

BOOK REVIEWS

Dictionary of Biblical Imagery. Edited by Leland Ryken, James C. Wilhoit, and Tremper Longman III. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1998, xxi + 1058, \$39.99.

Initially one finds some irony in the fact that an inherently left-brained genre—the dictionary—was chosen to promote a right-brained approach to the Bible, the very approach consciously taken by this new and highly touted reference work from InterVarsity (henceforth *DBI*). The book contains a number of attractive features, but it retains significant weaknesses that may threaten its longevity as “an indispensable reference tool” (in the words of the preface). More on these shortly.

According to the editors, the purview of the *DBI* is “the imagery, metaphors and archetypes of the Bible,” terms for which the introduction gives extensive definitions. There is a wide spectrum of topics, including each book of the Bible, most major Biblical characters, many topics that one would find in standard Bible dictionaries (e.g. heaven, sacrifice), as well as a number with a literary flavor (e.g. plot motifs, travel stories). Happily, most of the articles possess an appropriate and readable length. Irksomely, all of them are unsigned (a list of contributors resides at the front), since the editors, we discover in the preface, had to revise “the vast majority” of them and leave their own mark upon many of the entries, sometimes at the expense of the original author’s.

The book’s attractive features start with its title. The rising interest on the part of Biblical scholars in things literary combined with the current appeal of Bible dictionaries could hardly have made InterVarsity’s timing with this volume any better. Three other items are sure to catch the attention of someone casually leafing through the book: (1) the well-written introduction with its discussion and differentiation of images, symbols, metaphors, similes, motifs, literary conventions and archetypes—definitely worth reading; (2) the handful of intriguing topics scattered throughout the dictionary, such as cheat the oracle, eavesdropper, gigantesque motif, mythical animals, quest, taunt and weather; and (3) the extensive Scripture and subject indexes craved by those with paper and sermon deadlines.

But these features are peripheral to the book’s core—namely, the content of the approximately 850 articles, the quality of which varies remarkably. It will be helpful at this point to separate those topics that might be considered standard fare for Bible dictionaries from those related to literary ideas. For the standard topics, despite all claims to the contrary, a sizable number of the articles contain little more than what one can find in a general Bible dictionary. Most of the “Angel” article, for example, simply traces certain activities of angels throughout Scripture and offers nothing to show that it belongs in the *DBI*. An article like “David,” however, succeeds by structuring itself according to literary categories (character types, to be specific) and thereby maintains a sharp focus on the book’s intended purpose. There are, to be sure, a few gems scattered throughout, but the *DBI* has too many “Angels” and not enough “Davids.” One could argue that many of the articles on standard topics contain at least one paragraph devoted to talk of imagery, but this is a mere tip of the hat to the book’s theme and only reinforces the point that the article’s basic content is lackluster.

The article on literary topics are generally better, though they contain occasional problems. One has to do with the very word “imagery.” The definition offered in the

introduction allows an image to be “any word that names a concrete thing (such as tree or house) or action (such as running or threshing)” (p. xiii). At times, though, one wonders if all of the contributors were aware of this definition. “Legal Images,” for example, focuses entirely on legal symbolism (mostly in the NT), and symbolism, as the introduction makes clear, is only one aspect of an image and not even a necessary one at that. The article spends most of its time describing the intricacies of Roman law in an effort to explain certain NT metaphors. It gives short shrift to both OT images and symbolism and completely blunders in its description of ancient Israelite and Babylonian laws on adoption.

We can be glad, however, for the article’s use of comparative material from the Greco-Roman world. The *DBI* has a paucity of such comparable material on the whole. States editor Ryken: “Beforehand I expected that our articles would uncover a wealth of ancient associations of images and motifs, but much less of this emerged than I expected” (*Academic Alert*, Autumn 1998, p. 2), and the book is poorer for it. There is little doubt that including more ancient Near Eastern comparative material would have greatly enhanced certain articles. For example, “Assembly, Human” makes no reference to the Mesopotamian “assembly” that pervades Akkadian literature and legal texts. A brief but insightful explanation concerning it would have highlighted how ancient peoples viewed the role of the “assembly” in society. Ancient Near Eastern parallels would have also been helpful in discussions concerning the extended household and the father who controlled it. Mesopotamians, Egyptians, Hittites and others utilized this institution in a variety of contexts to represent other hierarchies such as the nation-state.

The editors claim that the target audience of the *DBI* is laypeople, and despite InterVarsity’s eagerness to market it to scholars (recall the numerous stacks of it at ETS and SBL in Orlando), the editors are right. Weaknesses aside, the *DBI* provides fresh (at least for most church-goers I know) categories for thinking about the stories and characters in the Bible and sensitizes readers to the Bible’s evocative language. It certainly has the potential to help readers deal with and profit from the literary aspects of the Biblical text. If a church-related small group decides to study, say, the book of Esther, there might not be a better place to start than “Esther, Book of” in the *DBI*. But it is doubtful if the work will stand the test as an important scholarly resource. For those who fall somewhere in between the pew and the ivory tower (e.g., seminary students and pastors), the usefulness of the *DBI* will vary by individual. Just be careful not to let the book’s early press clippings induce a hasty purchase.

Bruce Wells

Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD

The Oxford Encyclopedia of Archaeology in the Near East. Edited by Eric M. Meyers, et al. 5 vols. New York: Oxford University, 1997, xviii + 492 pp., vi + 488 pp., vi + 489 pp., vi + 536 pp., vi + 553 pp., \$595.00.

A monumental scholarly achievement, *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Archaeology in the Near East* (*OEANE*) has provided researchers for the first time a comprehensive up-to-date presentation of archaeological research from the broad spectrum of regions across ancient Near East. A board of 26 editors, working under the auspices of the American Schools of Oriental Research (ASOR), assisted editor-in-chief Meyers in gathering and synthesizing material from some 559 contributors from more than 20 countries. Volume 5 contains three appendixes, including (1) “Egyptian Aramaic Texts” (18 pp.), (2) “Chronologies” (6 pp.) and (3) “Maps” (13 pp.). Concluding the volume are

several indexes, including "Directory of Contributors" (20 pp.), "Synoptic Outline of Contents" (9 pp.) and "Index" (92 pp.). Each entry is concluded by a moderately extensive bibliography, providing the researcher with ready access to related literature.

The work complements three other recent multi-volume publications, the *Anchor Bible Dictionary* (ABD) (1992), the *New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land* (NEAEHL) (1993), and *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East* (CANE) (1995). Unlike the NEAEHL, which focuses on excavated sites and regions in Israel, Jordan, and Palestine, the OEANE covers archaeological research in regions defined today by the Arabian peninsula, Egypt and North Africa, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Palestine, Syria and Turkey, as well as the Mediterranean and Aegean Seas. The various types of articles address not only excavated and surveyed sites and regions, but also noted archaeologists (e.g. "William Foxwell Albright"), ancient Near Eastern peoples (e.g. "Hittites"), aspects of archaeological methods (e.g. "Locus"), contributing scientific disciplines (e.g. "Neutron Activation Analysis" and "Paleozoology"), special finds (e.g. "Siloam Tunnel Inscription"), the history of archaeological research (e.g. "Palestine Oriental Society") and sociological analyses (e.g. "Pastoral Nomadism").

Photographs and diagrams are kept to a minimum and are always black and white, including the maps in Appendix III (contrast the color photo plates interspersed throughout the NEAEHL). Yet, the OEANE contains an extensive article on "Photography" (17 pp.), relating to fieldwork, artifacts and manuscripts. Other kinds of methodological articles include "Balk," "Resistivity," "Building Materials and Techniques." Articles on "Roads" are included in the OEANE and ABD (2¼ and 6 pp. respectively) but not in NEAEHL.

On a site-by-site comparison with the NEAEHL with respect to sites in Israel, the OEANE articles tend to be shorter and less detailed. Several examples serve to demonstrate this point. The OEANE article on "Hazor" is 4½ pages long, with one diagram and two artifact photos, as compared to 22 pages and more than a dozen photos and diagrams in NEAEHL. The NEAEHL article on Bab edh-Dhrà is 6½ pages versus 2½ pages in OEANE. The articles on Khirbet Qumran compare similarly, at 4 pages in OEANE and 7 in NEAEHL. Yet, on the other hand, the NEAEHL does not contain articles on sites such as ʿAmuq, Byblos, Qurayyah or Tell Leilan, much less Babylon, Ur or the Uratu, since these are out of the regional purview of that set. Other random comparisons of article length yield the following results (OEANE / NEAEHL): "Tel Anafa" (1/3½), "Judah/Judea" (4½/2), "Judean Desert Caves" (1/21), "Monasteries" (6/7), "Petra" (4½/12½), "Timna" (in Negev) 1½/12, cf. 4 in ABD), and "Zero" (¾/2). Some articles are listed differently, such as material found under the headings "Amman," "Amman Airport Temple," "Ammon" and "Ammonite Inscriptions" in OEANE (combined 9½ pp.) being found under the single title "Rabbat-Ammon" in NEAEHL (9½ pp.).

Choice of authors for individual submissions is important in producing a quality single- or multi-volume encyclopedia or dictionary. For major articles OEANE, as did the NEAEHL, has done very well in choosing knowledgeable authors in the field of study, many of whom have directed excavations at the given site. For example, the lengthy article on "Petra" in OEANE is divided into two sections, "History of Excavation" authored by P. C. Hammond and "Recent Finds" by M. S. Joukowsky. Hammond worked at the site and wrote numerous articles (six listed in bibliography) on Petra finds in the 1960s and 1970s. Joukowsky currently is directing the Brown University excavations in the sacred precinct that contains the great temple and Byzantine church. "Hazor" was written by the current excavation director, A. Ben-Tor.

Two articles related to the Dead Sea Scrolls provide insight into authorial choices by the editors. The OEANE "Qumran" article was written by R. Donceel, who has questioned many of the interpretations of findings of excavation director R. de Vaux, describing the site as a Roman villa rather than a monastic community. Donceel rightly

questioned some of the details of Qumran chronology, such as the suggested abandonment of the site during the reign of Herod the Great, but his calling de Vaux's "scriptorium" an "upstairs dining room" and characterizing Period Ib as an era of "wealth" beg the evidence at the site. Other interpretations of the archaeological finds have been duly challenged by a variety of archaeologists, including H. Eshel and J. Magness (see the recent "The Enigma of Qumran: Four Archaeologists Assess the Site," *BAR* 24/1 [1998] 24–37, 78). The "Dead Sea Scrolls" article was written by M. Wise, another challenger to the traditional interpretation of the site. Without reservation Wise offers the suggestion of P. Donceel-Voute that the "scriptorium" construction "points instead to a triclinium" (a Roman dining hall; vol. 2, p. 119). The author does provide an excellent though brief overview of the major classes of documents found in the Qumran caves, noting the relative importance of some documents for discerning the identity of the Qumran sect and the relationship between the scrolls and Khirbet Qumran.

The article on "Lachish" is authored by David Ussishkin, who directed excavations at the site during the 1970s and 1980s. Ussishkin provides an excellent summary of finds from the various strata discerned in the earlier excavations of O. Tufnell and Y. Aharoni and refined by his own work. The interpretation of Level IV evidences his preference (or bias) for ascribing a 9th-century BC date to strata previously designated as 10th century. Regarding the mention of Lachish in Rehoboam's reign, Ussishkin states: "Lachish is cited in 2 Chronicles 11:5–12, 23 as one of the cities fortified by Rehoboam, but the list may refer to construction works by a later Judean king" (vol. 3, p. 319). This parallels his interpretation of the Megiddo "Solomonic gate" as dating to the subsequent century (cf. Ahroni, Finkelstein, et al.; see vol. 3, p. 467 in the "Megiddo" article, also penned by Ussishkin). In one of the widely debated subjects of the current "biblical archaeology" scene, the characteristics, and in some cases even the very existence, of the Davidic-Solomonic United Monarchy has been challenged by biblical and archaeological interpreters who hold only minimal confidence in the biblical text and its chronology. A separate article on the "Lachish Inscriptions" by D. Pardee, a renowned NW Semitic scholar, summarizes not only the well-known Lachish Letters dating to the fall of Judah to Nebuchadnezzar, but also the variety of lesser-known ostraca.

The subject heading of "Palestine" is divided into historical eras, each written by someone active in the particular period of research: (1) "Prehistoric Palestine" by O. Bar-Yosef, (2) "Palestine in the Bronze Age" by A. Joffe, (3) "Palestine in the Iron Age" by A. Mazar, (4) "Palestine in the Persian through Roman Periods" by D. Graf, (5) "Palestine in the Byzantine Period" by D. Groh and (6) "Palestine in the Islamic Period" by M. Rosen-Ayalon. Joffe prefers the designation "EBIV" for the transitional period between the Early and Middle Bronze periods ca. 2300–2000 BC and does not mention the use of "Intermediate Bronze Age" used by many Syro-Palestinian archaeologists. In the tradition of what one might call the "new Biblical archaeology" in which Biblical studies and archaeology of the ancient Near East are interactive and mutually informative, Mazar summarizes the findings of the Iron I period as follows: "the archaeological data are source materials for studying the origins of Israel presented in the biblical texts and in the single mention of 'Israel' in Merneptah's victory stela (c. 1207 BCE)" (vol. 4, p. 219). In contrast to the aforementioned view of D. Ussishkin regarding the 10th-century material, Mazar ascribes destruction of sites such as Qasile X and Megiddo VIA to the Davidic conquests.

"Biblical Archaeology" was authored by W. G. Dever, the often controversial figure who once favored the full separation of Biblical and archaeological studies, but who now finds himself defending a revised form of Biblical archaeology over against the minimalist school of T. L. Thompson and N. P. Lemche. Dever's summary of the status of the dialogue is as follows: "The crucial issue for biblical archaeology is properly conceived as a dialogue to achieve the proper relationship between its understanding and

use of archaeology on the one hand, and its understanding of the issues in Biblical studies that are fitting for archaeological illumination on the other" (vol. 1, p. 319). Unfortunately, as H. Shanks has noted in his recent review of the *OEANE* (BAR 24/1 [1998] 70, 72), Dever has little to say regarding archaeology and the NT, despite the manifold contributions of the last three decades of research in early Roman sites ranging from Jerusalem to Sepphoris and to Caesarea Philippi. Indeed nearly 9½ pages at the end of vol. 4 are judiciously devoted to the excavations of Sepphoris, written by dig director E. Meyers and his wife C. L. Meyers.

Other gaps in coverage of NT sites are evident in the *OEANE*. Only "Antioch on Orontes" has an article devoted to its research, a significant lacuna considering the number of Hellenistic and early Roman sites known by the name Antioch. There are 2½ pages given to "Pergamon" but none to Perge, and nearly 2 pages for "Atlit Ram" but none to the site ᵀAtlit where it was found. An extensive list of similar sites could be given.

Overall the *OEANE* provides an excellent foundation for additional research into many areas of archaeology in the ancient Near East. Its breadth of subject matter and depth of scholarship make it indispensable for both novice scholars pursuing a future in the field of archaeology as seasoned veterans in the field and classroom. The editors' choices for authors evidence the devotion to high-quality scholarship from the international archaeological community. And though any such encyclopedia must be revised every 10 to 15 years in order to maintain up-to-date information in an ever burgeoning field, the *OEANE* has set a high standard for future comparison.

R. Dennis Cole

New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, New Orleans, LA

Life in the Ancient Near East, 3100–332 B.C.E. By Daniel C. Snell. New Haven: Yale University, 1997. 292 pp., \$30.00.

Writing history of any kind requires an informed imagination. This is exactly what Snell exhibits in his efforts to provide his readers with a social and economic view of life in the ancient Near East. Inserted in the factual essays that comprise his chapters are a number of written vignettes depicting the personal experiences of ancient individuals, as Snell imagines them. The names are authentic; the depictions are embellishments on records inscribed on cuneiform tablets he has studied.

