of the nature of Scripture. His reflections on the origin of Scripture stress the human element more than the divine. His emphasis on narrative suggests that whenever we move from the idiom of story we encounter an incongruity between our convictions and the ways we speak them. This leads us to spend our energies on "alien questions" such as: "Do you believe the Bible is inerrant [*sic*]?" "Do you believe Jesus was raised physically from the dead?" and "Do you believe we should ordain homosexuals?" He admits that the response "Let me tell you a story" will not satisfy everyone and is not adequate for every issue. Yet he is much more willing to accept that answer than conservatives would be.

There is much here that should stimulate thought regarding the relationship of the different parts of the canon to our educational practice, but the questions raised are more satisfactory than the answers given.

Millard J. Erickson

Bethel Theological Seminary, St. Paul, MN

*Exodus*. By H. L. Ellison. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1982, xi + 204 pp., \$5.95 paper.

This commentary is part of the Daily Bible Study Series. Like other commentaries in this series it contains the text of the RSV divided into units suitable for daily reading followed by brief comments designed to elucidate the text in the light of modern scholarship and to apply it to modern Christian living. The strength of this particular volume is in its regular application of the spiritual and theological significance to both the Israelites of old and to Christians of today of the events of the exodus and the laws given on Sinai. Though such application is not made to every event or every law and though it is occasionally made from what would appear to be a secondary rather than a primary point in the passage under discussion, the reader will find more of spiritual and theological relevance in this commentary than in most commentaries on Exodus.

A further strength of the commentary is the caution exercised in interpreting the text. Where considerable doubt exists in ancient tradition or modern scholarship regarding the meaning of a term such as "Urim and Thummim," the location of a site such as the Red Sea crossing, or the origin and significance of a law such as boiling a kid in its mother's milk, Ellison frankly admits his ignorance and gives the various options. When modern explanations clash with ancient tradition, Ellison's states both, evaluates them critically and opts for one. In some cases this results in the rejection of the modern explanation, as in the case of the origin of the manna. In other cases this results in the rejection or the modification of ancient tradition, as in the case of the number of people involved in the exodus. In yet other cases this results in stressing both the modern explanation and the ancient tradition, as in the case of the plagues (which involved both a natural and a supernatural element). While such an approach leaves this commentary open to criticism from both critical and conservative scholars, it has the advantage of leaving the reader with both options. In many cases,



however, Ellison has not given enough information to make an intelligent choice between the two.

In summary, the consistent spiritual and theological application of the text and the cautious approach to interpretation make this commentary a worthwhile addition to the library of any pastor or layman.

Donald Glenn

Dallas Theological Seminary

*The Book of Job.* By Gleason L. Archer, Jr. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1982, 125 pp., \$5.95 paper.

Subtitled "God's Answer to the Problem of Undeserved Suffering," this brief study of the most ancient of our Scriptures was written in tribute to Gleason Archer's pastor, Richard A. Swanson, whose life seemingly was cut short when he died of cancer at the age of forty-two. During the days when his congregation watched their pastor suffer and die, Archer led them in a study of Job. He referred to their experience as the church's "discipline of sorrow," and he wrote with the prayerful hope "that all who read this book and study the teaching of Job with openness of heart may find themselves leaning more confidently than ever upon the sustaining grace of God, who never makes a mistake."

Following a foreword by Swanson's widow, Archer presents a somewhat detailed introduction in which he asserts his purpose to be the development of a spiritually uplifting survey of the teachings of Job rather than a debate of opposing viewpoints.

Archer's reputation as an OT scholar is well known to *JETS* readers. He presents enough introductory data to make even lay readers cognizant of the issues about the authorship, dating and location of this ancient work. Then he hurries on to mine from the text its hidden and not-so-hidden nuggets of truth.

In most books the summary comes at the end. Archer, however, unfolds the summary early so that the reader will be well alerted about what to expect in Job's experience. Archer emphasizes that God is worthy of our praise regardless of our circumstances, that he allows suffering in our lives to strengthen and purify us, and that the eventual answer to the problem of undeserved suffering is found only in the infinite wisdom of God.

A detailed outline rather than normal chapter divisions becomes the organizing structure of his exposition, which consists of greater and lesser explanations of the text and Archer's own paraphrases, making the text much more readily understood than even the modern translations of this deeply imponderable book. This structure at times and Archer's clear penetration of Job's meaning are just what is needed to make the book a useful guide for Bible-study groups and Sunday-school classes and a helpful devotional guide for the searching individual. It must be read with Bible in hand in order for it to achieve its best benefit in the hearts of its readers.

Robert D. Pitts

Taylor University, Upland, IN

*The Prophets: Volume One: The Assyrian Period.* By Klaus Koch. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983, 182 pp., \$10.95.

This is a translation of the first volume of *Die Profeten*, a two-volume work published in 1978 that surveys the prophetic movement in the OT. Koch is an important German OT scholar who has published a number of books on form criticism and apocalyptic. The present work, designed as an introductory text for theological students, treats the rise of the prophetic movement in Israel and those prophetic writings that Koch believes to have come from the Assyrian period—namely, Amos, Hosea, Micah, proto-Isaiah, Joel, Nahum and Zephaniah.

There is much in the critical stance adopted by Koch to which the evangelical is likely to object. For example, his account of the development of prophecy ignores Abraham, Moses, Miriam, Eldad, Medad, the seventy, and Deborah—all of whom are called prophets in the Bible—because of the alleged doubtful historicity of the accounts in which these are so described. Likewise the ecstatic aspect of prophetism is overdone. That the stock in which Jeremiah was locked (Jeremiah 20) represents a kind of sobering-up cell for frenzied prophets, as Koch claims, is most doubtful. Other critical conclusions not commonly shared by evangelicals include “proto-Isaiah,” detection of later interpolations in Amos, the suggestions that Elisha’s prophecy against Moab (1 Kings 3) failed, that the account of Elijah’s opposition to Baal worship is inaccurate, and that the reference in Amos 1:1 to an earthquake represents a redactor’s misunderstanding of the prophet’s message. Many evangelicals would want Obadiah and Jonah included in the discussion of the Assyrian-period prophets.

Having said this, I was surprised to read in the preface that Koch expects to be criticized for being too conservative. And, indeed, compared to most of his German colleagues Koch advocates a very moderate critical stance. For example, he regards many of the assertions of the literary critic as no more than a subjective judgment founded on personal taste. He rejects the common view expounded by Wellhausen that the prophets as representatives of ethical religion reject cult and ritual as such. Koch also rejects Wellhausen’s view that the prophets were only messengers of doom and that prophecies of salvation must be interpolations. On the contrary, the prophecy of the raising of the Davidic kingdom in Amos 9:11-12 is original, complementing the oracle against the nations in chap. 1 that were all formerly components of David’s empire. Likewise the messianic prophecy of Mic 5:1-6 is not post-exilic but original, as are Isaiah 9 and 11. Koch even finds it difficult to avoid the impression that Immanuel refers to the mysterious savior figure of Micah 5. Concerning predictive prophecy Koch, influenced by contemporary interest in parapsychology, does not automatically date predictions after their fulfillments. In some cases he can speak of predictions being “remarkably” fulfilled. In all this Koch is following this philosophy: “And where authenticity is concerned, I prefer to trust the transmitted text too much rather than too little” (p. 107). Even if we conclude that Koch has nonetheless trusted the text too little, we must applaud him for having come a long way in the right direction.

A strength of this book is the author’s vivid, imaginative reconstruction of the historical circumstances. Nathan’s encounter with David, Amos’ meeting with Amaziah, Isaiah’s temple vision, Isaiah’s encounter with Ahaz, the scandal of the prophetic statements against the cult are all made real by lively narration. The preacher will find these sections useful. On the other hand such reconstructions also get Koch into trouble as when he describes at length Abiathar’s use of Urim and Thummim to advise David in battle (1 Samuel 23), concerning which the text is totally silent. Koch fails to inform the reader when he leaves the text and enters the imagination. On the positive side, Koch poses good questions to the text even where the data is insufficient to provide an answer. There is limited interaction with other scholars (only 29 footnotes). Some sections are confusing—e.g., “justice” and “righteousness” as spheres of power and “auras” that radiate from the individual (pp. 58-59). A Scripture index is provided, but there is unfortunately no general index. The frequent quotation of Hebrew words in transliteration will make the text difficult to readers without Hebrew.

*The Prophets*, despite these shortcomings, is a stimulating work that is worth reading.

J. M. Sprinkle

Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, OH 45220



*Daniel*. By D. S. Russell. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1981, x + 234 pp., \$5.95 paper.

This volume is one of the first in the Daily Bible Study Series of commentaries on OT books, intended as a companion to the popular series on the NT by William Barclay. The primary purpose of the series is basically expository and devotional: to enhance the reader's knowledge of the ways of God, and to encourage faith in and obedience to him. In addition the series is intended to introduce the reader to some of the more important results and insights of modern OT scholarship.