Snell's education and experiences authenticate his creative touch. He is professor of history at the University of Oklahoma and has authored *Ledgers and Prices: Early Mesopotamian Merchant Accounts* and is a coauthor of *Economic Texts from Sumer*, both published by Yale University. He has contributed to a wide range of publications on Mesopotamian research since 1977. The book under review is his effort to provide a useful and needed synthesis of a vast body of scholarly productivity accumulated over the last two centuries and written with the upper-level college student in mind. When one considers the great span of time (ca. 5500–332 BCE) and territory (modern Iran, Iraq, Turkey, Syria, Lebanon, Israel and Egypt) covered, writing such a work is a formidable challenge.

The basis for a book of this nature is ancient texts. Interestingly, Mesopotamian texts provide the main components for this history and its focus because they provide the richest sources on economic and social matters. Other texts, including the Bible, play lesser but significant roles in the formulation of the story. Snell has organized his work in seven chapters, along with an introduction and epilogue. Each chapter deals with these topics: real people, population distribution, social groups, family, women,

work, land and agriculture, animal management, crafts, trade, money and prices, the government and the economy, Egypt, Israel and the rest of the world. The seven chapters cover (1) "The Origins of Cities," (2) "The Rise of Empires," (3) "Disunity and Reform," (4) "Retrenchment and Empire," (5) "Assyrian Domination," (6) "Babylon and a Persian World" and (7) "Trends and Implications." An appendix on theories of ancient economies and societies as well as notes, a 40-page bibliography and an index complete the book.

I found *Life in the Ancient Near East* rewarding to read. Snell writes clearly and interestingly, and he has packed the 158 pages of actual text with facts and insights that will inform college and seminary students and stimulate their professors who use it as a text. It can quite easily be incorporated into a semester or quarter of study, and having an overall perspective of the economic and social patterns in the ancient Near East will enrich students' awareness of everyday life in Biblical times for the common people, rather than simply focusing on politics and the elite, as so many historians do.

Keith N. Schoville
University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI

Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament. By Ernest Jenni and Claus Westermann. Translated by Mark E. Biddle. 3 vols. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1997, lii + 1638, \$119.95.

This work is a translation of the two-volume *Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament*, which was originally published in the 1970s. The English translation claims to be a faithful reflection of the original German work with a few modifications. These changes include updating the bibliography to encompass new editions and English translations, the translation of all quotes into English even when an English-language edition is not available, and the inclusion of a Scripture index.

The goal of the current work is "to make this an easily accessible and valuable resource for students of any level" (p. ix). It envisions the readers and users of the lexicon as "primarily theologians and pastors with a minimal knowledge of Hebrew and OT studies" (p. xiv). For this reason, all Hebrew words have been transliterated except for the entry heading.

This is not an exhaustive lexicon. The editors have chosen "a significant portion of OT vocabulary" to be included (p. xiii). It is expected to be used alongside existing lexicons.

The heading of each entry contains corresponding page locations to *Strong's Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible*, *Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon* (BDB), the English edition of Koehler and Baumgartner's *Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* (HALOT), Eerdmans' *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* (TDOT), Moody's *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament* (TWOT), and the recently published *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology & Exegesis* (NIDOTTE).

The entries are broken down into the following major sections: (1) "Root and Derivation," (2) "Statistics," (3) "Meaning and History of Meaning," (4) "Theological Usage," (5) "Postbiblical Usage."

One of the interesting features of this lexicon is the statistical section. These statistics are based on the earlier *BHK*, rather than the current Hebrew Bible, the *BHS*. Both of these Bibles are based on the Leningrad manuscript, however, so the statistics will be beneficial to current scholars.

In the second section of each entry there is a listing or chart indicating the number of times this word is used in each Biblical book. Thus, in the second section of the

word אֱלֹהִים, a chart shows the number of times both אֱלֹהִים and the divine name אֱלֹהִים are used in the various books. At a glance one can readily see that Ezekiel used the divine name 222 of the 439 times this word is used in the OT.

There are also various statistical appendixes in vol. 3. One I found interesting in Table 5, which lists the distribution of *hapax legomena* in the OT.

The *TLOT* is comparable to the *NIDOTTE* and *TDOT*. One of the main differences between the *NIDOTTE* and the *TDOT* is the evangelical theological stance of the *NIDOTTE* compared to the more liberal stance of the *TLOT*. While the basic facts remain the same regardless of one's theological stance, the conclusions the authors draw from this data need to be evaluated.

One example of a faulty conclusion is found in the article on אֱלֹהִים. Section III.4. discusses the patriarchal traditions of אֱלֹהִים and assumes that the expressions "God of Abraham," "God of Isaac" and "God of Jacob" originally represented the individual gods of the fathers and were eventually equated with Yahweh. While the patriarchs may not have formulated a comprehensive theology of Yahweh, there is no reason to assume they did not believe they worshipped the same God.

The *TLOT* is theologically similar to the *TDOT*, but is more concise in its presentation. Obviously, the difference arises in that the *TLOT* is a three-volume set while the *TDOT* is currently eight volumes with more to be produced.

The strengths of the *TLOT* include the fact that it is very user-friendly, especially for those unfamiliar with Hebrew characters. Also, the page references to the other English reference works save time and may also encourage one to examine another source for its input.

The limitations of the *TLOT* include the fact that not every OT word is addressed in these volumes. As mentioned above, the *TLOT* did not endeavor to be exhaustive. Also, the theological slant of the articles presupposes a liberal viewpoint. Thus, from an evangelical standpoint, some of the authors' conclusions need to be revised.

In conclusion, the *TLOT* is a valuable reference tool for studying the meaning of Hebrew words. Its presentation of information is concise and easy to understand, which is beneficial to new and experienced scholars alike.

Gale B. Struthers
Oak Hills Christian College, Bemidji, MN

A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew and Some Other Syntactical Questions by S. R. Driver. Introduction by W. R. Garr. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998, lxxxvi + 306 pp., n.p.

This volume is a reprint of Driver's 3d edition of *Hebrew Tenses* (1892). This reprint is part of Eerdmans' "Biblical Resource Series" edited by A. B. Beck and D. N. Freedman. This is not a revision of Driver's work; it is simply a reprint.

Hebrew Tenses is one of the milestones of English studies of Biblical Hebrew. It established Driver as one of the foremost Hebrew scholars of the world and was perhaps the first "modern" and "scientific" (Driver's terms) attempt to resolve specifically the thorny problem of the usage and syntax of the Hebrew verb system. Lacking the analytical tools of today (especially computers), Driver catalogued and analyzed thousands of examples of how the various forms of the Hebrew verb system were actually used in the text. We may rightly regard it as a classic.

This is not to say, however, that Driver's solution to the problem of Hebrew syntax is essentially correct or that this book is appropriate for recommending to modern students of Hebrew. To be sure, all scholars of Biblical Hebrew need to know this work.

But taking into account the fact that most seminary students will possess only a very small library dedicated Hebrew grammar, this is not the work I would suggest that they buy first (Hebrew grammar books tend to be extremely expensive, and for most students selecting a few essential books is a necessity). For the average student, more recent general studies such as Waltke and O'Connor or Muraoka's translation and revision of Joüon are likely to be far more useful. For those interested in pursuing more technical and specialized studies of Hebrew syntax, recent works by scholars such as Niccacci, McFall, Longacre or Andersen are probably better.

One is tempted to say that the best thing about this reprint is Garr's superb introduction (pp. xviii–lxxxvi). Such a review would not in any way disparage the quality of Driver's work *in its day*; it would simply recognize that the study of Hebrew grammar and syntax has progressed a great deal in the last 100 years and that many of his conclusions are now untenable. Driver lacked the research tools and the terminology that are available to researchers now.

Garr, in the course of making a (sympathetic) review of Driver's work, gives the reader a good assessment of the present state of the inquiry into the difficulties of the Hebrew verbs. For example, in regard to the "perfect tense" (now often called the *qatal* form) Garr succinctly demonstrates that it does not really describe "completed action." Rather, as Garr states, it "presents its situation as a single complete undifferentiated whole" (p. xlii). That is, it is perfective in aspect. Furthermore, Garr points out that Driver was incorrect in describing the imperfect (or *yiqtol*) as "nascent" and in regarding it as basic and prototypical. Driver tended to ignore comparative Semitics and compare Hebrew usage to ancient Greek; even in his day, on the basis of Arabic patterns, it was clear that the jussive was basic and the imperfect was modified. Garr argues that in contrast to the perfect the imperfect views an action from an internal viewpoint as an unfolding series (pp. xlv–li).

Driver's understanding of the imperfect consecutive (or *wayyiqtol*) also had some significant shortcomings. To begin with, Driver mistakenly thought that the imperfect consecutive was derived from the **yaqtulu* or imperfect tense. It actually is derived from the **yaqtul* form (thus the morphological similarity between the *wayyiqtol* and the jussive). Also, in contrast to Driver's analysis, Garr observes that the accent shift often observed in the *wayyiqtol* is not due simply to a "heavy prefix" but occurs when a form has a closed heavy ultima, an open heavy penult and a closed antepenult. Also, the word must not be in pause. Thus, we often see לְאִשָּׁרָא with accent on the penult. Most importantly, as Garr states, the "imperfect consecutive" is neither imperfect nor consecutive (pp. lxxv–lxxiii). We should not be too harsh on Driver for failing to resolve the problems connected to this form; it continues to tax the scholarship and ingenuity of Hebraists. Garr also points out some problems with Driver's understanding of the "perfect consecutive" (pp. lxxiii–lxxxiv).

There is one aspect of Driver's study, however, that merits mention. The very lack of technical vocabulary and comparative Semitic studies that is apparent in *Hebrew Tenses* is ironically one of its strengths for the student. Modern studies of Biblical Hebrew have become so specialized and so laden with technical jargon that they are fairly impenetrable to all but the most dedicated of students. The very thing Driver set out to do, to produce a handbook-sized, accessible survey of the syntax and usage of Hebrew verbs, remains a desideratum today. It would be wonderful to have something *like* Driver for the second-year Hebrew student.

Duane A. Garrett
Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, South Hamilton, MA

Semitic Languages: Outline of a Comparative Grammar. By Edward Lipiński. *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* 80. Leuven: Peeters, 1997, 754 pp., 3600 BEF.

Old Testament scholars with a curiosity for the origins and nature of the Hebrew and Aramaic languages will welcome this recent addition to the *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* series. The author, a renowned Semitist, draws on his remarkable breadth and depth of knowledge to answer many of their questions through a comparative study of the Semitic languages. Readers who are familiar with comparable studies (e.g., S. Moscati's *An Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages* [1980]) will be amazed at the detail with which Lipiński pursues his task.

The study proper follows a traditional structure, being divided into the following segments: I. Semitic Languages (pp. 23–94); II. Phonology (pp. 95–200); III. Morphology (pp. 201–480); IV. Syntax (pp. 481–536); V. Lexicon (pp. 543–574). Nonspecialists in the field of linguistics and/or Semitics will welcome an extremely helpful glossary of selected linguistic terms (pp. 575–592), a classified bibliography of studies of Semitic languages in general and the specific languages investigated in this volume (pp. 593–638), and a 70-page index first of subjects, then of words and forms, organized alphabetically by language.

The scope of the study is signaled by the opening chapter in which Lipiński places the Semitic languages in the broad class of Afro-Asiatic languages, alongside Egyptian, Cushitic, Libyco-Berber and Chadic. While many readers of this Journal will find little interest in these languages, it is important for the reader of this volume to wade through the opening chapters because of the frequency with which the author appeals to these other languages to explain a Semitic feature. Lipiński subdivides the Semitic languages into four groups: North Semitic, to which belong the written languages of the third and second millennia BC (Paleosyrian [represented by Ebla], Amorite, Ugaritic); East Semitic (Old Akkadian, Assyro-Babylonian, Late Babylonian); West Semitic, which includes the Canaanite (Old Canaanite represented by the Amarna correspondence, Hebrew, Phoenician, Moabite, etc.), Aramaic, and Arabic languages and dialects; and South Semitic (South Arabian and Ethiopic). In his comparative analysis the author moves back and forth from one language to another with remarkable ease. In fact, many readers who are interested primarily in the Biblical languages will be frustrated by the treatment of Hebrew and Biblical Aramaic like any other Semitic language. But Lipiński should not be faulted for this. This is a study by a Semitist for Semitists and specialists in any of the other languages who are curious about how their chosen linguistic fields fit into the larger pattern.

Despite the "outline" format and the breadth of its treatment, in this volume Hebrew scholars will find clarification of countless specific issues related to the history and nature of this particular language. Among these I found Lipiński's treatment of the traditional triconsonantal explanation of Semitic verbal forms particularly helpful. He argues convincingly that many so-called "weak verbs" (e.g. I-*nun*, II-*y/w*) derive from originally biconsonantal roots (pp. 436–443).

Given the breadth of Lipiński's agenda and the wealth of information contained in this work, any limitations we dare to cite probably reflect more on the reviewer than the work reviewed. But I should not hide the fact that when I opened this volume I hoped to find answers to a wide range of questions raised by specific features of the Hebrew language. For example, I had hoped for a full explanation of the nature and origin of the Hebrew form, *hištaḥ^awâ*, "to bow down, to prostrate oneself," from the root *ḥwh* (cf. *HALOT*, p. 296). But I was disappointed to find the word mentioned only in passing, first in the context of a discussion of the causative Š-stem (p. 388), and second under an analysis of the reflexive Št-stem (p. 400). However, in neither instance did the author account for the full prefix, including the *hē* (viz. *hišta-*), and nowhere does he

contemplate the Hishtaphel as a verb stem. For a second example, I had anticipated a full discussion of verbless/nominal clauses in other Semitic languages but was disappointed to find only three pages devoted to this subject (pp. 484–487). Specifically problematic is the author's comment that "the word order can be inverted and the predicate placed in front of the sentence" to express emphasis (p. 485). In the light of other recent studies, especially the recognition of the distinctions between clauses of classification and identification (at least in Hebrew) this statement could be more nuanced. In addition to substantive issues like these, some will be distracted by infelicities in the literary style of Lipiński's work (e.g. the common American use of the transitive "to lay down" for the intransitive "to lie down" [p. 435]). However, for one whose native language is not English, the author writes with remarkable precision, and any expression of frustration may be deemed trivial and unappreciative.

As one ploughs through page after page of technical analysis, one realizes that on any given issue Lipiński is just scratching the surface, hence the modest subtitle, *Outline of a Comparative Grammar*. With academicians being forced to specialize in ever-narrower fields, a work that surveys the landscape is welcome. At the same time, one is left wondering what a full-blown comparative grammar would look like. Biblical scholars would be particularly well-served if a scholar of Lipiński's stature and expertise would devote an entire volume to the study of Hebrew within its Semitic linguistic environment. In the meantime the thoroughness of Lipiński's work and the clarity of his presentation commend this volume as the basic introduction to comparative Semitic grammar, a status it should enjoy for decades to come.

Daniel I. Block

The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, KY

Archaeology and Biblical Interpretation. Edited by John R. Bartlett. London: Routledge, 1997, xv + 176 pp., \$18.95 paper.

The seven essays in this small publication can be read quite independently of one another. Their common core is that most originated in colloquia held in 1994 and 1995 in Dublin, and are published "to show that ancient writings and modern archaeology can illuminate each other, but only when used with professional care."

In the opening chapter Bartlett deals with the long-simmering debate over the relationship of archaeology to the Bible. Although he sees the Bible as an anthology begun about the eighth century BC, Bartlett does find fault with some current critical use of the data. Still, it is not surprising that he is most troubled by what he sees as "simplistic" and "misleading" understandings of the Bible and archaeology by conservatives. Within that mindset, Bartlett calls for a critical use of both archaeology and the Bible.

The next chapter covers familiar ground for anyone who has kept current with William Dever's writings. Dever finds the archaeological evidence does not support a 13th-century conquest; therefore the "historicised myth" is wrong. As he interprets the data, it also rejects "peaceful infiltration" and "peasant revolt" theories, and points to a "proto-Israel" emerging in the late 13th century from "motley," largely Canaanite origins. Dever's attempt to explain why Israel would invent their origin stories is freighted with speculation and concludes with such rhetoric as: "We are what we believe we are, just as ancient Israel was" (p. 48).

In chap. 3 A. D. H. Mayes sees the Biblical account of Israel's religious origins as distorted by experiences of destruction and exile. He argues for a strong Canaanite heritage in Israelite religion that, until the time of Elijah and Elisha, accepted the

worship of a plurality of gods. His interpretation of the controversial eighth century Kuntilet ʿAjrud Hebrew inscriptions and painted scenes is that they represent a stage in Israel's absorption of other gods and religious practices to the exclusive worship of Yahweh in the exilic period.

The remaining chapters will be less troubling to the conservative reader. In chap. 4 Bartlett focuses on "The Archaeology of Qumran" and provides a nice summary of the scroll discoveries and the architectural development of Kh. Qumran. He touches on several debated points (e.g. Was there a break in the occupation? Was there a scriptorium?) without strongly committing himself to any one position. He believes the scrolls and the Khirbet are connected, but cautiously qualifies his preference that Qumran was an Essene settlement.

Brian Lalor's chapter on "The Temple Mount of Herod the Great at Jerusalem" interests itself only with its southern area. He finds that excavation reveals Josephus as highly reliable in his description and justified in his use of hyperbole. Sketches complement the article and help the reader appreciate the "technical sophistication" and "superb craftsmanship" involved. Labor concludes that the Temple Mount "deserves to be better appreciated as among the most spectacular building projects of antiquity."

In "Archaeology and the Historical Jesus," Sean V. Freyne calls for a "dialogue between literary, historical and archaeological approaches to the understanding of the rise and identity of early Christianity." Freyne brings archaeological finds to bear on the view that Galilee was largely non-Jewish or at least open to every Greco-Roman cultural influence. To the contrary, he finds enough evidence of cultural and religious links with Jerusalem and its Temple to question the position of those who would picture Cynic influences on Jesus and his audience.

Claudine Dauphin's concluding chapter first surveys the emergence of Jerusalem as the focus of Christianity, and the growth of a pilgrimage infrastructure. She then turns to her excavations at Dor, one of the gateways into Palestine, where a huge Byzantine church complex has been found. Well illustrated, this chapter is a model of the way a site report and historical summary can be blended into an informative whole.

Alfred J. Hoerth
Wheaton College, Wheaton, IL

Ancient Egypt and the Old Testament. By John D. Currid. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1997, 269 pp., n.p.

Currid's work is the latest study on OT connections with ancient Egypt. Using both primary source material (Biblical and Egyptological) and the most recent scholarly articles and monographs, Currid defends the existence of contacts between Egypt and the Hebrew people. His stated goal is to demonstrate that there is indeed Egyptian material in the OT, thus opposing those Biblical scholars who claim that there is little or none and therefore neglect Egypt. Currid has assembled a great deal of otherwise scattered material from sources not normally consulted by Biblical scholars and has added new insights and connections not observed in most standard works on the subject.

The book is organized into five parts. The first, basically introductory, has a chapter on Near Eastern cosmologies showing their similarities to and differences from the Biblical creation account. In part two, Currid discusses Egyptian elements in the Pentateuch. He surprisingly does not place a great emphasis on the Joseph story,

touching only on the person of Potiphar, about whom he concludes we know very little. In the other chapters Currid treats the Biblical creation account in light of Egyptian mythology, serpent motifs in the Pentateuch and Egypt, the ten plagues, and the route of the Exodus. He concludes that the plagues were indeed an attack on Egyptian religion and that the route used by the Hebrews in leaving Egypt is accurate for New Kingdom times. Part three deals with the period of the Hebrew monarchy. In light of recent archaeological discoveries, Currid defends the existence of David and Solomon, but argues that we cannot know for certain which Pharaoh gave his daughter in marriage to Solomon. He further states that there was considerable Egyptian influence on the court and administration of the united monarchy. In an excellent final chapter in his third part, Currid presents a detailed account of what is known of Shishak's invasion of Israel, complete with an excursus on the toponyms of Sheshonq I's Bubastite Portal inscription. Currid's commentary is well done and up to date. In part four, Currid treats the alleged dependence of Proverbs 22–24 on the Wisdom Text of Amenemope, denying any direct copying and stating that similarities between the two works are vague and general. In part five, Currid treats differences and similarities between Egyptian and Hebrew prophecy. Of greatest interest is the chapter on dream interpretation. He clearly demonstrates the parallels between Egyptian dream texts and the dream sequence in the Joseph story.

Although Currid does not engage in the debate over the exodus or deal at length with the Joseph story, his exploration of new areas, his careful use of evidence and his defense of the historicity of Scripture make his book an important contribution.

Charles F. Aling
Northwestern College, St. Paul, MN

Cities of the Biblical World. By LaMoine F. DeVries. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1997, xviii + 398 pp., \$34.95.

The book is intended for the beginning Bible student. It is divided into two parts: "Cities of the OT World" and "Cities of the NT World." Each part is divided into units devoted to specific areas of the ancient Near East. Each unit begins with a regional map and a general overview of that area. Short chapters on selected cities of the region follow in alphabetical order. For example, seven cities, from Ashur to Ur are dealt with in Unit 1, "Cities of Mesopotamia." Not surprisingly, the unit on Palestine has the largest number of chapters: fourteen.

Each city chapter looks at the geographical setting and does not belabor the reader concerning the site's excavation history. The historical development of the site over the centuries is interwoven with Biblical history when available. Here the beginning student would have been aided if the Chart of Historical Periods (p. 387) had included the numerous names of rulers and periods mentioned in the text. In the case of sites not mentioned in the Bible, e.g. Nuzi or Sepphoris, the importance of that site to the Bible is summarized.

Each chapter provides a word picture of the known major features at that site. Slightly more than half the chapters contain some black-and-white illustration, but few of them really contribute to the text description. Unfortunately the majority have not reproduced well. Most captions are too cryptic, and those on pp. 165, 199, 225, 255 and 310 are incorrect.

The text itself is clearly written, and DeVries makes note of debated interpretations. Generally he does not take sides. The beginning student will gain a basic under-

standing of major sites of the ancient Near East that are of Biblical importance, and the bibliography following each chapter can greatly aid the student who seeks more depth. The reference nature of the volume results in some repetition of information, most notably in the four sites that appear in both OT and NT parts. Professors who found the earlier works by Vos (*Archaeology in Bible Lands*, 1977) and Schoville (*Biblical Archaeology in Focus*, 1978) of use to their students will want to consider this book. Students who could be satisfied with briefer studies, and information on many more sites, would probably prefer to use the *Baker Encyclopedia of Bible Places* (1995), which contains lavish full-color photographs and dozens of maps and site plans.

Alfred J. Hoerth
Wheaton College, Wheaton, IL

The IVP Bible Background Commentary: Genesis–Deuteronomy. By John H. Walton and Victor H. Matthews. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1997, 284 pp., \$19.99.

Every written work is inescapably connected to the cultural world of its author and audience. An author may attempt to hide this influence, as in the case of science fiction set in the 23rd century; nevertheless, tell-tale traces of the author's time lie hidden within such a book. Biblical writers were quite straightforward in their attempts to communicate with their readers, yet we modern readers are so far removed from their cultural world that we often struggle to understand ideas and expressions in the Bible that doubtless were easily understood by contemporaries of the Biblical writers. The only way we can gain understanding of what seem to be Biblical enigmas is by recovering that ancient cultural world. Most readers have neither the time nor the expertise to do this on their own, unless they devote themselves to scholarly research on the ancient Near East, poring over archaeological information, studying ancient texts, etc. Walton and Matthews have in this commentary done the research and therein made it available to readers of the Bible, opening up new vistas of understanding. (This volume is the first in a series that will ultimately cover the OT, similar to *IVP Bible Background Commentary: New Testament*.) Recognizing that the life and experiences of the patriarchs and Israelites were not lived in a vacuum but were a part of the larger world of the ancient Near East, our authors have rightly drawn illustrative materials from the larger world of the Fertile Crescent.

The format for each of the five books of the Pentateuch dealt with in the commentary includes a brief introduction that also explains how the illustrative materials from the wider ancient Near Eastern culture differs from Biblical culture because the Lord reveals himself and his will for his people in the latter. Following the introduction, the authors take us through the book, drawing attention and providing illuminating comments to selected passages; they do not comment on each and every verse. Nor are all problems solved. For example, the troublesome numbers of Israelites departing Egypt (six hundred thousand men plus women and children!) are dealt with forthrightly. The authors point out the difficulties of understanding the numbers literally, when, for example, the modern population of the eastern delta area is under 20,000. Further, the number of Israelite men would vastly outnumber the largest army known in antiquity: 37,000 Hittites at the battle of Qadesh. Other problematic implications are raised, as the length of the line of such a huge number of Israelites traveling in the desert, a line stretching from the crossing of the sea to Mount Sinai. So, although no solution is offered, the nature of the problem is presented and the suggestion is made that the

numbers likely should not be understood as they traditionally have been. It might have been helpful had the authors also brought in the use of large numbers elsewhere in the Biblical world, as with the impossibly long rule of monarchs in the Sumerian King List.

A helpful feature of the commentary is the sidebars that provide basic information on a number of matters. These include "Ancient Near Eastern Mythology and the Old Testament," "Ancient Near Eastern Flood Accounts," "The Religion of Abraham," "Major Trade Routes in the Ancient Near East," "The Date of the Exodus" and "The Covenant and Ancient Near Eastern Treaties." Particularly helpful to readers also is the glossary, because the comments frequently refer to names, places and things from the ancient Near East that do not occur in the Bible or in normal conversational English. This feature helps broaden the knowledge and understanding of the reader who is unfamiliar with terminology that is well known to most readers of *JETS*. Several tables and maps at the end of the book help the reader to grasp the scope of resources upon which the authors have drawn: "Major Tablets of Old Testament Significance," "Major Inscriptions of Old Testament Significance," "Legal Texts of the Ancient Near East" and "Ancient Near Eastern Literature Containing Parallels to the Old Testament." The maps, particularly of Abraham's travels and also that of archaeological sites of Palestine (Middle Bronze Age), appear to be reproductions from some other publication(s). They should have been redrawn and printed in larger format for ease of reference, and because the commentary covers the Late Bronze Age as well as the Middle Bronze Age, a map showing archaeological sites for the two periods is warranted. The IVP editorial staff should have seen to these details.

This commentary was written by two very competent, knowledgeable scholars, a fact reflected in the quality of the comments. No doubt other scholars will get a new perspective or learn something that they were unaware of if they consult this book, but it was not written with the scholarly community in mind. As the fly-leaf notes, "Pastors, teachers, Sunday-school teachers, college and seminary students, and everyday readers of the Bible" are the target audience. It certainly will serve that audience well.

Keith N. Schoville
University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI

Abraham in the Negev: A Source-Critical Investigation of Genesis 20:1–22:19. By T. Desmond Alexander. Carlisle: Paternoster, 1997, ix + 172 pp., \$14.99 paper.

By his publication of *Abraham in the Negev*, Alexander adds to his corpus of source-critical studies in the Abraham cycle, begun with his Ph.D. dissertation (Queens University, Belfast, 1982) and since followed by articles on portions of the Abraham narratives (e.g. sister-wife "doublets," Hagar-Ishmael "doublets"). In his dissertation Alexander argued that Genesis 12–25 were in effect the labor of one author (the Yahwist). His recent analysis of Genesis 20–22, material traditionally assigned to the Elohist (E) source, contributes to the ever-shrinking presence of E in the eyes of recent source critics. Alexander's view joins revisionist trends in Pentateuchal source-critical studies, which have rejected the traditional thesis of once-independent, parallel documents (Wellhausen) and alternatively have proposed an expanded role for the Yahwist (J).

Alexander finds that Genesis 20–22 functions as the necessary conclusion to a coherent, unified plot underlying 11:26–22:19. This original "heir plot" traced the story of promise and birth of a son to Abraham and Sarah. Genesis 20–22 is not viewed by Alexander as merely a late addition necessary to round out the story but is inte-

grally a part of the narrative dénouement of the promises (12:2–3) that is anticipated in Genesis 12, 16 and 17 and possesses many parallels with earlier parts of the cycle. There is no compelling reason to assign Genesis 20–22 to a source other than that of the earlier Abraham narratives, which are best assigned to J. Even the traditionally assigned P(riestly) sections—such as the covenant of circumcision (chapter 17)—are best taken as coming from the J author. Alexander repeats his earlier contention that the whole of the Abraham corpus is the work of J, excepting possibly the Lot episodes but even they show affinities with J. This Yahwistic source, however, cannot be like that of the traditional J source (Welhausen); rather, Alexander calls for a new understanding of this J author. He finds the common criteria for source identification, including divine names and distinctive vocabulary, untrustworthy for the task. The integrated literary and theological character of the Abraham cycle makes it improbable that modern scholars can satisfactorily reconstruct the source history of the narrative on internal grounds alone.

How did Alexander come to such sweeping conclusions? His method is a detailed analysis of Genesis 20–22 that is a typical example of the operating principles of source criticism. He shows that the three sister-wife accounts (12:10–13:1; 20:1–18; 26:1–4) were shaped by the literary process of composition and incorporation into the larger Abraham corpus. Genesis 20 and 26 presuppose Genesis 12 and avoid unnecessary duplication of details, indicating that the three were originally different literary compositions (not oral variants). As for the Hagar-Ishmael “doublets” (16:1–16; 21:1–21), Genesis 21 presupposes the birth of Ishmael (chap. 16) and brings to conclusion the narrative tension produced by Ishmael’s birth.

Alexander’s explanations will not be readily accepted by traditional source critics, but his work is a strong entry in the topsy-turvy field of source reconstruction and it presents welcomed corrections and refinements. His attention to the synchronic dimension of the Abraham corpus, especially plot development, contributes to the growing evidence of a unified literary work for Genesis 12–25.

Some conservative readers will be disappointed that Alexander, after arguing for a single author/editor of the Abraham corpus, does not relate his conclusion to the question of Pentateuchal authorship at large. Also, when Alexander sets Genesis 20–22 in the context of a putative “heir plot,” he does not deal effectively with the Lot episodes, suggesting only that the Lot stories show some signs of independence but are so well integrated that they too may be originally a part of the plot. More perplexing for the reader, however, is the account of Isaac’s birth in Genesis 21, which is identified as the fulfillment of the promise but is omitted in the palistropic display of the original plot (11:26–22:24) (p. 105). Also, although Alexander argues correctly that Genesis 12 and 22 form an inclusio for the Abraham story, he contends that the divine oath in 22:16–18 is the ratification of a conditional covenant of circumcision (17:1), which has its fulfillment in the obedience of Abraham at Moriah (pp. 83–88). While we can agree that Genesis 17 is also originally part of the Abraham narrative, the divine oath at Moriah is better taken as a reflex of 12:2–3 (so Wenham, *Genesis 16–50*, p. 103). It would seem simpler to take the exhortation to “walk blamelessly” with God (17:1) as a call to life-long piety, having its first demonstration in the circumcision of his household.

Alexander’s volume is instructive concerning source-critical method, its history and practice. I recommend it enthusiastically as collateral reading for Biblical criticism in the seminary classroom.

Kenneth A. Mathews
Beeson Divinity School, Birmingham, AL

The Urim and Thummim: A Means of Revelation in Ancient Israel. By Cornelis Van Dam. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1997, 296 pp., \$34.50.

“Urim” and “Thummim” (UT) are the Hebrew names for the object or objects used by the OT high priest to determine God’s will for the Israelites. Their actual identity has puzzled scholars for centuries. They are not described. Their method of use is not explained. The etymology of the terms is at best uncertain. Even their mention in the OT is somewhat haphazard. Still, scholarly consensus has concluded that they are some form of “lot oracle” and for that reason, no detailed study of the UT has appeared since 1824. Van Dam asserts, however, that the lot theory does not satisfy all of the evidence and undertakes a new exhaustive examination of the issue.

Van Dam begins with a study of the history of interpretation. He performs a topical overview, which surveys the various interpretations from the time of Philo to date and evaluates the different theories.