It is to be hoped, however, that forthcoming volumes in this series are more evenhanded about presenting the results of modern scholarship than this one. The author consistently follows the critical stance of a late date and pseudonymous authorship for the book of Daniel without acknowledging contrary views that would support a traditional date and authorship. Thus he interprets the book as the product of an Hasidic Jew writing during the period of persecution under Antiochus Epiphanes (170-164 B.C.) to encourage his fellow countrymen to remain faithful to the God of their fathers. To accomplish this purpose the author, according to Russell, combined legendary tales about God's deliverance of his servants (Daniel 1-6) with apocalyptic visions popular in his day (Daniel 2, 7, 8) and "prophecies" of the post-exilic period that are really a survey of history emphasizing his own period and containing his own hopes for the future (Daniel 9, 11). The fact that these "prophecies" and visions did not prove true in the author's day did not prove a hindrance to the value of the book of Daniel, according to Russell, because they were constantly reinterpreted and applied to later times.

Though this view of the book of Daniel may indeed be popular among many modern scholars and has some valid spiritual application, it has generally not been accepted by evangelical scholars who have refuted the historical, linguistic and exegetical bases for it.

Donald R. Glenn

Dallas Theological Seminary

*Love to the Loveless: The Message of Hosea*. By Derek Kidner. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1982, 142 pp.

"The Bible Speaks Today" series, to which this volume belongs, aims more at relating these Biblical books to contemporary life than posing as commentaries that merely elucidate the text. And, indeed, this is a most readable and suggestive work for teachers and preachers.

However, this reviewer was disappointed in Kidner's interpretive stance on Hosea's family. For Kidner, Gomer was a whore when Hosea married her, and the second and third children probably were not his but were products of her harlotry. This view fails to wrestle sufficiently with the fact that all three children are called "children of harlotry" even though we know for a fact that Gomer conceived and bore the first son "to him [Hosea]." This would lead to the inference that the children received this title because of the stigma of their mother's reputation instead of describing their own births as illegitimate.

If this reasoning is correct for the children (and we cannot see what alternative exists in light of the clearest statements of the text with regard to the first child and also the naming of the other two children [usually a father's privilege]), then it could be equally true that their mother was given the same designation by way of compressing and condensing into a single statement God's original order and Gomer's subsequent character. Thus what appears to be a purpose construction is really a result, just as E. S. P. Heavenor pointed to parallel constructions in Isa 6:9-12 or Mark 4:11-12 (*New Bible Dictionary*, 1962, pp. 540-541).

There is also the disagreeable matter of the "degree of fulfillment at the literal level" (p. 25) of Hos 1:10-2:1; 2:18-20. To argue that the old breach between the north and south had been healed in the post-exilic return of Ezra with his offering of "twelve bulls" (Ezra

8:35) and with the NT references naming us as believers the new "Israel of God" includes both delightful and disappointing conclusions. Certainly the concept of a single people of God is germane, but this gain must not be at the expense of recognizing that God's covenant with the nation of Israel is just as eternal and permanent as is the offer of the gospel in that same covenant. The new covenant incorporates both the Church as the people of God (as Kidner points out from Rom 9:25-26 and 1 Pet 2:10-11) and the restorations of the nation Israel after the full number of the Gentiles has come in (noted from texts like Rom 11:25-28). This latter emphasis is not a cultic or millenarian distinctive. It is the repeated and unavoidable portion of the same covenant that we Christians rightly rejoice in. We were pleased to note, however, that Kidner did acknowledge this national level of fulfillment at the climax of the gospel era in his exposition of Hos 3:4.

Hosea 4-14 is notoriously difficult. While Kidner lists the threefold indictment (lack of: faithfulness, kindness, and knowledge of God) against Israel in that pivotal text for the book—viz., Hos 4:1—he does not utilize it as some have (in reverse order) to outline the rest of the book (i.e., lack of the knowledge of God, 4:2-6:3; lack of kindness, 6:4-11:11; and lack of faithfulness, 11:12-14:9).

A vigorous and helpful discussion follows with such courageous stances as illustrated by his comment on Hosea 11:1. In Kidner's view the citation of this verse in Matt 2:15 is "far from arbitrary" (p. 101), for the infant Christ, as God's "firstborn son" (Exod 4:22-23), summed up in his person all that Israel was called to be. He was likewise threatened and delivered.

There were also some disappointments. For example, the current English rendering of Hos 12:4 ("[Jacob] met God at Bethel, and there God spoke with him") is followed against the Hebrew text, which clearly says "and there God spoke with us." Such a surprising switch in expected pronouns by Hosea introduces precisely the clue this generation needs in the Gadamer-sponsored thesis that the horizons of the writer and reader can be merged—even if it is on a somewhat different level than the envisaged.

Kidner has once again made a major contribution to our understanding of the OT. *Love to the Loveless* will especially encourage those who are easily intimidated by the OT's unusual historical and cultural context, and yet who wish to preach and teach from this OT book.

Walter C. Kaiser, Jr.

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

*Typos: The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New.* By Leonhard Goppelt. Translated by Donald H. Madvig. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982, xxii + 264 pp., \$15.95.

This publication makes available in English translation Goppelt's 1939 doctoral study with the addition of a journal article that appeared in 1964. The fact that an older work is reappearing in translation is indicative of the continued importance of this study for Biblical hermeneutics. Though somewhat dated (and here the reader should consult the informative "Foreword" by E. Earle Ellis), Goppelt's presentation has much to offer by way of challenging present-day hermeneutical methods of radical historicism and existentialism.

According to Goppelt "a genuine Christian typology" (p. 64), which is nothing other than legitimate and proper exegesis of the Scriptures, elucidates the place of Jesus in the history of redemption, more specifically in terms of the new age of the eschaton. Such exegesis is oriented to a distinctively redemptive-historical point of view. As instructed by the Lord himself the NT writers interpreted the person and work of Jesus in light of his typological fulfillment of the OT Scriptures (pp. 87-95). Goppelt creates the impression, however, that typological interpretation alone provides the solution to the perennial question of the relationship between the OT and the NT. Rather, typological exegesis must be seen as one aspect, however prominent, of Biblical hermeneutics.



In a refreshing manner Goppelt highlights the fact that "the new creation is not a repetition of the first, nor is it simply a reversal of the Fall; it is a perfect, i.e., a typological, renewing of creation" (pp. 134-135). It is from this decisively eschatological perspective that the author's cautionary word against an unwarranted (but all too prevalent) moralizing of OT persons and events takes on added significance. Commenting on 1 Pet 3:5-6 he says, "What is being emphasized is not moral conduct per se, but a trait that is fitting for the faith of a people 'who put their hope in God'. . . . Their ethical behavior is not in itself exemplary for the church, but it is exemplary as a characteristic that is appropriate for the faith that God's people have; it is an essential element in their relationship to God" (pp. 157-158). In his covenantal relationship with his people, "God dealt in a typical way (*typikōs*) with Israel in the wilderness, in a manner that is a pattern for his dealing with the church in the last days. The fortunes of Israel are types (*typoi*) of the experiences of the church (1 Cor 10:11, 6; cf. Rom 5:14)" (pp. 4-5). Recognition of God's dealing with Israel as a pattern for and example to the new covenant people of God underscores the importance of careful study of the OT Scriptures. Spiritual growth and maturity of believers as the body of Christ depend on diligent study of the whole Word of God. "The results of typological exegesis are primarily statements about NT salvation, not statements about the OT. . . . Typology also gives certainty and clarity concerning Christ's destiny and the corresponding destiny of his church. The Son of Man must suffer, die and rise again. It is no strange thing which happens to the church and its servants when persecution from without and various temptations from within oppress them. Typology removes the redemptive history of the NT from simple fortuitous factuality and places it under God's eternal redemptive decree. This does not lead to complacency but to obedience. . . . Typology not only brings the assurance of salvation, but it always provides a rationale for its warnings against contempt for this salvation. It clarifies the nature of salvation and justifies the warning against its misuse. The typological relationship to the punishment of Israel under divine forbearance (*anochē*) indicates that contempt and misuse will result in the eternal loss of the true salvation" (pp. 200-201).

Although Goppelt speaks of the peculiar redemptive-historical function of the Law of Moses as "a negative preparation for the gospel," this crucial aspect of the discontinuity between the old and new covenants remains undeveloped in his thought. What Goppelt identifies as a works principle of inheritance under the Mosaic covenant is not consistently worked out in his interpretation of the gracious nature of all God's redemptive covenants. Goppelt remarks: "When Paul speaks of the 'law,' which was added later (Gal 3:18f.), he is not thinking only of the revelation of God's commands, but also of the status of this law according to the Sinaitic order: its fulfillment is a requirement for existence before God" (p. 138 n. 36). As it is, Goppelt's treatment of "law" within the Biblical system of typology is inadequate at this point.

In general Goppelt achieves his stated purpose of allowing the Scriptures to speak for themselves on the matter of the relation between the two testaments. The author states by way of conclusion: "Our study of OT typology in the NT has introduced us to a comprehensive and profound view of redemptive history. This is not a modern or more sophisticated justification of the NT use of Scripture that is based on a more recent view of history; it is a point of view that is integral to the NT itself" (p. 198).

The strength of this study lies in the author's ability to canvass a vast amount of Biblical material clearly and concisely. His argument for the major place of OT typology in the NT is at once compelling and convincing. The controversial issue of the relation between the testaments has occupied a prominent position in the history of Biblical interpretation. Although Goppelt's work does not attempt to place the hermeneutical discussion in the context of historical theology in any comprehensive way, the author's purpose of simply considering the NT writer's use of the OT as the way to resolve the ongoing debate suggests a degree of insensitivity to the complexities arising in the history of doctrinal formulation. But more important than his failure to grapple with problems relating to the development

of doctrine, Goppelt fails to do justice to the creative role of the Holy Spirit as both the primary author and the interpreter of Scripture.