From this, Van Dam turns to the ancient Near East to explore possible analogues. First he explores lot oracles and notes that the use of lot oracles in the ancient Near East seems to be less common than supposed, and that there is no real analogy to the UT. The same is true with *teraphim*, which he covers very briefly as associated with the UT. He then examines in more detail analogies that have been proposed by region: Mesopotamia, Hatti, Ugarit, Egypt, Arabia and even China. While he notes items of dress in these cultures that may be compared to the *ephod* of the priest (which held the UT), he does not find any comparable method of revelation. With this foundation, he begins to repudiate the lot-oracle concept.

After a chapter on the history of translation, Van Dam arrives at the heart of his work, the biblical usages. He surveys the UT within the context of divine revelation in general and notes that God used a variety of methods to provide revelation to Israel, and encouraged the people to inquire of him for guidance. This was tempered with a stringent prohibition against divination of any type, specifically including *teraphim* and apparently lot oracles. Van Dam argues that the UT could not be lot oracles since on several of the occasions we find it used, the answers recorded exceed the possible yes/no responses of the lots.

Drawing upon the traditional translation of “light(s) and perfection(s)” evidenced in ancient Jewish tradition and the LXX, as well as the role performed by the high priest who was entrusted with the use of the UT, Van Dam concludes that the UT was used to validate a prophetic statement from the high priest as true revelation from God. He argues that the UT was some type of stone that would illuminate (with “true” or “perfect” light) when removed from the *ephod* to verify the divine source of a declaration (p. 224).

So, what happened to the UT? Here, Van Dam is more tentative. He concludes that the UT were not used after David, probably because of priestly unfaithfulness, although he also sees a role for increasing *written* revelation that supplanted the need for immediate revelation. Tied in with priestly unfaithfulness, he also notes a parallel increase in the prophetic office.

Although many questions are left unanswered, overall, this is an excellent survey of a very important, although obscure, facet of OT worship. Van Dam has provided a very thorough and readable compilation of the material available on the subject. His conclusions, although not completely new, are thought-provoking as they tie together the spiritual and physical realms.

Michael A. Harbin
Taylor University, Upland, IN

The Pilgrimage Pattern in Exodus. By Mark S. Smith, JSOTSup 239. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997, 355 pp., \$66.00.

This volume explores various issues related to the idea that the present shape of the book of Exodus, and of the Pentateuch as a whole, has been heavily influenced by post-exilic customs associated with the three pilgrimage festivals of Passover, Weeks and Booths. To this end, Part I examines liturgical life in ancient Israel, focusing on pilgrimage to Jerusalem, the temple and its symbolism, prayer and sacrifices, and pilgrimage as paradigm for Israel. According to Smith, because of its significance, the paradigm of pilgrimage became the basis for the priestly redaction of Exodus. This thesis is developed in Part II where, after surveying the current state of research on Exodus, Smith argues that the priestly arrangement of Exodus consists of two main sections, centered around chapter 15, both of which involve pilgrimage from Egypt to Sinai. The third, and final, part of the book considers the place of law within the priestly redaction of Exodus, and the relationship of Exodus to the rest of the Pentateuch.

At the heart of Smith's approach is the belief that the custom of undertaking pilgrimages to Jerusalem played a crucial role in shaping the book of Exodus as we now know it. Two main factors support this thesis. (1) The events surrounding the journeys of Moses alone and then Moses with Israel to Mount Sinai parallel pilgrimages to Jerusalem. "Pilgrimage supplied the priestly redaction of Exodus with a ready model in order to understand the journey to, and call and commission at, the divine mountain" (p. 46). (2) Smith argues that the chronological notices in Exodus (and through to Numbers) correspond with the three annual pilgrimage feasts of Passover, Weeks and Booths. The exodus from Egypt begins when the Passover is celebrated, the giving of the Torah at Sinai coincides with the festival of Weeks, and the Numbers account of the forty years in the wilderness corresponds with Booths.

Although Smith develops his thesis with considerable skill, his two main arguments fail to convince. The parallels between the accounts of Moses and the Israelites journeying to a sacred location and the experience of pilgrims going to the temple in Jerusalem are largely superficial. This is especially noticeable as regards the early chapters of Exodus. Moses journeys to Midian to escape from Pharaoh, not to rendezvous with God. When such a meeting does take place, it occurs unexpectedly. Had the telling of these events been influenced by a pilgrimage pattern, we might have expected this to be more apparent.

Smith's second argument rests largely on the observation that the chronological notice in Exod 19:1 dates the giving of the Torah to seven weeks after Passover, when the festival of Weeks was celebrated. While this association between Weeks and the timing of the theophany at Sinai reflects an ancient Jewish tradition, it is by no means certain that the chronological notice in 19:1 supports such a connection. Commentators have long argued over the precise meaning of this verse, uncertain as to whether it refers to the very first day of the month or the month as a whole. We should note, however, that the reference to the third month/new moon is given in relation to the Israelites' exodus from Egypt, and not the beginning of the calendar year. In other words, 19:1 refers to the first day of the fourth month of the year (i.e. the third new moon after Passover). This places the Sinai theophany at least 70 days after Passover, and not 50 as Smith's theory requires. In addition, the form of the chronological notice in 19:1 is unique, suggesting that it does not derive from a priestly source. If the "priestly redactor" of the Pentateuch intended to associate the giving of the Torah at Sinai with the feast of Weeks, it is surely unfortunate that the main chronological notice in support of this should indicate otherwise.

Since many readers of *JETS* are likely to question the very existence of a “priestly redaction” of Exodus, Smith’s general approach is unlikely to find acceptance in these quarters. His study, however, contains helpful insights into how disparate parts of the Pentateuch share common themes. From this perspective this volume proves instructive.

T. Desmond Alexander
The Queen’s University of Belfast, UK

Joshua: A Commentary. By Richard D. Nelson. OTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997, xviii + 310 pp., n.p.

In 1972 J. Alberto Soggin published his commentary on Joshua for the Old Testament Library series. Its learned summary and discussion of a wide range of continental scholarship on the book made it a valuable addition to commentaries on Joshua at that time. Furthermore, it balanced the more historical and archaeological emphasis of the work of Boling and Wright with a contribution of classic liberal Protestantism. A quarter century later a new commentary in the same series reflects the need to keep up with the changes that have taken place in Joshua studies and the Deuteronomistic history, as well as the need to provide an up-to-date English language commentary on a book marked by the absence of such commentaries. This is evident from the bibliography, which lists eleven commentaries on Joshua. Only two have appeared within the last fifteen years and these are both German (Fritz and Görg). Nelson omits my own 1996 contribution to the Tyndale Old Testament Commentary series.

Three major areas of positive contribution should be noted. (1) Nelson continues the approach of Soggin by interacting with a variety of published authors who support his critical approach. Although more focused on English-language and especially American studies, the review of scholarship is helpful. (2) Nelson’s own previous work on the Deuteronomistic history enables him to clarify the text of Joshua in the light of this literary-critical theory. Nelson again and again confidently distinguishes pre-Deuteronomistic sources from those that are Deuteronomistic. Indeed, so assured is the discussion of this view that here (and in many other writers who subscribe to Deuteronomistic redaction[s]) the evidence for such distinctions is often assumed rather than presented. (3) Nelson has provided a systematic comparison of the Old Greek version of Joshua with the Masoretic Text. This is invaluable. With the long-awaited publication of the final part of Margolis’ *The Book of Joshua in Greek*, it is now possible to compare these two ancient traditions. While often favoring the Old Greek, Nelson nevertheless provides a consistent comparison of the pluses and minuses of these two textual traditions, although he does so only in English translation. Nevertheless, this is probably the single most valuable contribution of Nelson’s commentary and one that will allow it to be profitably consulted by all who wish to study the book according to its earliest manuscript traditions.

The weakness of this commentary is its pervasive refusal to interact with alternative opinions or methods of interpretation. This is especially a matter of concern when Nelson addresses questions of historical and archaeological significance. The following examples of this problem will illustrate the concern. (1) Nelson asserts, regarding the appearance of hundreds of small settlements in the Israelite hill country ca. 1200 BC and usually identified with Israel, “there is no reason to see these pioneers as infiltrators or invaders from somewhere outside Palestine” (p. 3). However, this

ignores substantial contrary opinion by archaeologists and historians such as L. E. Stager, who asks where so many people come from (too many to be explained by the sedentarization of nomads local to the hill country or their neighbors in the lowlands), and A. F. Rainey who notes that the Jordan River was no boundary to nomadic groups who crossed back and forth right up to the present century. (2) Nelson asserts that the large mounds of Jericho, Ai and Hazor attracted conquest traditions to explain their presence and that "The original social location of these stories in a peasant society may be indicated by how often 'kings' serve as antagonists" (p. 10). This etiological approach fails to address the fact that these and other settlements in Palestine were ruled by "kings" throughout the second millennium BC, whether the king of Hazor (logogram, LUGAL) in the fourteenth century BC. Amarna letters, or the kings mentioned in the earlier execration texts and the Tell er-Rumeideh tablet. These kings constantly served as antagonists according to the picture portrayed by the Amarna correspondence.

Nelson's discussion of the boundary descriptions and town lists (pp. 11–12, 185–186) ignores the appearance of these forms in treaty documents and administrative lists from the second-millennium BC West Semitic world (see especially those at Ugarit and Alalakh, but also the recently discovered administrative text from Hazor.) His own attempt to assign them to artificial scribal compositions and student exercises is remarkable, since there are no extant examples of boundary descriptions or town lists used for this purpose (even though many examples of student exercises and scribal compositions do exist).

Examples could be multiplied but they would only reinforce the point that in terms of exegesis this commentary must be used with caution. It does not demonstrate an acquaintance with the broader range of ancient and modern literature that lies outside its own method of analysis.

Richard S. Hess
Denver Seminary, Denver, CO

Hosea: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary. By A. A. Macintosh. ICC. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1997, xciii + 593 pp., \$69.95.

In the introduction Macintosh discusses the linguistic problems with the nature of Hosea's dialect of Hebrew and rejects most attempts to explain difficult passages as corruptions. He finds ten early glosses that translate or explain difficult words, numerous dialectical peculiarities in vocabulary, and some unique syntactical constructions (pp. liv–lvii). Macintosh relies heavily on rabbinic commentaries (Rashi, Kimchi, ibn Ezra, ibn Janah) that focus on comparing Hebrew with Arabic and a few Aramaic cognates to solve many of the book's semantic problems. He makes only four consonantal emendations, three changes based on the Dead Sea Scrolls and seven vowel pointing changes. Thus he is textually conservative even while working with some very difficult texts.

Macintosh believes that chaps. 2, 4–8 were delivered orally in public, but that many other chapters contain private prayers (14:2–9) and meditative reflections (chaps. 9–11) that reveal the prophet's systematic and mature evaluation of the nation's problems or complex musings on key theological concepts. He states that "the massive unity of purpose which has been detected in the work is most naturally attributed to a single mind and a single author" (p. lxx), but he does attribute a number of Judah passages

to a later Judean redactor (he lists 14 examples on p. lxxi). He believes Hosea's prophetic function was to warn people that if there was no reform, the northern nation of Ephraim would be doomed to destruction. To accomplish this goal Hosea described the failure of the nation's political leaders to provide stability because of several *coups d'état*, the corrupt syncretistic religious policy of joining Baalism with the worship of Yahweh, and the people's failure to perceive why their nation was in such big trouble.

In Hosea 1–3 Macintosh concludes (1) that Hosea did marry a promiscuous woman (not a cultic prostitute, as Wolff suggests) and was the father of all three children; (2) that the names of the children given in the text were contrived for literary purposes (they symbolized periods of Israel's political decline) and were not their real names; (3) that chap. 2 was not a divorce case but merely a family quarrel (p. 41); and that the woman in chap. 3 is Gomer. He rejects ibn Ezra and Jerome's allegorical or visionary view of chaps. 1–3 (p. 121). From time to time he reviews numerous interpretations of crux passages: He gives seven possible interpretations of "they will go up from the land" in 2:2 (1:11 in English) and prefers "they will flourish in the land." Macintosh rejects ibn Ezra's view that the positive promises in 2:1–2 (1:10–11 in English) are actually oracles of doom, but heavily depends (in almost every verse) on rabbinic suggestions about the interpretation of difficult words. In discussing the *hapax* form *nblth* in 2:12 (2:10 in English) Macintosh refers to BDB, Jerome, ibn Ezra, ibn Janah, Kimchi, Michaelis and the 1904 article by Steininger (p. 59), but no modern authors. Elsewhere in 2:17 (English 2:15), he rejects the common translation of *nh* "to sing" that is supported by Jerome, ibn Ezra and Kimchi, also Rashi and ibn Barun's view that it means "to dwell," as well as Rudolph, Harper and Wolff's suggestion of "to answer," but instead accepts ibn Janah's conclusion that it means "to attend to, occupy oneself with" (pp. 72–73), which is derived from a borrowed Aramaic root. These long discussions are the primary contribution of this commentary.

Macintosh does find a lawsuit beginning in 4:1 and he dates this material to the prosperous time of Jeroboam II. Although his treatment is weak on the structural ordering and logical progression of each section, rhetorical markers and form-critical issues, his careful verse-by-verse exegesis does include a discussion of semantic and syntactical issues to justify his translation (this is where the rabbinic comments are so frequent), a brief discussion of the meaning of the verse (often with an indication of its historical setting—many are dated to the reign of Pekah) and a survey of variant readings in different versions.

In 4:10 he translates the Hiphil "they will play the harlot" (NASB) as a noncausal intransitive reflexive "they have abandoned themselves to promiscuity," based on ibn Janah's Arabic explanation of the common verb *šmr* "to keep" as "cleaving to, devoting themselves to, loving." Many of Macintosh's unique translations challenge present translations, such as the following examples. (1) "Their canopies are canopies of disgrace" at the end of 4:18 instead of "their rulers dearly love shame" (NASB); (2) in 5:12, he sees God compared to an "emaciating disease" rather than a "moth"; (3) in 6:4, he translates "good intentions" rather than "steadfast love." Throughout the commentary the reader will need to judge carefully the merits of these rabbinic interpretations based on Arabic cognates: sometime they are just stated with very little corroborating evidence to convince one of the viability of such suggestions.

This commentary uses an impressive list of early resources (the bibliography has more than 30 works before 1900, plus his constant discussion of rabbinic comments), but to our surprise there are less than a dozen books and articles from 1990 to the present. It is a shame that Freedman and Andersen's giant Anchor Bible tome (from 1980) is never consulted, Stuart's 1987 Word Bible Commentary section on Hosea is found missing, and Brueggemann's 1968 study of *Tradition in Crisis* is ignored. In spite of the fact that this is not an up-to-date study, the new renditions of problem

passages will rekindle fresh insights that will help interpreters understand this difficult book, unless new authors choose to follow Macintosh's example and ignore almost everything that has been published in the last ten years.

Gary V. Smith
Bethel Theological Seminary, St. Paul, MN

In Conversation with Jonah. By Raymond F. Person, Jr. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996, 204 pp., \$50.

In this work the theories and techniques of "conversation analysis" are introduced and applied to the text of Jonah. The basic premise is that a better understanding of the structure of conversation can enhance our reading skills and open up new insights into a narrative.

Previous knowledge of conversation analysis is not necessary since a clear introduction is given to the theory and terminology involved. Most of the introductory material focuses on the conversational structure called "adjacency pairs," which are sequences in the interaction of characters, such as assessment-agreement, question-answer and invitation-refusal. Fundamental to Person's work is the distinction between two types of adjacency pairs: those that have "linguistically preferred second parts" and those that have "linguistically dispreferred second parts." It is argued that a study of these sequences can be a valuable tool in the interpretation of a narrative.

The introduction is followed by a basic commentary that outlines the story and message of the book of Jonah, drawing attention in particular to the adjacency pairs and highlighting whether they have preferred or dispreferred second parts. The commentary also highlights obvious omissions in the text which invite the reader to fill the gap. Jonah's initial reply to God when asked to go to Nineveh is one such omission.

Building on the basic principles established in the introductory material and in his commentary, Person shows how adjacency pairs relate to the plot, character, atmosphere and tone of the Jonah narrative. The section on "character" is particularly interesting in that it shows how the structure of each character's conversation has an important role to play in the portrayal of that person in the narrative. The structure of Jonah's conversation (in which dispreferred seconds predominate) emphasizes that he is in conflict with everyone else, whereas the conversation of the other characters (with mainly preferred seconds) is structured in such a way that their avoidance of conflict is emphasized.

The final two chapters consider the role played by the readers in their interaction with the text. The distinction between implied readers (the type of reader that the author had in mind) and actual readers and their respective interactions with the text is discussed. The implied reader understands Hebrew and is familiar with the geographical and historical backgrounds of the narrative. The implied reader is not always the actual reader, however, and Person analyzes various "readings" and "misreadings" of the text. He selects samples of conversation in Jonah and examines how these have been dealt with by various authors, ancient and modern. He contends that modern Biblical scholars misread the text because they are "text bound" and focus so much on what is in the text that they fail to see the significance of deliberate additions or omissions by the narrator. The pre-twentieth century authors also misread the text through their tendency to use Scriptures to interpret Scripture, and because of their theological presuppositions. One of the main implications of the misreading of the text by both modern and earlier authors is, according to Person, a failure to recognize the satirical nature of the book of Jonah.

In conclusion, this is a technical work which approaches the book of Jonah through the techniques of conversation analysis. It is a fascinating approach that highlights the importance of dialogue in a narrative. Even though the reader may not come to the same conclusions as the author, this is an interesting work that allows us to look at the familiar text from a different angle.

James McKeown
Belfast Bible College, Belfast, Northern Ireland

Freedom Beyond Forgiveness: The Book of Jonah Re-examined. By Thomas M. Bolin. Copenhagen International Seminar 3. JSOTSup 236. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997, 217 pp., \$53.50.

This revision of a doctoral dissertation from Marquette University, Milwaukee (1995) has as its primary goal “the recovery of authorial intent” or “meaning” (p. 64) for the Book of Jonah. After a relatively brief survey of how the book of Jonah has been interpreted from antiquity to the present day, Bolin discusses each chapter of Jonah in turn, before offering in his final chapter some comments regarding further issues to be explored.

At the heart of Bolin’s study is the belief that the author of Jonah views Yahweh as a “capricious, awesome deity” (p. 96) who is absolutely free to “save or destroy apart from any notions of guilt or innocence” (p. 88). This picture of God supposedly pervades the entire book. Thus, for example, Bolin interprets Yahweh’s concluding remarks about the city of Nineveh in 4:10–11 as implying that its people and animals are “worth no more than a plant created for a temporary shade and a worm’s breakfast” (p. 176). For Bolin, the book of Jonah has nothing to say “about an extension of divine mercy, or of a new, more profound teaching about Yahweh’s love” (p. 177). Indeed, “any exegesis which finds them here is the result of a petrification (*sic*) of older readings” (p. 177). The meaning of this latter comment is not particularly clear, an unfortunate occurrence given that this appears to be the only explanation as to why, if Bolin’s interpretation is accepted, the vast majority of commentators have failed entirely to grasp correctly the book’s true meaning.

Although Bolin’s study is impressive in terms of the sources he has consulted, his thesis is fundamentally flawed, resting as it does on a series of attempts to reinterpret radically each chapter of the book. Since space does not permit a detailed critique of all that Bolin claims, we shall limit our comments to the important link that he makes between the book of Jonah and Greek/Hellenistic traditions concerning the total destruction of Nineveh in 612 BC. Significantly, Bolin uses these to support his thesis that Yahweh never intended to spare the city, in spite of the population’s repentance. Thus, he takes the statement, “Yet forty more days and Nineveh turns over,” to mean that Nineveh will repent and then be destroyed (p. 140). However, Bolin ignores the fact that the author of Jonah clearly places these events in the eighth century BC, several generations before the city’s actual destruction. While an author writing after 612 BC might well be familiar with Nineveh’s downfall, any bearing that this might have upon the expression, “Nineveh turns over,” is clearly excluded by the reference to “forty days.” The later destruction of Nineveh is largely irrelevant to the meaning of Jonah chap. 3. Of greater importance for understanding the book is the destruction of the northern kingdom of Israel by the Assyrians in 721 BC.

In passing it is perhaps worth observing that Bolin favors the recent attempts of P. R. Davies, N. P. Lemche and T. L. Thompson—all of whom as editors are directly

involved in the book's publication—to date the whole of the OT to the Hellenistic period. Interestingly, in an extended footnote concerning the dating of the Pentateuch (p. 167), Bolin makes much of the *omission* of any reference to Moses in Neh 9:7–21, a passage that focuses on the “Exodus-Sinai-wilderness themes”; yet, Moses is clearly named in v. 14! Here, as elsewhere, one senses Bolin's enthusiasm to read between the lines of the Biblical text without carefully reading the text itself.

Given the radical nature of Bolin's interpretation of Jonah, it is a matter of regret that he never addresses the following question: How did a work composed to emphasize, in Bolin's words, “the futility of the foundational religious and theological issues of prayer, sacrifice, repentance and right living” (p. 185), become part of the Jewish Bible (and a central text for the celebration of Yom Kippur)? In spite of its erudite appearance, Bolin's thesis lacks credibility.

T. Desmond Alexander
The Queen's University of Belfast, UK

The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls. By Florentino García Martínez and Julio Trebolle Barrera. Leiden: Brill, 1995, 269 pp. \$44.50 paper.

This work is a collection of 12 essays, eight by García Martínez and four by Trebolle Barrera. It is arranged in three major sections: “The Men and the Community of Qumran,” “The Bible, Purity, and Messianic Hope” and “Qumran and the Origins of Christianity.”

In the first section, an introductory chapter by García Martínez entitled simply “The Dead Sea Scrolls” provides a basic background to the discovery and contents of the Dead Sea Scrolls. García Martínez also briefly discusses the identity of the community (to which he later devotes an entire chapter), then has a section entitled “The Qumran Manuscripts and the OT” which is a mere one sentence long (a footnote explains that the matter is covered in two subsequent chapters); and finally concludes the chapter by discussing (and rightly rejecting) O'Callaghan's contention that the Qumran manuscripts contain a tiny fragment of the gospel of Mark. Unfortunately, the second essay (“The Qumran Finds, Without a Hint of Scandal”), by Barrera, covers much the same ground in the first half of the article. He describes the working of a team of scholars in greater detail as they published (or failed to publish) the remaining Dead Sea Scroll material. He condemns those who called the failure to publish these documents a “scandal,” and instead points out the numerous legitimate reasons for the delay in publication.

The third essay, “The Men of the Dead Sea,” originally delivered as a speech, still reads as one. García Martínez tries to enter into the thought pattern of the men of the Dead Sea Scrolls. This is one of the best essays of the collection, as García Martínez skillfully weaves in the new material from Cave 4 with the standard sources (e.g. *Manual of Discipline, Damascus Document*) to present a fresh analysis. He briefly discusses the reasons for the group's retreat into the desert, their ascetic lifestyle and their dualistic thinking.

The fourth essay (“The Essenes of Qumran”), by Trebolle Barrera, again provides a brief introduction to the Qumran community (its writings, the Teacher of Righteousness, government, entry and rituals), then discusses the origin of the Qumran Essenes, and finally deals with the tension between legalism (law) and apocalyptic (messianism) in their thinking. The fifth essay, “The Origins of the Essene Movement and of the Qumran Sect,” while in one respect repeating the ground covered in the first and fourth

essays, in another respect is one of the most original essays in the book. Here García Martínez explains in detail his support of the “Groningen Hypothesis,” which sees the Qumran community as rooted within the Palestinian apocalyptic tradition, but originating as a split within the Essene movement. García Martínez asserts that some Essene priests broke from the main group over the calendar, the temple, the imminence of the end time, and other matters revealed to the Teacher of Righteousness, the group’s leader.

The second major section of the book (“The Bible, Purity, and Messianic Hope”) begins with an essay entitled “The Bible and Biblical Interpretation in Qumran.” Here Trebelle Barrera discusses the impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on the matters of transmission of the OT text (faithfulness of transmission, plurality of text types), the OT canon and Biblical exegesis. Trebelle Barrera argues that the NT uses the same exegetical methods (*peshar* and *testimonia*) as at Qumran. Unfortunately, in this wide-ranging essay a number of assertions are made but not well supported. The next essay, “Biblical Borderlines,” by García Martínez, deals with the impact of some recently published texts (11QPaleoLev, 4QPaleoEx^m, and 4QNum^b) on theories of the development of the OT text. García Martínez also treats one text, 4QRP (4QRewritten Pentateuch), that raises new questions concerning the borderline between Biblical and non-Biblical texts. Though García Martínez raises more questions than he solves, this essay is one of the best in the volume.

A third essay in this section deals with the Qumran concept of ritual purity. García Martínez explains through his study of the *Temple Scroll*, 4QMMT, and other texts, that extreme concern with purity was a major tenet of the group from its inception.

The final essay in the section (and the longest in the book) is on messianism at Qumran. In it García Martínez presents the texts at Qumran (including several recently published texts from Cave 4) that speak of one or more messianic figures. While García Martínez does not offer a novel synthesis of the data, he does an excellent job of explaining the significance of each text in this highly intriguing area of Qumran studies.

Three essays on “Qumran and the Origins of Christianity” comprise the third and final section of this work. In the first essay, García Martínez first dispels two false understandings of the significance of the Dead Sea Scrolls on Christianity: the view that scholars “conspired” to hide the texts from publication because they somehow posed a threat to Judaism and Christianity, and the view that the Dead Sea Scrolls (and the NT as well) contained a secret, esoteric meaning (he briefly refutes the contentions that James or John the Baptist was the Teacher of Righteousness). In the second part of the essay, García Martínez provides three brief examples of the true value of the Qumran manuscripts for the NT: they reveal to us more fully “the Judaism from which Christianity was born” (p. 198).

In the next essay, “The Qumran Texts and the New Testament,” Trebelle Barrera surveys the possible parallels between Qumran thought and the NT, especially John the Baptist, Jesus, Matthew, John’s writings (dualism) and Paul. His treatment here is well-balanced and properly cautious, finding more differences than parallels between the two.

The final essay in the section and in the book deals with the matter of the “Brotherly Rebuke in Qumran and Mt 18:15–17.” Here García Martínez correctly argues that the earlier attempts to find the origin of the Matthew 18 “brotherly rebuke” passage in Qumran thought were misguided, since there are numerous important differences between the two.

Unfortunately, taken as a whole, the book reads like a scattered collection of essays, with a good bit of duplication of material from one essay to the next. A small type font, no chapter numbers, footnotes (375 of them!) placed inconveniently at the back of the volume rather than on each page, and most of all, the lack of an index all detract

from the readability and usefulness of the work. For a clearer, better organized introduction to the scrolls, J. VanderKam's *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* is recommended.

On the other hand, there is a wealth of helpful information and analysis in this collection for the more advanced student or teacher. Garcia Martinez and Trebolle Barrera are to be commended for collecting these essays in one convenient volume, but a better job of organizing and editing the material would have greatly enhanced the overall value of this work.

Todd S. Beall
Capital Bible Seminary, Lanham, MD

The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Craig A. Evans. *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 26/Roehampton Institute London Papers 3.* Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997, 414 pp., \$78.00.

The essays on the Dead Sea Scrolls found in this book were delivered at the conference entitled "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Bible," held in February 1997 at the Digby Stuart College in England. The essays in this book are divided into four parts. Those in Part I deal with the larger problems concerned with the historical and literary context of the scrolls. The first essay is by P. R. Davies, "Qumran and the Quest for Historical Judaism." He records the uncertainties of our knowledge of who wrote the scrolls and also of the true meanings of the diversity of this collection. He warns against reading them in the light of the rigid and older notions of late antiquity Judaism.

C. Hempel, in "Qumran Communities: Beyond the Fringes of Second Temple Society," properly questions the earlier view that the scrolls reflect the beliefs of a small, fringe movement, not part of mainstream Judaism. Careful study is going on to seek to determine which of these texts reflect in the narrow sense the Qumran community and which reflect information on a wider movement.

In "The Current State of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Are There More Answers than Questions?" L. L. Grabbe stresses the need for Qumran scholarship to recognize how uncertain is much of our present knowledge of the Qumran material.

The essays in Part II speak of how the scrolls may help us to understand and better interpret the OT Scriptures and the various ways in which these record eschatological and messianic ideas. C. A. Evans reviews the role of the David figure in the scrolls, stressing how the virtues, achievements and promises of David contribute much to the messianism of the scrolls and how in his view these provide a background for the understanding of the early Christian belief of Jesus.

In "'Son of God' as 'Son of Man' in the Dead Sea Scrolls? A Response to John Collins on 4Q246," J. D. G. Dunn contends that the figure of the "son of God" in this document refers to the descendant of David in the messianic prophecy of 2 Sam 7:14. L. Stuckenbruck, in "The Throne-Theophany of the Book of Giants: Some New Light on the Background of Daniel 7," suggests that this document preserves a theophanic tradition that helps interpreters to understand better the vision of the son of man recorded in Daniel 7.

The essays of Part III suggest how the Dead Sea Scrolls relate to the writings of the NT and early Christianity. G. J. Brooke, in "The Canon Within the Canon' at Qumran and in the New Testament," finds important similarities with Genesis, Deuteronomy, Isaiah and the Psalms, their perspectives and traditions as they are interpreted. More than 20 copies of these books have been found at Qumran, and approximately 17 copies of Exodus and at least 15 of the book of Jubilees. Leviticus is also widely used. Other studies of some of the Qumran scrolls indicate an extensive use of the OT.

In "The Greek Papyri of the Judaeian Desert and the World of the Roman East," S. E. Porter notes that the Greek papyri have been an invaluable resource that reveals the language of everyday life in the Greco-Roman world. He stresses that much more attention needs to be paid to the documentary papyri archives outside of Egypt as "the best guide to the Greek of the Graeco-Roman world and hence to that of the New Testament" (p. 296).

The four essays in Part IV examine some of the extra-biblical texts found in the Scrolls. The essay by P. S. Alexander provides an insightful essay on "Wrestling Against Wickedness in High Places": Magic in the Worldview of the Qumran Community." The contents of the Qumran documents suggest that the Qumran community may have practiced certain forms of magic. Alexander states that it is clear that the worldview of Qumran included magic and that it was a high-level, learned magic. But the Qumran texts markedly restrain magical praxis. The documents also strikingly provide prayer as part of spiritual warfare.

The Scrolls and the Scriptures provides much extensive and helpful information on careful studies of the Qumran documents. Proper study underlines that these documents reflect a much larger community and thought pattern than that of the small Qumran community earlier portrayed.

Erich H. Kiehl
Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, MO

The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira: Proceedings of a Symposium held at Leiden University 11–14 December 1995. Edited by T. Muraoka and J. F. Elwolde. STDJ 26. Leiden: Brill, 1997, 222 pp., \$81.00.

This volume, papers presented at the first international symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira, is of importance for every serious Hebrew grammarian. The value of the contributions lies not so much in the results—as the raw data for much of the Dead Sea side of the discussion is still forthcoming—but in the methodologies detailed in the studies and current bibliographical information.

M. F. J. Baasten contributes the first article, "Nominal Clauses Containing a Personal Pronoun in Qumran Hebrew" (pp. 1–16). This study focuses on the order of elements in simple (bipartite) and tripartite noun clauses that include a personal pronoun.

In "Developments in Hebrew Vocabulary between Bible and Mishnah" (pp. 17–55), J. P. Elwolde details the "innovation and development . . . in the vocabulary of all Hebrew texts prior to the compilation of the Mishnah" (p. 18). Although preliminary—especially in regard to the Dead Sea corpus, where corrections and additions would require a much longer review than allowed!—this article represents an important step in the study of early Hebrew lexicography.

S. E. Fassberg's "On the Syntax of Dependent Clauses in Ben Sira" (pp. 56–71) examines conditional, relative, temporal, circumstantial and purpose clauses in the Ben Sira manuscripts from the Cairo Genizah, Masada and Qumran and concludes that they are "on the whole, similar to dependent clauses in Classical Biblical Hebrew" (p. 71).