The author's underlying (neo-orthodox) premise is that the Biblical writings, the OT and NT canonical documents, comprise the community of faith's apprehension of God's redemptive-historical revelation in Christ. Goppelt presupposes that the Biblical writers have produced a collection of writings that are historically and critically fallible. Consequently Goppelt's discussion of Biblical typology as a redemptive-historical category is weighed down by the dialectical tension between history and theology.

The nature of OT prophecy is treated in an entirely unsatisfactory manner. What exactly is OT prophecy according to Goppelt? The answer is found in his proposed understanding of covenant typology. "This typology is not to be distinguished from prophecy; rather, it is a principle that forms and uphold it" (p. 228). Here lies the fundamental error in Goppelt's argumentation. First, just the reverse of what Goppelt maintains is valid. It is the prophetic character of God's revelation that forms and upholds the typological system of redemptive covenant. Second, Goppelt's definition of covenant typology is relational and anthropocentric rather than truly redemptive-historical and theocentric. He writes: "Typology is not a hermeneutical method with specific rules of interpretation. It is a spiritual approach that looks forward to the consummation of salvation and recognizes the individual types of that consummation in redemptive history. . . . The discovery of individual typological relationships is governed by the following principles (unconsciously, of course, and simply as a consequence of the nature of the subject matter): Persons, events, and institutions are interpreted only insofar as they express some aspect of man's relationship to God. Consequently, typology does not deal with inherent or external features in the events and accounts in the OT. Because Christ alone is the fulfillment of this relationship to God, another principle is always added that arises from the subject matter. This principle specifies that all typology proceeds through Christ and exists in him. From these two principles it follows as a matter of course that the antitypes, like the types, are not merely inherent or external features, but are the important elements in the perfect relationship between God and man" (p. 202).

This brings us to the more immediate problem of the relation between history and theology. According to Goppelt, the Biblical writers engage in redactional activity for typological (i.e., theological) purposes: "A type has validity also for us if a historical event in the Exodus or in the wilderness wandering that was governed by a revelatory word made a life from God possible for Israel, and if contempt for this experience resulted in judgment. The validity is not diminished even if many details in the description of the wilderness wandering are a reflection of subsequent divine revelations to Israel. If it is true, as we have indicated, that the OT type has not been molded by the church's experience of redemption, then that experience only confirms the significance of the type. Accordingly, the validity of a typology does not depend on the historicity of individual scenes, but on the truth and reality of God's revelation of himself in history and on a standard for the historical phenomena that can only be developed from the subject matter. In principle, typology is not dependent on a greater amount of historicity than any other biblical revelation, as long as one maintains that true typology represents an important element in God's relationship to man" (pp. 232-233). Goppelt suggests that the typological basis of Jesus' resurrection and ascension is theological, not historical. It is an article of faith (p. 82). Similarly the question of the historicity of Adam, as another example, is a matter of speculation. Assuredly the apostle Paul's interest is "genuine typology," which is apparent only through the eyes of faith. The eschatological presence of God in history is a spiritual reality, an experience not subject to historical and scientific verification (see pp. 134 ff.).

Goppelt's hermeneutical principle, the typological principle, comes into sharper focus when he discusses the creative role of the Biblical authors in their use of typology. According to Matthew's understanding of Psalm 22 in Matt 28:10: "Did the evangelists interpret these statements about the righteous sufferer that are taken from the Psalms as direct



prophecies or in some typological way? We cannot ask them this pointed question. Their only concern is that these statements from the Psalms were fulfilled in Jesus' experience; they are not interested in what the poet had in mind originally. The way in which the OT passages are introduced suggests that theirs is a typological approach which looks for similarity in essentials, not simply for the fulfillment of external features. There are no explicit statements that prophecy has been fulfilled, such as we might have expected, especially from Matthew; the passages are simply alluded to. The distress of the saint that is portrayed by the psalmist is fulfilled in Jesus" (p. 103; cf. pp. 122-123). The "essential" ingredient in covenant typology, according to Goppelt, is relational and existential. It pertains to man's encounter with God. The peculiar, typological interpretation of the OT in the NT differs from our way of thinking and "our standards of logic" (p. 162).

Jesus himself employed the typological method of OT interpretation, which grew out of the tradition of the Israelite community of faith and contemporary Judaism (p. 79). Here Goppelt implicitly obscures the scriptural teaching concerning the ontological oneness of the Father and the Son. He perceives Jesus' messianic consciousness to be something learned exclusively through the OT tradition of faith in the God of promise. Furthermore the place that Goppelt gives to the canonical writers as bearers of redemptive revelation has the effect of relegating Jesus' unique role as the messianic fulfillment and interpreter of the OT Scriptures to one of secondary and derivative status: "Jesus and the evangelists found a scriptural basis for their conviction that the Messiah had to be rejected by his people and had to pass through suffering and death on his way to glory. From our study thus far it would be natural to suppose that with the aid of typology they found this basis in an idea that occurs throughout the OT, the idea of the prophet, king, and as the whole passion narrative indicates, righteous man. In the pursuit of his calling he suffers, dies, and rises again for God's sake" (p. 95). Thus "Jesus faced death consciously and deliberately as being the destiny of the Messiah that had been ordained by God's redemptive decree and would, therefore, issue in victory" (p. 102).

In the course of his development of a typological understanding of the relation between OT and NT Goppelt treats the theme of eschatology by reference to promise and fulfillment, covenant continuity and discontinuity, and what Ellis describes as "historical correspondence and escalation" (p. x). As already indicated, the cogency of Goppelt's redemptive-historical construction of Biblical typology founders on his uncritical adoption of a neo-orthodox conception of history and theology. The solution to the problem of the relation between the Mosaic covenant and the new covenant depends on recognition of and submission to the self-interpreting character of the Scriptures as the infallible and inerrant Word of God. Only on such a basis is the exegete and theologian critically responsible in his hermeneutical task. Although Goppelt's study may raise more questions than it finally answers, its chief contribution will be to encourage us to return to the NT writings themselves for understanding the relation between the two testaments, and in so doing come to acknowledge the Biblical hermeneutic of the self-interpreting Christ speaking through the Scriptures of the old and new covenants.

Mark W. Karlberg

108 Heather Road, Upper Darby, PA

*The New Testament Student and His Field*. Edited by John H. Skilton. Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1982, 310 pp., \$9.95.

When first presented with the title of this book one might anticipate reading a fresh introduction to the NT or perhaps to the various disciplines and criticisms applied to it. Instead one discovers the fifth volume of a series entitled *The New Testament Student*, this one an anthology of essays with no additional unifying theme apart from "conservative biblical scholarship" (p. viii). Most of the essays seem to have been completed by the mid-70s. Two have appeared in this *Journal* (Grant R. Osborne, "The Evangelical and Tradi-

*tionsgeschichte*," *JETS* 21 [1978] 117-130; Robert H. Countess, "Thank God for the Genitive!", *JETS* 12 [1969] 117-122), the former in a revised form already at that time. No explanation for the delay in publication is given.

Several other questions also spring quickly to mind. What were the previous volumes of this series about? When were they published? Are more forthcoming? The book provides no answers. In fact the traditional blurbs on inside and back covers are missing altogether. It turns out that vols. 1-4 appeared from 1974 to 1978 and are all equally amorphous, although vol. 3 does have a section emphasizing theology and vol. 4 one on Bible translation. John Guret (b. 1926), to whom this volume is dedicated and who also wrote one of its articles, an "Introduction to the History of Paul's Aesthetic," is described as a brilliant Christian literary theorist, but no entry under his name appears in either the *National Union Catalog* or *Books in Print*. Although I am not a professional philosopher, it has been a long time since I have read an entire philosophical essay without gaining the slightest insight into its main point. That I did so here may not be Guret's fault, but it certainly places a question mark over Skilton's stated goal for his contributors to address theological "students" as well as "scholars" (p. vii).

These introductory remarks do not imply that Skilton's efforts have been entirely wasted. Several articles come from well-known evangelical scholars. Osborne's work, noted above, offers a good introduction to the various criteria used to affirm the authenticity and inauthenticity of synoptic sayings credited to Jesus. Edwin Yamauchi points out nine areas where recent findings have disproven claims of William Ramsay ("Ramsay's Views on Archaeology in Asia Minor Reviewed"), thus cautioning conservatives not to endorse uncritically all of the positions of that great turn-of-the-century scholar of Luke-Acts. William Lane identifies three functions of wisdom Christology in Heb 1:1-4 ("Detecting Divine Wisdom in Hebrews"), reflecting pastoral concern, hortatory motivation, and a foreshadowing of the priestly typology of later chapters. Vern Poythress applies the insights of modern rhetorical analysis to scriptural sentences ("Propositional Relations"), to develop a detailed procedure for outlining and diagramming a passage in terms of cause and effect and topical, temporal and spatial relationships.