A. Hurvitz, in "The Linguistic Status of Ben Sira as a Link between Biblical and Mishnaic Hebrew: Lexicographical Aspects," examines lexical examples that suggest that Ben Sira evidences a transitional point between Biblical and Mishnaic Hebrew.

T. Muraoka's contribution, "Verb Complementation in Qumran Hebrew" (pp. 92–149) is an important prelude to the study of verbal complements in Qumran Hebrew. As it stands, however, the article is skewed by the small number of documents exam-

ined (1QH, 1QS, 1QSa, 1QSb, 4Q255–264, 4Q159, 4Q513, 4Q514, 5Q11, 5Q13). For example, although Muraoka notes correctly (p. 97) that the object marker ^ʔt with suffixes as a complement to the verb is virtually nonexistent in his database—the pronominal suffix is instead the rule—it is relatively common in 11QTS and elsewhere. As more extensive data become available in the next few years, the value of Muraoka's study will be in the nature of the question that he asks of his own limited corpus of texts.

W. T. van Peursen's study, "Periphrastic Tenses in Ben Sira" (pp. 158–173) is introduced by a helpful discussion of the periphrastic construction giving it value even for students whose grammatical interests might not include Ben Sira.

"How to Write a Poem: The Case of Psalm 151A (11QPsa 28.3–12)" (pp. 182–208), by M. S. Smith, is included because its final section, "A syntactical taxonomy of the superscriptions in 11QPs^a," was read at the symposium. Sections I–V, concerning Psalm 151, represent a workshop presented during the symposium.

Shorter articles include: "The Syntax of ׀ in the Language of Ben Sira" by M. Z. Kaddari (pp. 87–91), "Die hebräische Sprache der Naḥal Hever Dokumente 5/6Hev 44–46" by G. W. Nebe (pp. 150–57) and E. Qimron's study, "A New Approach to the Use of Forms of the Imperfect Without Personal Endings" (pp. 174–181).

Martin G. Abegg, Jr.
Trinity Western University, Langley, BC, Canada

Qumran and the Essenes. By Lena Cansdale. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1997, 230 pp., DM 168.00.

This volume, handsome as always with this publisher, represents a revision of Cansdale's 1994 University of Sydney dissertation, supervised by A. D. Crown. The first 80 pages Cansdale devotes to "The Community of the Scrolls," a literary-historical evaluation of the manuscripts from the Qumran caves. The final two-thirds of *Qumran and the Essenes* considers "Qumran and its Surroundings." It is here that the author interacts with the archaeology of the site. Two appendixes, five very nice maps and three archaeological plans round out the volume.

Cansdale concludes that the content of particular manuscripts from the Qumran caves, while at times superficially similar to what is known of the Essenes from classical authors, does not correspond sufficiently well with those accounts to justify identifying the scrolls' authors as Essenes. Her methodological wedge into this question is one with which I agree: since all Jewish sects of the late second temple period derived their beliefs from the Hebrew Bible, substantial commonality is only to be expected. Consequently, when comparing any two groups one should focus on the differences, not the similarities. The differences are what defines. The analytical procedure is analogous to constructing a dialect geography.

The principal defining differences to which Cansdale points are the following: (1) the peace-loving Essenes contrast with the warlike spirit evident in some of the scrolls, especially the *War Scroll*; (2) the Essenes were mostly celibate, whereas the scrolls include many laws concerning women, children and even sexual intercourse; (3) the Essenes abhorred slavery, while the scrolls legislate the practice; (4) the Essenes took no oaths except when entering the group, whereas the scrolls contain numerous regulations for the taking and voiding of oaths; (5) the Essenes owned no private property, whereas the scroll-writers did; and (6) there are significant differences between the Essenes and the relevant Dead Sea Scrolls regarding entry procedures for new members. Cansdale concludes that the scrolls probably issued from one of the many Jewish sects

whose names are not recorded in the meager sources at our disposal, perhaps a sect related to the Sadducees.

Her archaeological analysis similarly diverges from traditional conclusions. For Cansdale, Khirbet Qumran was not a place inhabited by monkish ascetics, as suggested by the original excavator R. de Vaux. Instead, from the time of the early Hasmoneans the site functioned as a fortified customs post, collecting the salt tax and other duties levied on merchandise making its way along the Dead Sea trade route toward Jerusalem. Additionally, Cansdale suggests that the site may have served as an inn for travelers, whose staff undertook small-scale industrial activities such as manufacturing pottery and preparing perfume. The related site of Ain Feshka to the south, she suggests, was probably a tannery.

Qumran and the Essenes comes at a time when the field of Dead Sea Scrolls research is in flux. New ideas and interpretations abound. Adherents of the traditional Essene hypothesis are still in the majority, but the availability of all the manuscripts since late 1991—revealing a previously unsuspected variety of authorial perspectives and concerns—has tended to erode this stance. Cansdale embraces one of the competing theories, the “Jerusalem hypothesis” of N. Golb. Golb sees only an accidental connection between the site of Qumran and the scrolls hidden in the nearby caves; intrinsically, he says, the scroll writers were unrelated to the inhabitants of Khirbet Qumran, whoever the latter may have been. The scrolls represent the holdings of a number of Jerusalem libraries, evacuated from the city and hidden in the Judean wilderness at the time Rome threatened to take the city ca. AD 70.

In supporting Golb’s general perspective, Cansdale makes intriguing suggestions and uncovers points of vulnerability in the Essene hypothesis not previously noted. For example, on p. 49 she focuses attention on the spindle whorls found at Khirbet Qumran, evidence of a female presence because in antiquity women did the spinning. She explains the large assemblage of pottery stacked in loci 86 and 89—which de Vaux argued supplied the “refectory” where dined his monks—as evidence either for the kitchen inventory of an inn or for a storage annex to the pottery workshop, containing materials ready for sale or dispersal. On pp. 156–158 she forces the reader to confront the problem of valuable glassware, lamps and stone vessels, all certainly imports to the site, all arguing against the supposed poverty of the inhabitants, and all absent from (or soft-peddled by) de Vaux’s reports on the excavation. On pp. 178–179 she observes that the Qumran inhabitants did not cultivate the nearby *Buqei’a* region, unlike earlier (Iron II) inhabitants of the region. Hence they must have been supplied by food from the outside, not likely for a group of Essenes, described by the classical sources as agriculturists.

Yet the ingenuity of Cansdale’s treatment is counterbalanced by a general superficiality and, often, a simplistic approach to the evidence. To take one example from the realm of history: there are severe problems with her analysis of the Hasidim, Pharisees, Sadducees and the Fourth Philosophy—in other words, with her analysis of Jewish sectarianism, an understanding of which is basic to her thesis. Proceeding from a faulty linguistic analysis, she concludes on p. 108 that the word *חסיד* changed its meaning in the second-temple period. Whereas in Biblical usage it had meant “God-fearing person,” it now came to designate someone who fought for his religious beliefs. She does not see that the word always meant both. She cites neither P. Davies’ seminal article, “Hasidim in the Maccabean Period,” *JJS* 28 (1977), nor J. Kampen’s recent *The Hasideans and the Origin of Pharisaism* (1988).

On p. 36 Cansdale tells us, “before the rise of the Hasmonean dynasty, the Sadducee interpretation of religious laws was probably in force.” In the same vein she says on p. 69, “the Pharisees were predominantly lay people, that is scribes and sages, who were rigidly opposed to the priestly aristocracy belonging to the Sadducee

faction," and tells us on the next page of "the priests, the majority belonging to the Sadducee faction." As far as modern scholarship is concerned, these statements about the Sadducees are just plain wrong. There is no evidence that the group even existed before the time of Jonathan Maccabee, for it is in his reign that Josephus first mentions them. Neither is there evidence that the priestly aristocracy as a whole belonged to the Sadducees, though doubtless some did. Presumably few Zadokites—displaced by the Hasmoneans, some of whom in turn were supported by the Sadducees—were themselves Sadducees. The priests are never said in any source to be Sadducees. In fact, in all his voluminous writings Josephus applies the term "Sadducee" to no more than three or four individuals.

On the Fourth Philosophy Cansdale cites—and apparently knows—neither M. Hengel's *The Zealots* (T. & T. Clark, 1989) nor Morton Smith, "Zealots and Sicarii: Their Origin and Relation," *HTR* 64 (1971). Her discussion of the relationship between the *sicarii* and the Zealots on p. 73 lacks all depth and nuance; Steve Mason, *Flavius Josephus on the Pharisees* (Brill, 1991) might have helped her reconcile Josephus' contradictory statements on the Fourth Philosophy and the Pharisees.

Cansdale's problem here is not failing to cite the requisite authorities, for that is not what scholarship is about. Her problem is that she fails to understand central issues, and the best writers on the topics might have helped her.

She has similar problems with superficiality in her literary analysis. She describes the contents of 1QS (p. 35) as a way of considering the "Community of the Scrolls." But what about the oldest manuscripts of the work, those from Cave 4? Cansdale never mentions them. Several of the 4Q manuscripts are distinctly different from 1QS; what then of their relation and the questions of purpose, date and redaction—all aspects of the literary evidence that she never even broaches? Again, Cansdale's odd term "original materials" on pp. 95–96 betrays what the next pages affirm, that she does not understand clearly the distinction between documentary and literary writings, not again that between authorial autographs and scribal copies.

In sum, *Qumran and the Essenes* is a strange mixture of incisive thinking and unsophisticated analysis, not surprising in the work of a debutante scholar who has chosen too broad a topic. The book would have benefited from the advice of one or more specialists in scrolls research, as Cansdale's *Doktorvater* is better known for his work in Samaritan studies. Cansdale demonstrates in this work the potential to be a fine scholar. We may look forward to a purer demonstration of her talent.

Michael O. Wise
Northwestern College, St. Paul, MN

The Semitic Background of the New Testament. By Joseph Fitzmyer. The Biblical Resource Series. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997, xxi + 524 pp. + 300 pp., \$35.00 paper.

This volume is a reprint combining two of Fitzmyer's classic studies, *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (1971, 1974), and *A Wandering Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays* (1979). There is a new preface and, more importantly, a new appendix that contains additional notes and bibliographic references to more recent works. But this appendix is only ten pages long and most of it is comprised of corrections and bibliographic additions to footnotes. The longest comment, concerning the interchange between Fitzmyer and G. Vermes on methodology in studying the Aramaic substratum of dominical sayings in the Gospels, is less than a page long.

Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament is a collection of papers originally published between 1955 and 1967 on a variety of NT issues. It includes

two essays on the use of the OT, six on passages from the Gospels, two each on the Corinthian correspondence and Hebrews, and four on early Christianity. *A Wandering Aramean* comprises studies mostly done between 1970 and 1975. It discusses Aramaic in its own right and explores the relationship of Aramaic texts to the NT, with emphasis on Qumran and Christological issues.

Since this volume does not contain substantial new material, it will be of interest mainly to those who have not yet been able to read or purchase these previously out of print studies. In the new preface Fitzmyer acknowledges his essays may be somewhat dated, but he affirms that his conclusions are still valid. One could wish for an up-to-date discussion of texts and secondary literature that have been published in the last 25 years, but one will not find it here. Nevertheless, Fitzmyer's original studies made an important statement and they deserve an ongoing wide audience. This is especially true in these days of scholarly emphasis on the wider Hellenistic setting of the NT and the theory of a cynic Jesus who was only tangentially related to formative Judaism.

David L. Turner
Cincinnati, OH

The Archaeology of Early Christianity. By William H. C. Frend. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996, xix + 412 pp., \$34.00.

W. H. C. Frend has contributed a number of significant volumes on early Christianity over the years, perhaps most notably *The Rise of Christianity*. Here is another worthy contribution from Frend, a volume that covers the history of Christian archaeology from the Renaissance to the present. In his introduction Frend writes, "I have attempted to outline the growth in Christian archaeology from the Renaissance onwards, describing briefly excavations in the main areas of discovery, and placing these discoveries within the framework of cultural and religious movement of the day" (pp. xv-xvi), and Frend has succeeded admirably in this purpose.

Christian archaeology, like archaeology in general, was a "child of the Renaissance" (p. 11). It first achieved prominence in 1578 with the discovery of the catacombs in Italy (an earlier discovery of catacombs in 1475 had no ongoing significance). These discoveries were valued by the Church primarily for apologetic purposes rather than for any light they might have cast on early Christianity. After the Peace of Westphalia (1648) the catacombs were used to recover relics and provide primitive evidence for Catholic doctrine, e.g. the Eucharist and the cult of the Virgin Mary.

In the 19th century nationalist interests became a major force in Christian archaeology. After France gained control of Tunisia and Algeria, archaeological efforts were undertaken for the purpose of spreading French culture and reclaiming North Africa for the Catholic church. Prior to World War I various European governments (e.g. France, Austria-Hungary and Germany) sponsored archaeological expeditions in the Middle East, the Balkans, North Africa and Europe that were designed to bring prestige to the states and governments involved and demonstrate European cultural superiority (which would abet Europe's already established political and economic hegemony). However, impartial study of the discoveries themselves was gaining ground and higher standards of scholarship made an impact during the later 19th century. The finds themselves proved to be of enormous importance and during the early 20th century began to have a significant impact on Christian historiography. This impact increased due to the discoveries that followed World War II.

Within the framework of his historical survey, Frend briefly discusses the major finds and their importance. These include discoveries bearing on such issues as the importance of Donatism, the character and importance of Gnosticism and other dissenting movements, the gradual decline of Christianity in North Africa about the time of and subsequent to the Arab conquests, and the vicissitudes of Christianity in Britain. Thus the book serves as an archaeologically based source of early Christian history as well as an history of archaeological endeavor. Frend sees the historical value of all these excavations as primarily two-fold: (1) They have served to shed new light on the major transitions in early Christian history, e.g. that from paganism to Christianity in the third century, from late antiquity to Byzantium in the fifth century, and from Byzantium to Islam in the seventh century. (2) Non-orthodox and dissenting traditions have become able to speak for themselves, e.g. movements such as Gnosticism, Donatism and Manichaeism.

While appreciating the genuine accomplishments of Christian archaeology over the past few centuries, Frend is justifiably critical of archaeological techniques of the past. The long-used technique of *deblayage* was concerned with horizontal clearing of significant buildings. It was a technique oriented toward architecture, the major interest of excavators into the 20th century. Neglected were such issues as stratigraphy and the way buildings fit into public life. Mortimer Wheeler introduced improved methods with the result that by the end of World War II scientific techniques were used in excavations with proper attention to stratigraphy and detail. Tragically, much of value had been lost through use of the old techniques.

This book is a historical survey and therefore has limited space for discussion of individual excavations. But it is unique in that it provides the reader with a history of Christian archaeology through 1994 and within that history demonstrates the importance of archaeology in the reconstruction of early Christian history. Discussions are judicious and fair, but critical when warranted. In fact his book is a masterful work from a distinguished scholar and deserves a place on the shelf of anyone seriously interested in early Christianity. Included are copious and helpful notes, a bibliography for each chapter as well as a general bibliography, maps and photographs. The latter part of the book contains, unfortunately, so many *errata* that one begins to anticipate them. This, however, is a minor matter in the light of the riches contained in this book, which should serve as a reference for years to come.

Robert Cecire
Bethel College, St. Paul, MN

The Coming of God: Christian Eschatology. By Jürgen Moltmann. Trans. by Margaret Kohl. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996, 390 pp., \$28.00.

In this book, Moltmann presents his approach to Christian eschatology. In the preface he states his basic conviction that genuine Christian eschatology has to do not with "the end of all things," but with "the new creation of all things." Following an introductory survey of literature ranging from the contributions of Schweitzer, Cullmann, Barth and Bultmann to the rebirth of messianic thinking in Judaism, Moltmann offers one section each on the themes of personal, historical, cosmic and divine eschatology. In these he develops his thought respectively on the hope in God for the resurrection and eternal life of human individuals, for the history of human beings with the earth, for the new creation of the world and for God's own glory. His aim is to integrate these perspectives into a unified whole.

The work has a number of good features. The broadness of Moltmann's treatment challenges Christian theologians to move beyond often narrow bands of eschatological concern and to consider the subject in its completeness.

Drawing from a wide range of knowledge, Moltmann also offers striking insights from mostly western history as well as from historical theology in the form of quotations from Luther and Calvin. I lacked the expertise to judge the accuracy of every appeal to the Reformers (and other theologians), but some of the claims strike me as odd. I suspect that Moltmann remakes both Luther and Calvin in his own image when he claims that neither Reformer believed that hell is a remote place but both understood it purely as existential experience (p. 252). I also wonder whether Moltmann is right to assert that the last judgment was not understood as a trial of the wicked until after the time of Constantine (p. 235).

Moltmann often surprises his readers with an apt insight or a well-turned phrase that provokes thought. For example, he alleges that in the Bible millennialism functions more as a call to resist evil than as a hope for escape from persecution (p. 153). Further, he diagnoses amillennialism as ecclesiastical chiliasm and the evolutionary idea of progress and development as philosophical chiliasm (pp. 182, 188–89).

The Coming of God is thoroughly documented. Endnotes are not the best way of communicating with the reader, but in this case they are handily indexed according to the page on which they appear in the body of the text.

Moltmann's work suffers, however, from a basic difficulty that restricts its value for evangelicals. Moltmann's view of Scripture is defective. For him the Bible is only "a collection of testimonies to the living God . . . but not a theological textbook for conceptualities about life and death" (p. 78) or, for that matter, about any other subject! With no authoritative Scripture with which to evaluate material gleaned from other sources, he winds up espousing a hodge-podge of ideas that will strike many evangelicals as unusual and even unbiblical. Moltmann subscribes, for example, to the notions that the gospel had retrospective power when Jesus "descended into hell" and preached it to the dead (p. 106), and that the nation of Israel has its own covenant with God that continues in effect alongside the church's "new covenant" (pp. 197–198). He rejects any idea of soul immortality on the ground that if a thing has no end, it has no beginning (p. 59). He even wavers in indecision about whether the Bible views resurrection as a good thing because it means the defeat of death, or as a bad thing because it means judgment at the hands of God (p. 69).

Moltmann's style sometimes makes it hard to identify his position among the alternatives he discusses, and at times he seems inconsistent. For example, he accuses the religious right of retreat from the real world rather than engagement in it—but then faults the movement for its current policies of engagement (e.g. pp. 158, 168–169). Also, in accounting for the social ills suffered by the Third World, he places the onus squarely on Europe and the United States, whom he accuses of "creating capital" by exploiting the resources of their New-World colonies (pp. 214–215). One wonders how he managed to forget that the United States was itself a New-World colony and that computerization and automation have made people as superfluous in this nation as in Third-World countries!

Even with these and other shortcomings, Moltmann has offered to the Christian world in *The Coming of God* a challenge to restudy Christian eschatology from all its various angles. I can only wish Moltmann had done his work from a more decidedly Biblical perspective.

Cecil R. Taylor
University of Mobile, Mobile, AL

Jesus: The Messianic Herald of Salvation. By Edward P. Meadors. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1997, xii + 387 pp., \$19.95 paper.

This volume is a revision of Edward Meadors' Ph.D. dissertation under the supervision of I. Howard Marshall at the University of Aberdeen (1993). The book was published by J. C. B. Mohr (1995) and now bears the Hendrickson imprint. Meadors' essential thesis is that recent research in the "Q" source has tended to magnify the distinctions between Q and the synoptic gospels and has minimized the similarities. This has caused many Q scholars to conclude that the Q community came from a distinctive branch of early Christianity that differed from what later came to be the orthodox faith. These Q scholars postulate a strand of Christian faith, expressed in Q, that was non-Messianic, had no theology of the cross and did not know or value the resurrection of Jesus. For these scholars, Jesus was an itinerant Hellenistic wisdom teacher or Cynic. Meadors bristles at this reconstruction of Jesus and, in this work, attempts to magnify the similarities between Q and the synoptics and minimize the distinctions. This leads Meadors to an understanding of Q that dovetails nicely with Markan theology.

Meadors pursues his task by investigating Q's understanding of Jesus and wisdom (chap. 3), prophecy and the Q community (chap. 4), the Son of Man sayings in Q (chaps. 5 and 6), and Q's perspective on the kingdom of God (chaps. 7 and 8). For each of these concepts Meadors tries to demonstrate the compatibility, though not necessarily the parallelism, of Q's theology with what can be found in Mark's gospel. Meadors' analysis concludes that there are no grounds for concluding that Q was a developing community with an evolving theology at odds with Mark. Meadors believes that recent studies that have defined redactional layers in Q are unfounded and that evidence supports the authenticity or dominical origin of most of Q.

Bucking the current trend to see Q as a form of Hellenistic sapiential literature, Meadors argues persuasively that Q should be seen against the backdrop of Jewish ideology. Meadors even goes so far as to say that Q is the document cited in the well-known quotation of Papias (Eusebius, *H.E.* III, 39.15). Thus, it is suggested that the apostle Matthew was responsible for the collection of the Q *logia* in Aramaic. This, of course has broad ramifications not only for Q research, but also for current historical Jesus research.

With this book, Meadors has rightly challenged many of the dubious assertions that have become entrenched in Q scholarship, particularly the Hellenistic *Sitz im Leben* of Q and the implausible reconstructions of a heterodox Q community. But it is probably fair to say that he finds a Q that is a bit too Markan. That is, he has not sufficiently explained the disparity of Q. Nevertheless, Meadors has done much to rehabilitate the ancient sayings source and charts a new course for Q studies.

Mark R. Fairchild
Huntington College, Huntington, IN

The Gospel of John: A Theological Commentary. By Herman N. Ridderbos. Translated by John Vriend. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997, xiv + 721 pp., \$42.00 paper.

Readers familiar with Herman Ridderbos have come to expect outstanding scholarship from the well-known Dutch scholar. *The Gospel of John: A Theological Commentary* should not disappoint anyone. Ridderbos approaches the fourth gospel attempting to magnify John's theological understanding of Jesus while at the same

time supporting the historical underpinnings of the gospel. According to Ridderbos, John assumes that his audience was familiar with the Jesus tradition and that he did not have to recount the general flow of events, as can be found in the synoptics. John rather builds on the tradition by interpreting the events of Jesus. In thus theologizing, John realizes his connectedness with the tradition. Factors, such as John's personal relationship with Jesus coupled with John's sense that the Holy Spirit would bring to remembrance all that Jesus said, combine in this gospel so that John has a substratum of history overlaid with a layer of theological interpretation. At times, according to Ridderbos, it is not clear if the gospel reports the authentic Jesus or John's understandings. The words may be placed upon Jesus' lips, but the language and style are Johannine. "This means that the boundaries between what is intended to be Jesus' own discourse and what the Evangelist says about him are not always clearly distinguishable" (p. 16).

Despite the inability to distinguish between the voice of John and the voice of Jesus, Ridderbos maintains the historical reliability of this gospel. John certainly subordinates historiography to his interpretation of Jesus, but this by no means precludes the reliability of his story. Here Ridderbos parts company with the many scholars who consider John a theologian, but not a trustworthy eyewitness.

As John shapes the tradition his focus becomes more clear. He reports the miracles of Jesus, but not for historical reasons. Rather, the miracles are seen as signs to disclose Jesus' identity as the Son of God. Likewise, the eschatological framework, which, as it is found in the synoptic gospels contributes to the dominant theme of Jesus' teaching of the kingdom, here in John contributes to the understanding of Jesus as Christ and Son of God (John 20:30-31). Thus, Ridderbos identifies John's focus as the person of Jesus in its all-embracing significance.

Many scholars have noted that to a certain degree John's gospel reflects the *Sitz im Leben* of the later church as it dialogued with Jews of the synagogue. In part Ridderbos agrees with these findings and believes that this controversy may have been the reason why John focused his story on the person of Jesus. Nevertheless, John's concern to be engaged in this controversy did not cause him to blur or distort the historical facts in order to support his theological contentions. Thus, Ridderbos believes that passages dealing with excommunication from the synagogue, such as John 9:22, 12:42 and 16:2, may have been preserved by John because they were apropos to his audience, but John did not tamper with the historicity of these accounts. Likewise, on other occasions Ridderbos argues against reading the text as a redactional reworking of earlier material so as to produce a fabricated historical narrative.

Probably the biggest disappointment of the book is the lack of a comprehensive introduction to John in which Ridderbos would tackle some of the salient issues of the gospel, such as Johannine sources, relationship to the synoptics, theological and conceptual influences and audience. Instead, Ridderbos offers a small "theological introduction," which is nicely written, and he occasionally deals with some introductory issues in an *ad hoc* fashion throughout the commentary. Issues of authorship and the Johannine community are discussed in an excursus at the end of the book. Here, Ridderbos recognizes that the testimony of the "we" in 1:14, 16 and 21:24 indicates community support corroborating the witness of the beloved disciple. Ridder even goes so far as to say that the gospel was published posthumously. But, he resists the temptation to posit a highly stratigraphied gospel that reflects a community's theological development over the years. The editorial work of a Johannine community was minimal in Ridderbos' estimation.

Ridderbos's commentary reflects balanced scholarship that endeavors to come to grips with what John was trying to say in his portrayal of Jesus. Written at a time

when many in the late first century were pondering the person of Jesus, John offered an understanding that went beyond mere history to propound the Messiah, the Son of God. Rather than finding an emerging Christology, as is currently fashionable in NT studies, Ridderbos roots this highly developed understanding of Jesus in the apostolic witness of the beloved disciple, rather than the later church. The commentary is a splendid example of theological analysis without postulating redactional layers and is a significant addition to works on John.

Mark R. Fairchild
Huntington College, Huntington, IN

Preface to the Study of Paul. By Stephen Westerholm. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997, xii + 128 pp., \$13.00 paper.

The starting point for this work is the premise that, although the apostle Paul and his writings continue to attract widespread attention, contemporary readers need help to make sense out of his assumptions and worldview. Westerholm, therefore, attempts to bridge the gaps between Paul's horizons and those of his 20th-century readers. The result is a work that combines OT background study and a NT theology of Paul with an analysis of contemporary culture.

As a means of structuring the book Westerholm follows the general outline of Romans, allowing Paul's argument to determine the issues examined and the sequence in which they are raised. Among the topics discussed are divine goodness (*Ṣēdāqāh*), sin and its effects, law, faith, guilt and atonement, Jesus as God's Son, Israel, and Pauline ethics. The study is weak on Paul's view of the role of the Holy Spirit, since Westerholm chooses to group 8:1–13 with the discussion of "law" in Romans 7 and to focus on the topic of "overcoming" in 8:14–39. His treatment of Paul's ethics is also brief, with Romans 12–16 relegated to a single chapter (11 pages). Otherwise key topics are covered well with appropriate OT background supplied. Particularly helpful is the discussion of Israel's place in Paul's thought. In that chapter Westerholm provides an excellent overview of the argument in Romans 9–11 without getting bogged down in the details which so often distract readers from Paul's primary concern.

Westerholm's style is engaging, if at times overly clever. Some readers might find (as I did) the frequent parenthetical comments distracting. The length of the book is indicative of the fact that this is not an exhaustive study. As a concise "preface" to Paul and his thought, however, it functions admirably.

John D. Harvey
Columbia Biblical Seminary & Graduate School of Missions, Columbia, SC

Paul, The Law, and Justification. By Colin G. Kruse. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1997, 320 pp., n.p. paper.

Colin Kruse's work on the law and justification was published in 1996 by InterVarsity in England, and now Hendrickson has made the volume available for American readers. Kruse begins his book with a survey of scholarship on the law and justification, including brief expositions of the views of Montefiore, Foot Moore, Schweitzer, Davies, Schoeps, Stendahl, Drane, Hübner, Sanders, Räisänen, Dunn,

Gaston, Westerholm, Thielman, Martin, Tomson, Wright and Schreiner. His survey of the various views is lucid and is a fine introduction to 20th-century scholarship on the law. If readers desire a thorough survey of the issue of justification, another work is preferable. Kruse interacts with justification insofar as it relates to the law. His book does not tackle justification in its own right with any detail.

The heart of the book examines the four major letters of Paul: Galatians, 1 and 2 Corinthians and Romans. Kruse devotes a separate chapter to each letter, with the addition of an extra chapter for Romans. After examining the *Hauptbriefe*, Kruse investigates the contribution of the other Pauline letters to the subject at hand in a single chapter. The final chapter of the book summarizes the major conclusions.

One of the advantages of Kruse's work is that his view of the law and justification are explained through a careful exegesis of the respective letters. Paul's theology of the law is gleaned by interpreting each letter in context instead of a topical approach where the major themes relative to the law are treated. The exegesis is consistently sane and conversant with modern scholarship. If one were to place Kruse on the map of Pauline interpreters, his view on Paul and the law is rather similar to that of F. F. Bruce.

A sampling of some of his major conclusions should be useful. Though Paul's thinking on the law is complex, he should not be dismissed as a contradictory thinker. Discerning the Pauline meaning in context yields a coherent understanding of the law. The issue of "works of law" in Galatians arises out of the boundary marker issues of circumcision and the observance of the calendar, but even in Galatians "works of law" cannot be confined to such badges, and in Romans "work of law" focuses on the moral demands of the law. Those of the works of the law are cursed, and the reason for the curse is not that works of the law are legalistic. The curse exists because people fail to keep all that the law requires. The Judaism of Paul's day was not intrinsically legalistic, but legalism easily arose for those consumed with nomism. Paul countered such legalism in his letters, and maintained that a new era of salvation history has dawned with the death and resurrection of Christ. Thus, the law is no longer in force for believers in Christ. The Mosaic Torah is confined to the era before Christ's coming and should not be imposed on believers today. What continuing role does the law play in the life of Christians? Kruse argues that the moral demands of the law are no longer binding on believers. Paul appeals to the law in paradigmatic ways for Christian ethics and sees the demands of the law fulfilled in the law of love. He does not, Kruse insists, impose the demands of the Mosaic law upon believers in Christ.

Kruse does not interact as extensively with the issue of justification, but his examination of this issue is of interest as well. Justification in Paul cannot be restricted to forensic categories, though the latter are included. Kruse concurs with Piper that the overarching idea in justification is God acting for the sake of his name. Under this wide-ranging category, righteousness in Paul is said to include distributive justice, God's covenant faithfulness, his saving righteousness, a right relationship with God, and a righteousness that leads to life. On the issue of justification more thorough study is needed to establish Kruse's conclusions. His definition of justification is so all-embracing that one wonders if it accurately represents NT evidence. In any case, a more thorough defense is needed to demonstrate the validity of Kruse's view.

It is questionable whether Kruse's sharp distinction between the demands of the law of Christ and the demands of the Mosaic law can stand. Paul certainly appeals to the law analogically and paradigmatically. But it is doubtful that the only binding requirement of the Mosaic law can be restricted to love. Love is the heart and soul of the Pauline ethic. But Rom 13:8–10 also suggests that the moral norms of the

Mosaic law constitute love. I have no quarrel with those who say that these demands from the Mosaic law are binding as the law of Christ—as long as it is acknowledged that some of the moral norms of the OT law still remain binding for believers in Christ.

Despite the above reservations, the work of Kruse is to be welcomed as a significant contribution to Paul's understanding of the law. The "new perspective" launched by Sanders and elaborated by Dunn has certainly provoked scholars to reconsider Paul's theology of law. A number of works, including Thielman and now Kruse, call into question some of the sweeping claims made by Sanders and Dunn. We can be grateful to Colin Kruse for calling us back to a more balanced view, one that is anchored in the Pauline text.

Thomas R. Schreiner

The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, KY

Explorations in Exegetical Method: Galatians as a Test Case. By Moisés Silva. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996, 236 pp., n.p.

The title of this book explains its content well. It is neither a commentary on Galatians nor a textbook on exegetical methodology. Rather, Silva explores a variety of exegetical issues using Galatians as a base text. The book is divided into three main parts: "Language and Literature," "History" and "Pauline Theology." Under these broad headings each chapter deals with particular aspects of exegesis, using examples from Galatians. The section on language and literature includes chapters on texts, vocabulary, syntax, and discourse and literary structure. The historical section has chapters on the task of reconstruction, Acts and Galatians, and the date of Galatians. "Pauline Theology" includes the distinctiveness of Paul's message, Paul and his Bible, eschatology in Galatians, and the function of the law. Much of the material in the book has appeared previously in various books and articles.