Several less esoteric articles clearly do address the needs of the student vis-à-vis scholar, supplying simplified "state-of-research" surveys of various fields. Skilton describes "The New Testament Text Today," although he rejects modern skepticism concerning the recovery of the text of the autographs without really presenting or refuting the relevant arguments. Skilton's approach, however, naturally follows his adoption of the presuppositionalism of C. Van Til. Apologists of other schools of thought will be less convinced. Robert Newman compiles the appropriate texts for "Jesus' Self-Understanding According to the So-Called Q Material" and argues that the combination of titles and concepts that led to the belief in Christ's deity is present, even if at times only implicitly, already in this earliest gospel stratum. But Newman avoids most of the traditio-historical questions that must be addressed if one is to reconstruct the original Q from Matthew and Luke, to say nothing of moving the step further back to the historical Jesus. Paul Bremer offers sober "Reflections on 1 and 2 Corinthians," highlighting the differences between Corinth and Galatia (and Rome) that led to more emphasis on true wisdom in the former and on Christian freedom in the latter. Finally, Thomas Wilkinson reviews the problems of "The Man of Lawlessness in 2 Thessalonians," adopting a fairly typical nondispensational stance by rejecting a distinctive role for Israel in the eschatological denouement along with interpretations of the restrainer (*ho katechōn*) as the Holy Spirit or the Church.

All but one of the remaining essays contain unusual anomalies. Donald Penner introduces "The Computer: A New Tool for New Testament Studies," but his information is hopelessly out of date with no developments more recent than 1972 described. Jan Versteeg sets out to survey "Old Testament Citations in the Gospel According to Matthew" but spends half his time discussing one verse (Matt 2:23) and the other half on the meaning of "fulfillment" in the NT in general. John Werner "discusses" the "Discourse Analysis of



the Greek New Testament" by reproducing an outline of 2 Thessalonians by one of his students at the International Linguistic Center in Dallas. Daniel Howell and Julius Scott include a "Bibliography of Works of New Testament Theology" that is already seven years out of date. Milton Fisher spends less than two pages on "Ethiopic Studies and the New Testament" but stresses the importance of this field. Strangest of all Countess, in his revised *JETS* article, accuses Harold Ockenga of Arminianism based on his (only) single predestinarian views. More specifically Countess argues that the neuter *touto* in Eph 2:8 has as its antecedent the feminine *pisteōs*, so that "faith" in particular (not just the salvific act in general) becomes entirely a gift of God. To do this he produces three classical and six NT examples of such "incorrect" grammar. But all of the scriptural parallels are susceptible to other interpretations, and even if Countess is right in every instance he defies all logic by concluding that these exceptions prove that Eph 2:8 must be a similar exception.

The final article in Skilton's collection leaves the reader with a more positive impression. Douglas Vickers introduces the much misunderstood discipline of "Economics in Christian Theological Perspective" by carefully avoiding the pitfalls both of reconstructionism (à la Rushdoony and G. North) on the one hand and of a modified socialism (à la R. Sider) on the other. But this final essay does not obliterate the feelings generated by most of its predecessors: This volume should have been published several years ago or else substantially revised. As it stands, less than half of the collection merits any close attention.

Craig L. Blomberg

Palm Beach Atlantic College, West Palm Beach, FL

*Introduction to the New Testament. Vol. 1: History, Culture, and Religion of the Hellenistic Age; Vol. 2: History and Literature of Early Christianity.* By Helmut Koester. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982, 448 pp., \$24.95; 400 pp., \$22.95.

This is a translation and slight revision, by Koester himself, of his German *Einführung*, already extensively reviewed elsewhere. Far from being a standard "introduction" to the NT documents, complete with detailed technical discussion of the date, provenance, literary integrity and structure of each NT book, this pair of volumes aims rather at providing a comprehensive survey of early Christianity in its contemporary setting.

Accordingly the first volume, as the subtitle indicates, provides a sweeping panorama of the Hellenistic age, from just before Alexander the Great until the late second century C.E. It is divided into six sections: (1) historical survey; (2) society and economics; (3) education, language and literature; (4) philosophy and religion; (5) Judaism in the Hellenistic period; (6) the Roman empire as the heir of Hellenism. Yet this brief recital fails to do justice to the wide-ranging discussion. Each subsection contains succinct bibliographies of what Koester holds to be the best treatment of and/or primary sources to the topic or period involved. This background material is not integrated in a detailed way with the second volume, but one leitmotiv that connects the two volumes is Koester's conviction that Judaism of the Greco-Roman period was profoundly Hellenized, thus making Christianity itself, from its inception, an essentially Hellenistic movement. This largely accounts for the relatively slim discussion of distinctively Jewish heritage and literature.

The second volume carries on with (7) the sources for the history of early Christianity; (8) from John the Baptist to the early Church; (9) Paul; (10) Palestine and Syria; (11) Egypt; and (12) Asia Minor, Greece and Rome. It is immediately clear that, after Paul, Koester treats early Christianity geographically. Moreover he does not restrict himself to the twenty-seven canonical books but ranges through the other sixty or so extant documents or fragments of documents from the first 150 years or thereabouts of the Church's life. The resulting panoramic sweep represents Koester's comprehensive vision not so much of NT introduction (despite the title) as of the soil, setting and rise of early Christianity.

In one sense it is far too easy to criticize a book like this, precisely because it covers such a broad spectrum. No one can be a master of material with so wide a sweep, and Koester

should be praised, not criticized, for attempting a massive synthesis. The difficulty in assessing this book is not aided by the fact that Koester has chosen not to use footnotes to document his arguments and conclusions. The brief bibliographies at the beginning of each subsection must suffice. But that is where the first awful suspicions begin: The bibliographies are frequently painfully selective. It is almost beyond comprehension how the relation of the mystery religions to the Hellenistic world and to Christianity can be discussed without so much as mentioning the work of R. E. Brown; how the literary criticism of the Acts can include Cadbury, Bultmann, Haenchen and Schneider but fail even to mention Smith, Ramsay, Bruce, Gasque or Marshall; how discussion of form criticism can touch on none of the essays and books that have raised probing questions about the method (e.g. Güttgemanns, Stanton, Ellis); and on and on. In many critical areas this is the least evenhanded treatment I have ever read, and it is not entirely reassuring to be told that the author is here attempting the overarching synthesis and not the detailed technical work, for technical decisions have not only been made (that, after all, is unavoidable) but frequently without indicating to the student the viability of other options or the range of literature on the matters discussed or even the basis on which decisions were made.

Thus one wonders if Koester is a trifle too certain about such things as the historicity of Dionysiac homophagy, the reliability of Josephus, the pre-Christian rise of fully-formed gnosticism, or the monolithic status of the "divine man" figure in antiquity. In discussing the latter question, for instance, he does not even mention the penetrating and well-researched works of Tiede (his own student) and Holladay. Even though Koester insists that his work is not a technical introduction, his choices tell us more about where he is in his thinking than how he got there or even what the current state of play is. In this way Luke is dated about 125, Acts ten years later. The *Gospel of Thomas* is rather early, the product of Christian mystery associations. Canonical Acts, the *Acts of Peter* and the *Acts of Paul* were all written about the same time, and all made use of cycles of legends relating to Peter and Paul.

But the most astonishing feature of this two-volume work is the place accorded to Jesus. This work of almost 850 pages dealing with the rise of early Christianity manages to devote to Jesus Christ himself precisely thirteen pages. I was immediately reminded of the similar ratio in the *Theology of the New Testament* written by Rudolf Bultmann, Koester's mentor and the person to whom this work is dedicated. It is not only a very skeptical but a very old-fashioned Biblical criticism that takes such an approach today. Every hint of redaction is presumed to be historical fabrication, and trajectories of theological development are sketched in with an aplomb that can only be judged methodologically naive.

There is another deep-seated problem in this work that again reflects the thought of Bultmann. Koester sees himself not only as an historian committed to a principally anti-supernaturalistic historiography but as a Church theologian concerned with living issues of faith, with the "ought" as well as with the "that." But his self-perception as theologian should have told him that there is more to knowledge and moral choice than putatively "neutral" observations and synthesis of historical phenomena, or his self-perception as an essentially secular historian should have told him that his theological bias is unfounded. The tension is unresolved throughout the work, but it leaves the impression that either Koester's position is epistemologically bankrupt or else he actually believes that there is some theological canon that can be uncovered from the historical process itself—without telling us what it is. I would dearly love to know which of these alternative positions Koester occupies.

In short, this is an important work and a stimulating synthesis, a mine of useful information and a reasonably self-consistent model, but an erratic guide to early Christianity.

D. A. Carson



*Reasonable Belief: A Survey of the Christian Faith.* By A. T. Hanson and R. P. C. Hanson. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 1981, 283 pp., \$26.95.

Over the years the Hanson brothers, identical twins, have kept us well supplied with thought-provoking and sometimes ground-breaking books. Writing on the edge of their retirement from their respective posts (A. T. Hanson as professor of theology at Hull University, R. P. C. Hanson as professor of historical and contemporary theology at Manchester University), the two here collaborate for the first time and winsomely tell the reader that he will be "fortunate if he can read the book with the same ease and pleasure as the authors experienced in combining to write it."

This is not a book of systematic theology, even though its chapters cover many of the same points featured in the standard works on dogmatics—God, Christ, the Holy Spirit, the Holy Trinity, Christianity and history (subsections dealing *inter alia* with eschatology, Marxism, providence and predestination), and so forth. The book by the Hanson brothers covers these topics by examining them "historically"—i.e., by surveying what the Bible seems to say of them, how much of this can be believed or defended today in the light of our present knowledge, ways in which these topics have been handled here and there in the history of the Church, all culminating in what the Hanson brothers hold to be "reasonable belief." The book leaves aside the niceties of footnotes and aims for the mythical well-read layman.

The presentation is interesting, stimulating and well-written. Theologically it is very much in the tradition of Alan Richardson, to whom the book is dedicated. This means among other things that in general the authors avoid stooping to exegetical ingenuity to cover up their own inability to believe something the Bible teaches. Because the Bible is a witness to revelation, not revelation itself, they are not embarrassed to find the witness wanting at numerous points. They are always courteous to those who hold positions further left than their own, and some of their critique (e.g. of logical positivism or of depth psychology) is telling. Unfortunately they are frequently condescending to those who are further to the right than they are—e.g., "The ancient doctrine of the inspiration and inerrancy of the Bible," which, acknowledge the writers, was universally held by ancient Judaism and early Christianity, "is impossible for intelligent people today." Indeed it represents "the first step towards the ever-recurring sin of idolatry."

The eclecticism of the options selected from Church history is rather disconcerting, and the rapidity with which each is picked up, weighed, kept or rejected, though usually competent within the authors' limited space (though I have grave reservations about the accuracy of some sections—e.g., their comments on the philosophy of science), will not convince everyone who has probed these matters thoroughly. The Hansons' critique of Chalcedonian Christology, for instance, is so brief that it fails to weigh the counter-arguments that centuries of debate have forged. Chalcedon has its problems, and more work on Christology needs to be done. But I am not persuaded that it is weaker or less Biblically faithful than the Hanson brothers' synthesis of Baillie and Pittenger. And their Logos doctrine (Logos is God-in-revelation) paves the way to a painfully sub-Biblical Christology and an unconvincing treatment of the Trinity.

Nevertheless, the book deserves wide reading, especially by conservatives whose views need the goad of challenge and criticism. At the end of the day, however, I remain persuaded that the Hanson brothers' "reasonable belief" owes rather more than it should to a dated liberalism that stipulates in advance what it is prepared to believe. the "ever-recurring sin of idolatry" against which they rightly warn us may also rear its head in the form of a kind of culturally-enslaved intellectualism where the limits of creedal acceptance are determined rather more by certain academic tradition than by the constraints of the Biblical presentation of God's gracious self-disclosure.

D. A. Carson

*Learn To Read the Greek New Testament.* Ward Powers. Third edition; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans/Sydney: Anzea/Exeter: Paternoster, 1982, 336 pp., \$19.95.

It is sometimes said that almost every teacher of elementary Greek dreams of writing his or her own introductory textbook, and that is why there are so many of them around. This fresh entry is one of the better ones. Its slant is its attempt to teach Greek by relying on principles that arise out of modern linguistics and (so far as practicable) the habits of language acquisition we all used in learning to speak our mother tongue. The books that have adopted this approach so far have been guilty of spending too much time on linguistics and not enough on Greek. This one avoids that trap (though the appendices, designed to be used primarily at the intermediate level, are studded with a fair bit of linguistics terminology not learned by most former generations of students—e.g., “lexals,” “allomorphs” and “morph slots,” all carefully defined).

The Powers method (as the book rather self-consciously calls it) means that the author tries to bring the student to rapid understanding of a certain “framework” of Greek, using examples from the Greek NT, while avoiding undue emphasis on rote learning. The student then proceeds immediately to the next “framework.” Powers’ aim is to introduce the student to the entire “framework” of NT Greek as quickly as possible, and then to go back and flesh it out with systematic learning of paradigms and the like at the “intermediate” level (which in this book is sketched in as lessons that bring together the appendices, readings from the Greek NT, and the systematic study of Zerwick’s *Biblical Greek*).

The book is clearly printed and well laid out, but I confess that I still have some reservations. In my experience almost any method of teaching Greek—from rather classical methods to programmed instruction on a computer—works well provided the teacher is enthusiastic and competent, and each method seems to work better with some students than with others. Powers intends this book to be either a classroom text (he includes 24 pages of “Basic Principles for Teachers Using This Book”) or as a “teach yourself” book, and doubtless the latter accounts in part for the work’s persistent verbosity.

The fundamental questions of approach are difficult to assess. Powers himself recognizes that learning to read a dead language cannot be exactly like learning one’s mother tongue, but the obvious discontinuities between the two raise questions in my mind about the wisdom of Powers’ “framework” approach. He covers the entire “framework” in only nine lessons. But this means that lesson 2, for instance, has nine subsections as follows: The Greek Sentence; Forms for Noun, Pronoun and Adjective; The Article; Paradigms of the Article and Second Declension; Inflections of Adjectives and Pronouns; Prepositions; The Verb; Paradigm of the Present Indicative Active; Word Order. No teacher of Greek tries to teach all there is to know about, say, prepositions the first time around, but there is at least something to be said for going a shade more slowly and learning the material a little more thoroughly at each step, since the adult mind learning a dead language can integrate and grasp paradigms that an infant learning a live language must pick up over a much longer period of time by observation and repetition. Moreover the “intermediate” level includes a great deal of work normally learned at the elementary level. Zerwick’s text is of course competent, but it is in some respects an eclectic volume that cannot be compared, so far as comprehensiveness is concerned, with, say, Brooks and Winbery, much of whose “intermediate” material would be excluded by the Powers method.

Powers tells us that after comparing more traditional methods and his own approach in the crucible of the classroom he judges that the latter produces better results: better retention, understanding, enthusiasm and so forth. Of course that is not a scientific sample: The better results may spring in part from his own enthusiasm for his approach. My equally subjective assessment is that I have gained better results than I formerly did by reverting to even more archaic methods. Although I introduce some linguistics material as I go along and bring in examples from the Greek NT as soon as possible, I require not only an early and consistent amount of memory work (complete with class drills and chants) but also



Greek composition and extensive translation of English into Greek. Hard work of this sort does wonders not only for an understanding of the language but for retention. The chief difficulty of course is that it is not geared for a "teach yourself" setting (especially Greek composition).

This is not to depreciate Powers' fine volume. He has come as close as anyone to convincing me to tack in a different direction. In classroom work, however, the quality of the teacher is more determinative of results than the quality of the text. And as for private study, only time will tell if this work introduces more students to the thoughtful reading of the Greek NT than, say, Wenham's *Elements* or Machen's *New Testament Greek*.

D. A. Carson

*Gospel Perspectives III: Studies in Midrash and Historiography*. Edited by R. T. France and David Wenham. Sheffield: JSOT, 1983, 299 pp., £5.95.

This is the third volume of studies on the nature of history and tradition in the gospels carried out within the framework of the Tyndale House Gospels Research Project (cf. reviews of vols. 1 and 2 by E. J. Epp in *JBL* 99 [1980] 652; 102 [1983] 177). The present effort addresses the question of whether the Jesus movement and the ensuing gospel genre has significant parallels (as is often claimed) with Jewish or Hellenistic literary genres—i.e., how much relevance do Jewish "midrash" or "midrashic" techniques and historiography have for the narrative work of the evangelists?

Bruce Chilton, "Varieties and Tendencies of Midrash: Rabbinic Interpretation of Isaiah 24,23" (9-31), demonstrates the considerable variety of midrash on this text, along with the preservation of a basic eschatological understanding. Rabbinic interpretation tended to express not only some theological exposition of a given text but also a current message from God to the community. However, one can not jump from this background, e.g., to conclude that the transfiguration narrative is a "midrash" on Exodus 24. Rather an evangelist's allusion to OT texts is not properly midrash but perhaps a midrashic style of narration.

Richard Bauckham, "The *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* of Pseudo-Philo and the Gospels as 'Midrash'" (33-76), argues that Jewish exegesis in the NT period may have some relevance for an evangelist's redaction of written sources but that the use of the Jesus material involves more linkage of independent pericopae than creative building in the style of midrashic development. Similarly Bauckham is cautious about drawing analogies between the evangelists' narration of Jesus' teaching and the freedom exhibited by Pseudo-Philo with speech material. Recent memory of and interest in the historical Jesus as an authoritative figure would contravene the normal historiographical habits concerning inventing contexts and discourse for literary characters; cf. also the call for fresh considerations on this point by W. C. van Unnik, "Luke's Second Book and the Rules of Hellenistic Historiography," *Les Actes des Apôtres: Traditions, rédaction, théologie* (ed. J. Kremer; BETL 48; Louvain, 1979) 59.

With the use of only four footnotes, F. F. Bruce, "Biblical Exposition at Qumran" (77-98), masterfully argues that a point of resemblance exists between OT exegesis in Qumran texts and that found in the NT insofar as both read the OT in light of a new situation. The Qumranians and the primitive Church recognize an age of fulfillment. Eschatology at Qumran envisioned a prophet, a priest and a king; the NT writers saw these roles coinciding in Jesus. It is doubtful that the speculation concerning intermediary figures at Qumran, which was typical of a dynamic creative process in intertestamental Judaism, supports the view that the evangelists freely created the Jesus material or perceived Jesus as just another such figure. Rather the historical facts about Jesus motivated a sober yet Christologically distinctive approach to the OT.

Leon Morris, "The Gospels and Jewish Lectionaries" (129-156), raises a convincing

question mark against the theory that the evangelists attempted to produce edifying lectionaries, but one can not overlook the early roots of possible liturgical use of pre-gospel tradition by the Didachean community. Craig Blomberg, "Midrash, Chiasmus, and the Outline of Luke's Central Section" (217-259), posits that an unconfused Luke was not narrating a chronological/geographical snapshot in his central section but arranging Jesus' teaching to portray his consciousness concerning his destiny. D. S. Greenwood, "Poststructuralism and Biblical Studies: Frank Kermodes, *The Genesis of Secrecy*" (263-288), offers both a chastisement and a breath of fresh air for insular scholarship. Bravo!

In "Tradition and Old Testament in Matt 27:3-10" (157-175), Douglas Moo points to the fuzziness surrounding terms like "pesher" and "midrash" and challenges the appropriateness of applying this terminology to NT texts. Moo does allow, however, for midrash to convey a creative influence of the OT on expressing the Jesus tradition. But in particular he argues that any resemblance between Matt 27:3-10 (as a supposed midrash) and the variety of exegetical procedures in rabbinic literature is overshadowed by the important differences between rabbinic interpretations and the gospel genre.

Philip Payne, "Midrash and History in the Gospels with Special Reference to R. H. Gundry's *Matthew*" (177-216), submits a critique of Gundry's methodology wherein it is presupposed that the evangelist goes beyond editorial expression to piously embroider the tradition with numerous unhistorical elements (under the influence of midrashic technique). Payne's piece takes into account both personal correspondence with Gundry so as not to misrepresent his position and the earlier evaluation by D. A. Carson, "Gundry on Matthew: A Critical Review," *Trinity Journal* 3 (1982) 71-91. Payne is required reading for Matthean students. Gundry's midrashic understanding of Matthew's thought life does not support the historical origins of pre-Matthean tradition or the evangelist's redaction, neither can it in any way rescue Matthew from charges of historical error. Since Gundry's methodology is unaccompanied by sufficient counter-arguments or controls, it can not be assigned a high level of confidence as a literary theory with which to identify unhistorical midrash. In any case it is better to appraise Matthew's detectable redaction as in the category of exegetical expansion rather than unhistorical creation.

Coeditor R. T. France contributes "Jewish Historiography, Midrash, and the Gospels" (99-128) and a helpful "Postscript—where have we got to, and where do we go from here?" (289-299). With relevant citations from Jewish literature France once again confirms Sandmel's warning of "parallelomania" when crossing over into the gospel tradition with its distinctive sense of history. While "creative midrash" may exist and be detectable in the gospels (assuming, I take it, with confidence levels set by a scientific handling of the data), the existence of a midrashic procedure cannot be shown by adducing parallels from non-Christian Judaism. In summary, the gospels are not, in any proper sense of the word, midrashim. Neither the pre-gospel tradition or any work of the evangelists can be viewed as a commentary on an OT text or book. Unhistorical writing in the guise of history cannot be assumed to be a feature of the gospel genre. The origin of gospel traditions in recent history of living memory marks an important distinction from the setting of the "rewritten Bible" genre. Therefore the creation of Jesus material for narrative or community purposes cannot be taken for granted.

It may fairly be said that this third volume in the Gospel Research Project serves well to inform its readers (the reviewer included) in the specialty areas of Jewish historiography and midrash. The cumulative impression is that a more careful investigation of how ancient historiographical backgrounds and literary techniques relate to gospel writing is in order, bearing in mind the results achieved here. The present effort is significant for removing a considerable amount of scholarly fog that had begun to settle over the gospels.

Paul Elbert

London Bible College



*The Light Has Come. An Exposition of the Fourth Gospel.* By Lesslie Newbigin. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982, xiv + 281 pp., \$8.95 paper.

John's gospel is everybody's favorite—most of us read it and memorized parts of it from our earliest days as Christians. For one who wants a clear, simple and conservative explanation of the theological significance of this gospel, Bishop Newbigin has provided a very useful volume. The text of the *RSV* is printed section by section, followed by Newbigin's commentary. The book is not aimed at the scholar, the specialist, or one who wants to interact with the various interpretive options or the sources the author employed to arrive at his positions. Rather it is written with the layperson in view, and so the reader is spared the mechanics of sources and footnotes.

In an avowedly self-revealing preface, Newbigin, noted missiologist and associate general secretary of the World Council of Churches, sets forth the basic philosophy and purpose of the commentary. As for his working presuppositions he writes as "a Christian believer" who reads "the text of the Fourth Gospel as a witness to Jesus Christ, the presence of God in human history and therefore the source of truth and life" (p. viii). His purpose is to "help the reader to hear the original word spoken today to the mind and conscience of the 'modern' student" (p. xi). He confesses a great dependence on the standard critical commentaries and resources, and the volume amply bears this out. He devotes only two pages to the complex issue of authorship, concluding that the "beloved disciple" was probably the apostle John. The gospel, then, originates from a company of John's friends and disciples. One of these put the developing body of material into its present form.

Newbigin steers a fairly conservative course through the complex interpretive problems of this gospel. He seems to eschew attempts to harmonize the fourth gospel with the synoptics. For example, in reference to John 1:35-42 he says, "The historical details as given here are not compatible with those in the synoptics, and seem to rest on independent tradition" (p. 18). Yet he staunchly resists the critical approaches that see the supernatural or the claims of Jesus' deity as projections of later Church theology back onto the story of Jesus. He takes a typical approach to the issue of the displacement of the cleansing-of-the-temple pericope: John has moved the event out of its chronological order to sound the note of Jesus' challenge to institutional Judaism (pp. 29-30). Newbigin recognizes that John rearranges material throughout his gospel, a point that is difficult to contravene. He is sensitive to the concerns of redaction criticism, albeit very briefly. He attempts to draw out John's purposes for writing, and why and how John treats a particular incident in Jesus' life. In all this there is a refreshing simplicity that seeks to get at what John is really trying to say. The reader encounters "It is simpler to believe that it is so recorded because it so happened" (p. 263) at many junctures in the book.

Readers ought to be aware that Newbigin interprets John in strongly predestinarian terms, from God's specific choice of who will be believers (see e.g. pp. 132-133) to "we have to face the fact that this unbelief is perceived as the work of God himself. It is he who shuts the eyes and ears of the people" (p. 163). Newbigin unashamedly defends this stance both from John's text and in philosophical terms. Also readers will be delighted to find sprinkled throughout the volume many illuminating parallels and insights that come from Newbigin's long years in India.

Here is a book for personal devotional study or for a group Bible study. It is lucidly written, well-informed, articulately reasoned, and practical for modern Christians.

William W. Klein

Denver Conservative Baptist Seminary

*The Parables of Jesus.* By James Montgomery Boice. Chicago: Moody, 1983.

This collection of sermons has many keen applications and vivid illustrations. It is not scholarly, however, and very little is original insight. There is a fundamental failure to grapple in depth with the nature and function of parables and no analysis of principles for interpreting the parables or description of their historical setting in the life of Jesus.

Boice includes among Jesus' parables such borderline cases as the comments about a lamp put on a lampstand and the extended simile of the sheep and the goats. Yet he omits many with far more extensive narrative and plot. He writes that the first parables recorded in Matthew appear in chap. 13, overlooking the parables in 5:25-26; 7:24-27; 11:16-19; 12:43-45.

Boice's many fine comments regularly fail to convey an adequate sense of the coherence of the parable story or its message. Typically three, four or five main points are extracted from a parable. Yet many of these points seem extraneous to anything in the content of the parable itself or presuppose a Church setting not in existence at the time Jesus told the parable. Often due to lack of attention to the parable's content these points are phrased too generally or are simply speculative inferences. Insensitivity to irony and literary coherence combined with lack of consideration of the contrast between Jesus' vision of the kingdom of God and expectations of God's reign typical of his day contribute to Boice's improbable interpretation of the parables of the leaven and of the mustard seed "as teaching an abnormal and harmful bureaucratic expansion of the church" (pp. 25-26).

Parallel gospel accounts are rarely considered. For instance, p. 195 asserts that Jesus did not apply the parable of the wicked tenants with a statement such as "the owner of the vineyard will return and destroy those tenants." But what of Mark 12:9 and Luke 20:16? Similarly one wonders whether Boice is aware of the problems for the historical reliability of the synoptic gospels caused by his identification of Matt 22:1-14 and Luke 14:15-24 as the same parable.

Boice's personal preaching concerns and Calvinistic doctrine frequently intrude into his expositions. The majority of these sermons become fine salvation messages pressing home the necessity of belief in Jesus Christ. Often, however, the message is not firmly rooted in the parable, which functions rather like a springboard.

There is nearly complete absence of comments that illuminate the historical and cultural backgrounds of the parables and no interaction with contemporary research. The only work on the parables cited was published in 1900. It is unfortunate that Boice's preaching gift was not undergirded with more awareness of recent and substantial advances in our understanding of Jesus' parables.

Philip Barton Payne

Kyoto, Japan

*The Origin of Paul's Gospel.* By Seyoon Kim. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982, xii + 391 pp., n.p. paper.

This is the work of a Korean scholar trained at Manchester, England. It is a revision, but not an updating (p. vii), of his thesis submitted in 1977.

Kim reacts with recent interpreters who see the origin of Paul's gospel in thoughts of the ancient Mediterranean world rather than in the Damascus road experience. He speaks in opposition to the "impression that Paul's theology is a hotchpotch syncretism of various mosaic pieces derived from many diverse sources which are all very precariously pieced together to form a 'Jesus Christ' the Lord and the Son of God miles away from the historical Jesus" (p. 333). He well observes the unfair bias of radical scholars in evaluating exegetical skill in Pauline studies (p. 150), but perhaps in a few cases his language becomes excessively polemic in doing so (pp. 152, 154-156). Kim is extremely well-read in and has a very good grasp of continental and British thought about the Pauline corpus. He has interacted



thoroughly (but negatively) particularly with German scholarship, a remarkable feat for one of his background.

Martin Hengel in the "Foreword" makes much of Kim's third-world origin. At long last scholarly interpretation of the NT, he says, moves "beyond the too restrictive traditional bounds of the old European culture" (p. v). Yet Kim's methodology is thoroughly European, with the result that it is difficult to detect any third-world roots. In Asia the libraries do not include the type of literature with which Kim deals in this work (p. vii), so one is driven to the conclusion that this third-world scholar has become thoroughly "westernized" through his years of education in Europe.

On the book cover this work is compared by F. F. Bruce, Kim's mentor, to J. Gresham Machen's work with a similar title, *The Origin of Paul's Religion*, published in the earlier part of this century. Yet Kim in his treatment nowhere refers to Machen. This is typical of a preoccupation with continental and British scholarship and an ignoring of America—a tendency not limited to Kim, however, but one that generally characterizes much scholarship on the other side of the Atlantic.

Typical of the western methodology exhibited by Kim is his utilization of an approach, one that is widespread among NT scholars, of selecting a single interpretation in controversial passages and furnishing only a bare mention of other possible meanings, sometimes not even that. This sophisticated proof-text method of interpretation is illustrated in his inadequate discussion of Paul's use of the first person plural in 2 Cor 3:4-4:6 (p. 5), his questionable generalization regarding scholarly consensus about the "fourteen years" in Gal 2:1 (p. 63), his unsupported conclusion in translating the participle in Rom 1:4 by "installed" rather than "proven" (pp. 111, 132; but see p. 144 where the other meaning is given implicit approval in his discussion), and his very weakly supported identification of the Church as the true Israel (pp. 268, 317-318, 327-328).

While the evangelical appreciates Kim's revulsion against the conclusions of radical scholarship, one wonders how it can be plausible to trace so much revelation to one experience such as Paul's encounter with Christ on the Damascus road (pp. 98, 335). Kim concedes in his overview that only the germ of various teachings was revealed in the Damascus experience (p. 102), but in his detailed discussion he is inclined to trace more than just the main lines of Paul's theology to this origin. He seems to overreact against the radical extremes he is trying to combat (p. 149), being unwilling to allow for subsequent revelations to Paul. This forces him to refer Paul's every reference to revelation by God to his Damascus experience. With such a presupposition the handling of several passages becomes unnatural. Among these are 1 Cor 2:10 (pp. 78 ff.) and Rom 11:25-26 (pp. 82 ff.).

A welcome addition to the work would be a serious discussion of the chronology of Paul's life. Unanswered questions in this regard are substantial. He dates Paul's conversion during the years A.D. 32-34 (p. 105), though scattered comments elsewhere (p. 103) seem to necessitate the earlier part (A.D. 32). He complicates the picture by speaking of four or five years of pre-Pauline Christian history, presumably subsequent to the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ, events that can hardly be placed earlier than A.D. 30. Yet Kim does not notice the difficulty.

At a few points Kim lapses, probably unwittingly, into viewpoints that are questionable for an evangelical. For example, at one point he writes that "the Damascus Christophany was Paul's Easter" (p. 106). His intimation here that the resurrection of Christ is only a subjective perception smacks of such existentialism as is unacceptable for one with a high view of Scripture. In another place he makes an allowance for editorial activity by a NT writer in Acts 9:15 that raises questions as to his belief in the inerrancy of Scripture (p. 64).

A reader would expect in a work that ties so much of Paul's doctrine to his Damascus experience a thorough discussion of the Acts descriptions of that experience. Such a discussion is conspicuously absent, however,

Shortcomings notwithstanding, Kim is to be commended for a treatment that includes

so much of current scholarship related to Pauline studies. The array of material treated is vast. On the other hand, Bruce's ranking this work alongside that of a seasoned scholar such as Machen is probably unwarranted.

Robert L. Thomas

Talbot Theological Seminary, La Mirada, CA

*The Justification of God: An Exegetical and Theological Study of Romans 9:1-23.* By John Piper. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1983, 316 pp., \$8.95.

The difficult exegetical terrain of Romans 9 has been a favorite battleground for theological polemicists. This is not to say that the battle has been fought well or carefully, for proof-texting, superficial generalization, and a priori judgments have been all too common. There has been a need for a careful and detailed treatment of the text. I believe that John Piper has supplied this need.

The book focuses on the question of God's justice that is raised in 9:14: "There is no unrighteousness with God, is there?" Piper devotes two chapters to an examination of the preceding verses in an effort to find precisely what it was that raised the problem of theodicy for Paul and his readers. In vv. 1-5 Paul is seen to confront the problem that the divinely privileged people of the old covenant remained largely in unbelief. This does not mean, however, that "the word of God has fallen" (v. 6a), for God's elective purpose never intended that all Israelites should be saved, as the examples of Isaac/Ishmael and Jacob/Esau demonstrate (vv. 6b-13). Piper is concerned to refute two commonly-advanced interpretations of these opening verses. He argues (1) that the blessings spoken of in vv. 4-5 are redemptive and eschatological, not merely theocratic and historical; and (2) that God's unconditional election focuses on individuals, not merely on groups (Israel or the Church).

If God's elective purpose is individual and salvific as is argued here, then the question of the justice of God raised in v. 14 is understandable and even expected. Contrary to many commentators who maintain that Paul simply affirms God's righteousness in vv. 15-18 but provides no real argument in defense of God's action, Piper holds that Paul reasons with his objectors. God is indeed righteous in all that he does, but Paul uses this term in a different sense from his objectors. It is not for Paul an ideal norm of a *justitia distributiva*; it is rather God's "unswerving commitment always to act for the glory of his name—a name which according to Ex 33:19 implies a propensity to show mercy and a freedom from all human distinctives in determining its distribution" (p. 78). Therefore if God chooses to save and bless some with an eternal inheritance, he is righteous to do so because thereby his glory (i.e., his name) is revealed. But also if God chooses to reject others and display his power and his wrath in them he remains the righteous God, for in this too he proclaims his glory (his name). A chapter devoted to OT materials argues for a similar understanding of the righteousness of God as a background to Paul's thought. For this absolute freedom and sovereignty of God in exercising both mercy and wrath (double predestination) Piper finds support in extended discussion of the hardening of Pharaoh (20 pp.) and the metaphor of the potter and the vessels (25 pp.).

The result is a monograph whose conclusions, as the author admits, are not novel from an historical viewpoint. This is Calvinism with a strong supralapsarian flavor. I found it very satisfying—but then I am a Calvinist. Yet even for non-Calvinists Piper's work is too carefully reasoned and stays too close to the text to be ignored. All future treatments of election and predestination will need to deal with the book.

David G. Dunbar

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL



*Galatians*. By Charles B. Cousar. Atlanta: John Knox, 1982, 158 pp., \$13.95.

This is the second volume published in a new series entitled *Interpretation: A Bible Commentary For Teaching and Preaching*. James Mays is the series editor, Patrick Miller serves as OT editor and Paul Achtemeier acts as NT editor. According to the series preface the aim is to provide a commentary "which presents the integrated result of historical and theological work with the biblical text." Based on the *RSV*, the series is aimed at those who teach, preach and study the Bible.

Since the format of the series is expository, one cannot look for an extensive introduction or a detailed verse-by-verse commentary. Cousar has devoted eleven pages to introductory matters. He adopts a North Galatia destination with caution, feels that Paul's opponents were Jewish Christians with no official support from Jerusalem, and dates Galatians A.D. 53-55.

The commentary proper is concerned primarily with developing Paul's argument in Galatians. Therefore the text is treated a section at a time. After discussing at some length what he understands Paul's line of thought to be, Cousar isolates a few exegetical problems in each section, summarizes various solutions to them, and then states his own. A contemporary application usually follows.

The contemporary application sections reveal Cousar's favorite theologians: Karl Barth and Jacques Ellul. Although Cousar's applications are sometimes idiosyncratic, they do contain good material for reflection and preaching. A case in point is his discussion of love and freedom in chaps. 5 and 6 of Galatians. A sample comment is found on p. 108: "Freedom comes not in human choices but in a divine choice, in God's election of his people in Christ and their response in faith and obedience."

The annotated bibliography on pp. 157-158 and the occasional citations within the text indicate that the author has read widely and is well-acquainted with the exegetical literature on Galatians. He informs the reader in the preface that the commentary by Dieter Betz in the Fortress Press *Hermeneia* series appeared too late to be given serious consideration in the commentary itself.

The most difficult question to answer about the commentary is its usefulness. In the reviewer's opinion, someone who had never studied Galatians in detail might read this commentary through first to become acquainted with Paul's argument in the letter. Or one who has studied Galatians thoroughly might read it for further insights and material for reflection. Since this is not an exegetical, verse-by-verse commentary it should not be compared with or used instead of the works by Betz, Bligh, Bruce and Burton. (It may be that one cannot write an exegetical commentary on Galatians unless his name begins with B!)

Cousar is professor of NT language, literature and exegesis at Columbia Theological Seminary in Decatur, Georgia.

Carl B. Hoch, Jr.

Grand Rapids Baptist Seminary

*Philippians*. By Gerald F. Hawthorne. Word Biblical Commentary vol. 43; Waco: Word, 1983, lii + 232 pp., \$18.95.

If an early offering of the Word Biblical Commentary series is any indication, Hawthorne's *Philippians* is prophetic of good things to come. With this series the editors hope to serve "the fledgling student, the working minister [and] . . . colleagues in the guild of professional scholars and teachers," a tall order by anyone's standard. But after "four years with Philippians" the professor of Greek at Wheaton College has come close to realizing this aim.

With such a broad readership in mind, one might expect the author's approach to favor one end of the spectrum or the other. And the technicality of the commentary suggests that this has been the case. Attention to bibliography throughout is thorough, bringing the

scholarly discussion on almost any point of the epistle up to date. Interaction with this literature is evident from the numerous notes located, unfortunately, within the text, marked off deceptively with parentheses, brackets, etc. Happily, especially for the untrained, Greek words are generally accompanied by their translations, but unquestionably at least a basic understanding of Greek grammar is a help (if not prerequisite) for appreciating Hawthorne's detailed exegesis.

It is chiefly the task of the specially designed format to reach the various levels of readership. Within the commentary proper each section of the epistle is treated under six headings: (1) "Bibliography"; (2) "Translation"; (3) "Notes" offer brief explanation of text-critical matters and decisions; (4) "Form/Structure/Setting" introduces the passage from the standpoint of its literary characteristics and context; (5) "Comment" gives detailed exegesis; and (6) "Explanation" summarizes the salient points of (4) and (5) briefly and simply. The benefits of this layout are evident. Nearly every need of the scholar is met in a systematic study of (1) through (5). The untrained, who would perhaps be uninterested in (1), (3) and (4), would profit from using (6) as an introduction to (5). In the reviewer's judgment (5) would be eminently more readable and manageable for uninitiated and scholar alike if footnotes, instead of parenthetical notes in the text, had been employed (in striving to give the text an "uncritical" look, the process of sorting information has actually been complicated). Finally the author deserves commendation for his artful use of (4) and (6) to pull together the thematic threads before and after his exegesis of each passage, thus enabling the message of the letter to speak coherently with renewed clarity and force.

Hawthorne handles introductory matters ably and thoroughly, demonstrating his awareness of the state of scholarship at most points and defending his decisions cogently. Philippians was written by Paul and, despite numerous arguments to the contrary, consists of a single letter. Many will read with interest his reasoned, if not wholly convincing, defense of the epistle's "Caesarean" provenance. He correctly rejects suggestions that Paul faced more than one set of opponents in Philippi, but his identification of them as "Jewish missionaries" is doubtful. The view that they were Judaizing Christians (e.g. Lightfoot) has not been improved on. Additionally the author argues strongly that the background for Paul's thought was strictly Jewish (p. 1). In doing so he does not overlook the work of Martin Hengel among others, but seems, since he opposes Hengel, to misunderstand his thesis, for while Hawthorne correctly rejects extravagant attempts to appeal to the mystery religions or overmuch to the philosophers to explain Pauline thought, at points in the commentary (pp. 2, 27, 45, 68-69, 186-189, 198-199, 200) he clearly confirms Paul's indebtedness to his Hellenistic environment, which parallels closely what Hengel demonstrated in the case of Palestinian Judaism. A balance should have been struck here.

The commentary itself offers meticulous exegesis, and some original insights are contributed to the interpretation of the epistle. At nearly every point fresh linguistic data and grammatical analysis are combined to shed new light on the text. Only two highlights of Hawthorne's exegesis can be mentioned, both related to the Christ-hymn (2:6-11): (1) He argues, on the strength of verbal parallels and parallels in thought and progression, that the hymn may be the product of Paul's or some other Christian's meditation on the event referred to in John 13:3-17 (p. 78). (2) His interpretation of the hymn itself is brilliant; he solves the difficult problem posed by vv. 6-7 by showing (a) that v. 6 contrasts "God-likeness" with "acquisitiveness" (*RSV*: "a thing to be grasped") but equates it with "pouring himself out" (*kenōsis*) (v. 7), and (b) that "poured out" is a poetic way of saying "taking the servant-form"—in actuality Jesus' *kenōsis* was an "adding to" rather than a "subtracting from," for he lost nothing but through the incarnation took on the added dimension of servanthood.

The first point gets high marks for originality but stops short of convincing. Even granting a basic similarity in the humility motif, the verbal and conceptual parallels are insufficient to register anything more than possibility. Nevertheless Hawthorne's search for sources has shown that one need look no farther than the gospel traditions for the



material that stimulated the writing of this hymn.

On the whole Hawthorne's work is insightful, steady and thorough, and the few criticisms lodged by this reviewer do not detract from his contribution. The expositor will find his careful explication of Paul's thought a valuable aid. Certainly no serious student of Paul can overlook this work on Philippians. It will be extremely useful for many years to come. (At the price, however, the publisher might have used a better grade of materials and stronger binding for so significant a work/series; the binding on this reviewer's copy is already broken.)

Philip H. Towner

Aberdeen, Scotland

*1 and 2 Thessalonians*. By I. Howard Marshall. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983, 240 pp., \$6.95 paper.

I. Howard Marshall's recent work is a welcome addition. Its style and scholarship continue the tradition of excellence we have come to expect from the author. It is up-to-date, summarily exhaustive, sensible in its approach, blunt in its critical confrontation but always polite, clear, and beautifully precise. It is in the New Century Bible Commentary series and therefore incorporates the RSV text into the commentary.

In the preface Marshall acknowledges his debt to E. Best's work in the Black series from whom he has "generally been unwilling to differ." But he gives five reasons justifying yet another commentary on 1 and 2 Thessalonians: to deal with continuing problems of exegesis; to write a work briefer than that of Best; to concentrate on research since Best (1972) and therefore be "able to dispense with detailed discussion of earlier investigations"; to deal especially with the question of pseudonymity in 2 Thessalonians; and to bring out the "abiding message and significance" of these two letters.

On these five emphases Marshall is admirably successful. He is relatively brief in his discussions, but never to the point of incompleteness with regard to the needs of normal exegesis. His bibliographical references to the essential works are quite satisfying. When dealing with critical issues that are basically agreed on or are relatively minute, he states his position and refers the reader to where the arguments are found.

The Introduction provides an excellent update on the critical issues affecting study of these two epistles. For the new student it will serve as a good entrance to the issues. He shows that most theories of interpolations in 1 Thessalonians are to a large extent based on "irregularities" that are seen when the epistle is placed into a critically preconceived literary structure. But Marshall constantly refuses to force 1 Thessalonians into any particular structure, and therefore the basis for theories of interpolations dissolves.

In dealing with the authorship of 2 Thessalonians, Marshall argues that the similarity in structure and subject matter with 1 Thessalonians is accounted for by the fact that the same author was writing to the same church concerning the same topics within a relatively brief period of time. He claims that "it is surely time that the myth of the cold tone of the letter was exploded" (p. 34). It is a fitting "tone" for addressing the Church as a whole, and we must allow for some variation in Paul's tone. And the eschatological discussions in the two epistles are not contradictory but complementary. Just as in the gospels we find "the same juxtaposition of the suddenness and unpredictability of the End and of the prophecy of premonitory signs" (p. 37) side by side, so the two messages in these two epistles could have been written by the same author. Marshall of course has many more detailed arguments.

The discussions of the eschatological passages are quite good. 1 Thessalonians answers two problems raised probably by an overemphasis in the church on the imminence of the parousia: Those who have died will still be included in the parousia, and although the Lord's coming will be sudden, those who are living proper lives as "sons of the light and sons of the day" (5:5) will be prepared and worthy to meet the Lord. But the eschatological excitement

continued to mount in the Thessalonian church so that some claimed that the day of the Lord was now present and that very soon they would meet the Lord. Paul answers in his second epistle that although the process culminating in the parousia had already begun (2:7) the actual coming of the Lord was to be preceded by "a general increase in godliness within the world at large" (which would affect the world's attitude toward the church), and during this time a man will appear who will oppose God and will usurp "the place of God in the world" (pp. 191-192). The Lord will allow the day of the Lord to come only after the gospel has been proclaimed to the nations.

Throughout the commentary Marshall endeavors to make Paul's instructions applicable to the present reader's life. For example, he repeatedly makes the point that eschatological discussions are not to provide historical minutiae about exactly when the Lord will return. Rather it is the demand to be ethically and spiritually prepared for his coming that is basic to Paul's eschatological mindset. And it is this emphasis that we should feel today.

We welcome yet another excellent work from the pen of I. Howard Marshall.

W. D. Mounce