Though the book is selective rather than comprehensive, Silva's choice of texts and issues means that many—perhaps most—crucial issues in Galatians are dealt with. His cautious and careful scholarship and linguistic expertise provide an engaging read for scholar and student alike. I found particularly interesting those sections where Silva challenges oft-repeated exegetical dictums. For example, in a discussion of lexical distinction in chap. 2, he challenges the commonly held (and frequently preached) semantic distinction between *heteros* and *allos* in Gal 1:6–7. While many have interpreted Paul's words to mean that his opponents were preaching a "different" (*héteros*) gospel that is not merely "another" (*allos*) version of the same gospel, Silva considers the change in terms to be merely stylistic. The key to Paul's statement is instead in the terms *ei mē* which follow. The Judaizers are not preaching another gospel *except* (in the sense) that some are trying to pervert the gospel.

In a chapter on the date of Galatians (chap. 7), Silva goes against the majority of evangelical scholars by defending a late date for the letter, after the council of Jerusalem. Following J. B. Lightfoot, he argues convincingly that Paul's visit to Jerusalem in Galatians 2 is the same as the council of Jerusalem (Acts 15), and that the apostle's argument in the letter does not depend on his having visited Jerusalem only twice. Silva still favors a south Galatian audience (noting that the evidence for a north Galatian one is very weak), but points out that this does not in any way exclude a later date for the letter.

Particularly helpful is Silva's discussion in his introductory chapter ("Lessons from the History of Exegesis") and then again in his epilogue ("Reader and Relevance") on the

complex relationship between meaning and significance. Comparing the apologetically motivated exegesis of Irenaeus and Tertullian with the more historical method of Chrysostom and the Antiochene School, he points out that all exegesis, whether ancient or modern, “literal” or allegorical, is colored by the contextual situation of the interpreter. This is not necessarily a bad thing, however, as “genuine concern for authorial intent does not preclude interpretive shifts in the process of contextualization; and, conversely, what may appear to be free application of the biblical text does not necessarily betray a lack of appreciation for the historical meaning” (p. 23). Since it is impossible to set aside our prejudices, we should make the most of them. “While we may—must—insist on the priority of the historical meaning, it is in our best interests to recognize that readers are not merely passive observers but are actively involved in the exegetical process from the start” (p. 197). While Silva admits he does not have hard and fast solutions to the complex relationship between exegesis and application, he calls for more sensitivity by those who practice traditional historical exegesis to the role presuppositions can (and should) contribute to the interpretive process. This is a lesson that needs to be taken to heart and passed on to our students.

Silva’s usual erudition and clarity of expression make this book a delight to read. It would make an excellent supplemental text for a Galatians (or Pauline) exegesis course or a general course in Greek exegesis. Though academic and informed, the style is conversational and engaging, with occasional moments of dry wit.

Mark L. Strauss
Bethel Theological Seminary—West, San Diego, CA

A Discourse Analysis of Philippians: Method and Rhetoric in the Debate over Literary Integrity. By Jeffrey T. Reed. JSNTSup 136. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997, 525 pp., \$80.00.

Reed says concerning his work: “To my knowledge, it is the first monograph-sized attempt at a New Testament discourse analysis based on systemic linguistics” (p. 24). Reed builds on the systemic-functional theories of M. A. K. Halliday, hoping to present “the framework of Halliday’s theory in a readable and usable manner for the New Testament scholar” (p. 7). He applies this theory to the literary integrity of Philippians.

The book has two parts. The first part, “Discourse Analysis as New Testament Hermeneutic,” divides into two chapters. Chapter one provides an introduction to discourse analysis, including a sketch of its history. Chapter two presents “A Model of New Testament Discourse Analysis.” For those unfamiliar with discourse analysis or systemic linguistics, part one is worth reading, but the reading is very difficult. Though Reed seeks to present systemic linguistics in a readable and usable manner for the NT scholar, scholar and layperson both are likely to find this section laborious reading as they try to make sense of new (or differently used) terms such as cotext, rheme, thematisation, texture, slots, fillers, meronymy, temporal deixis, ideational, register, virtual system and transitivity. One cannot read through these first two chapters; one must study or gain almost nothing.

I must admit I found parts of Reed’s first section to be quite tedious, as he delved into the obvious, such as that NT writers “are not readily available to be questioned regarding their assumptions and intentions” (pp. 39–40) and that context limits word choice so that we cannot complete the statement *I gulped down* with the phrase *a dog running through the park*. At times hermeneutical guidelines are wrapped with different words and presented as fresh insights, even though a careful reader can find

some of the same hermeneutical instruction being given in Plutarch's *How a Young man Should Study Poetry* (ca. AD 50–120). I do not imply that discourse analysis is without value, only that its insights are sometimes presented as new when in fact they are actually sharpening of old insights.

Part two is a "Discourse Analysis of Philippians" and has four chapters, titled "The Debate over the Literary Integrity of Philippians," "The Structure of Philippians," "The Texture of Philippians" and "Conclusion." Part two is the strength of Reed's work. In these chapters he is careful, detailed and insightful, virtually providing the reader with an introduction to ancient letter writing and epistolary theory. His voluminous citations of papyrus examples illustrate his points well. Particularly good is his proposal that Phil 3:1 employs an epistolary hesitation formula and should therefore not necessarily be viewed as a bad seam by a sloppy redactor.

Much of recent Pauline scholarship views his letters against the background of ancient rhetoric (and rhetorical handbooks). Reed neither rejects current theory regarding rhetoric and Pauline letters nor accepts it uncritically, but carefully steers his own path, based on documentable evidence in papyri. We can be thankful for his approach.

Part two also provides analysis of several chain interactions that span the disputed parts of the letter and thus support a single-letter theory (though Reed does not support a single-letter theory wholeheartedly). The participant Paul is introduced at 1:1 and the chain is continued with the first-person pronoun throughout the letter. The participant Philippians are introduced at 1:1 and continued with the second-person pronoun (mentioned by name again in 4:14). So these two main participants in the letter (Paul and the Philippians) interact with third-person participants (supernatural beings, opponents and allies) across nearly all parts of the letter, indicating cohesiveness. Of course the reader immediately sees the potential problem with Reed's analysis: The first-person pronouns only refer to Paul if we assume Pauline authorship of the whole; the second-person pronouns only refer to the Philippians if we assume all this material was originally written to them.

The end of the book includes two appendixes: "Clause Structure in Philippians" and "The Influence of Rhetorical Theory on Greco-Roman Letter Writing." This latter section is quite informative and I recommend that students of Paul check out Reed's work and study through this appendix.

Reed's work provides us with an introduction to discourse analysis and NT Greek, but this introduction is available elsewhere (e.g. Porter and Carson, *Biblical Greek Language and Linguistics*, 1993; Porter, *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*, 1992). For the scholar interested in Philippians studies, Reed is worth reading. Nevertheless, I anticipate his work having a minimal impact on Philippian scholarship, for two reasons: (1) He reaches no firm conclusions regarding integrity. Firm conclusions spark response and controversy. Controversy brings more readers and thus wider impact. (2) For the reader unfamiliar with linguistics, his work is hard reading.

G. W. Peterman

Osceola Evangelical Free Church, Osceola, IA

The Crucified Jew: Twenty Centuries of Christian Anti-Semitism. By Dan Cohn-Sherbok. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; American Interfaith Institute and the World Alliance of Interfaith Organizations, 1997, xx + 258, \$18.00 paper.

Rabbi Professor Dan Cohn-Sherbok, the author or editor of more than forty books, a number of which are devoted to Jewish-Christian dialogue, has produced a lucid

and pointed summary of the painful history of “Christian” anti-Semitism. Presenting a devastating array of material, Cohn-Sherbok draws a straight line from the pages of the NT to the Holocaust and beyond, yet he does so with a uirenic tone, always willing to point to examples of Christian leaders (including medieval popes) who stood up for fair treatment of the Jews. Moreover, the purpose of his book is constructive and redemptive, believing that now is the time for Christians and Jews to come to a place of understanding and mutual affirmation. The fact that this unchanged reprint of the original 1992 edition (Harper Collins) is jointly published by Eerdmans, the American Interfaith Institute and the World Alliance of Interfaith Organizations makes it imperative that evangelicals assess the accuracy and implications of this book, as well as come to grips with the shameful legacy of anti-Semitism in the Church.

After a thorough introduction in which each of the book’s 18 chapters are conveniently summarized, Cohn-Sherbok moves systematically from “anti-Judaism” in the NT to the *Adversos Judaeos* of the Church Fathers, the Inquisitions, blood libels, and Crusades of the Middle Ages, the demonization of the Jews in European culture, and 20th-century anti-Semitism, including, of course, the Holocaust. While there is virtually nothing new that is presented here (the author acknowledges his debt in particular to Leon Poliakov and Rosemary Radford Ruether on p. xi), the special contribution of Cohn-Sherbok’s volume is the richness of the material presented, always with reference to *Christianity* as the thread that ties all these variant manifestations of Jew-hatred together. Thus, while he recognizes the existence of pre-Christian, pagan anti-Semitism, he claims that it is only with the writing of the NT that “Jews come to be viewed as contemptible and demonic” (p. 1). Moreover, his quotations from the Church Fathers (including illustrious names such as Chrysostom and Augustine) not only prove shocking reading for the uninitiated evangelical but seem to back his claim that it was influential leaders such as these who paved the way for subsequent Judeophobia.

Unfortunately, Cohn-Sherbok provides no documentation at all throughout his book, a fact that is especially bothersome in chapters when even a reference to a quoted primary source (such as a Church Father) would have been extremely helpful. In addition to this, while the author demonstrates an excellent knowledge of Christian theology and is thoroughly conversant with the NT, at times he overstates his case (cf. e.g. p. 21 on Gal 4:8–10 and p. 24 on John 8:44, 47), while at other times he fails to interact with recent scholarly discussion of the alleged anti-Semitism of the NT (cf. e.g. David P. Efroymson, Eugene J. Fischer and Leon Klenicki, eds., *Within Context: Essays on Jews and Judaism in the New Testament* [Michael Glazier, 1993]). Also, his contrast between early Christianity and the Jews does not adequately recognize the fact that the first “Christians” were themselves Jews (despite later discussion of the Jewishness of Jesus; see pp. 225–227).

It would be fair, however, to say that such points are mere quibbles in light of the highly indicting material garnered by Cohn-Sherbok, and there are issues of far greater importance with which evangelical Christians must grapple, since the solution to anti-Semitism articulated by the author follows the lead of the Second Vatican Council and recent pronouncements of the World Council of Churches, calling for the mutual affirmation of Judaism and Christianity as valid saving faiths (with reference to two-covenant theology) and the repudiation of Christian “mission” in favor of Christian “witness.” For the evangelical believer, however, the options presented are not wholly acceptable, leaving us with a challenge: Can those who hold to the veracity of the NT witness and the fundamental correctness of a universal gospel mission demonstrate that “Christian” anti-Semitism is a horrible aberration rather than a natural consequence of the foundational documents? In my judgment, this can only be done by

repudiating supercessionism (i.e. replacement theology) as unbiblical, acknowledging the Church's forsaking of her Jewish roots, and reaffirming God's eternal purpose for the Jewish people (as reflected by their return to the land).

We can thus be grateful to Cohn-Sherbok for his passionate and forceful book, which makes it impossible to avoid the painful issue of the Church and the Jews, and more importantly, underscores the utter inappropriateness of offering cheap answers to the historic problem of "Christian" anti-Semitism.

Michael L. Brown
Brownsville Revival School of Ministry, Pensacola, FL

The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church (Third Edition). Edited by E. A. Livingstone and F. L. Cross. Oxford, 1997, 1786 pp., \$125.00. *Westminster Dictionary of Theological Terms*. Edited by Donald M. McKim. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996, 310 pp., n.p., paper. *Dictionary of Premillennial Theology*. Edited by Mal Couch. Grand Rapids: Kregel, 442 pp., n.p.

Livingstone's latest edition of the *ODCC*, which was originally published in 1957, is the first major revision of the work in over twenty years. Because it gives greater attention to the Eastern churches, to moral theology and to recent theological events and developments such as Vatican II, feminism and Liberation Theology, the publishers actually claim universality. But universality somehow excludes American orthodoxy, whether in its Puritan, evangelical or reformed manifestations. One finds Maximus the Cynic and Semi-Quietism, but not any of the three great Mathers: Richard, Increase or Cotton. *ODCC* has entries for Guido II and the hymn "Vexilla Regis," but not for B. B. Warfield or C. F. H. Henry. Absent also are A. T. Robertson, T. Shepherd, J. Norton and N. W. Taylor. C. Hodge gets one paragraph, C. Finney gets two—about the same as that given to W. Butterfield, the 19th-century architect. The Scopes trial and the Salem witch trials both are conspicuous by their absence, as is evangelicalism. In other words, while one is more than grateful, more than impressed, by the clarity, accuracy and number of entries in the *ODCC*, one must never consent to reducing universality to European parochialism. Despite the narrow horizons of this massive volume, there is theological life beyond the Atlantic.

Based squarely and soundly upon the premise that words are the building blocks of theology, McKim's volume sets forth more than 5,000 theological terms and phrases. He does so with clarity, brevity and precision—rhetorical virtues not easily acquired or combined. He frequently pauses to note the Greek and Latin original of the terms under scrutiny. Because the volume is the work of but a single theologian, one might fear the intrusion of bias, whether subtle or overt. But that fear seems unjustified. This handy book is detailed, descriptive and impressively free from polemics.

Couch's dictionary is brief, accurate, readable and surprisingly comprehensive. It marks out its own rather circumscribed field of interest, which it then covers with skill and precision. Unlike Livingstone's *ODCC*, Couch's dictionary makes its narrowed field of vision appear in its title. The theological sympathies and contents of its editor and contributor are not masked and are not ignored. Because they are not, the book is neither self-deceived nor deceiving, a characteristic not found in all such reference books.

Michael Bauman
Hillsdale College, Hillsdale, MI

The Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy. Edited by Robert Audi. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995, 882 pp., \$89.95, cloth; \$27.95 paper. *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy*. Edited by Ted Honderich. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995, 1009 pp., \$49.95, cloth.

Theologians and philosophers share many of the same figures (such as Augustine, Anselm and Kierkegaard), wrestle with many of the same problems and questions (such as the existence of God, ethical issues and the justification of belief), and are influenced by or respond to many of the same movements and systems (such as pragmatism, existentialism and postmodernism—in all its forms and shapes). Consequently, it is not long before theologians find themselves confronted with the discipline of philosophy. Yet, it would require quite a large library and substantial time to delve into such matters, both of which many may understandably lack. These two reference works go a long way towards filling in that gap and providing a wealth of information that is readily accessible for philosophers, apologists and theologians.

Both of these works are similar in many respects. A number of philosophers have contributed to both works, some even writing on the same entry, such as John Cottingham on “Descartes.” Both are current in their research and quite up-to-date in their selections. Each has extensive cross-reference systems. They are also similar in their aim: to provide a one-volume extensive dictionary of philosophers, philosophies (both Western and Eastern) and related disciplines by a team of international scholars. However, there are also some differences.

The *Oxford Companion* (OC) has a number of features which are absent in the *Cambridge Dictionary* (CD). One such feature that is almost indispensable to a reference work is bibliographies. The CD does not include bibliographies for any of the entries, while the OC has at least one reference for every entry and quite a few for some entries. These references are helpful, for they direct the reader to the best of the related material or to a work that contains an extensive bibliography. Another lacuna in the CD is that while it often quotes directly from the subject of the article, only rarely does it provide a reference. The OC, in contrast, provides at least a general reference for quotations. The OC also provides thirteen charts in the appendix and a handy eleven-page chart of the chronology of philosophy. The charts or “Maps of Philosophy” graphically display the relationship between issues, schools of thought and philosophers in such fields as epistemology, logic and ethical theories. The OC also has a number of portraits of prominent philosophers scattered throughout the text. All of these features are missing in the CD.

In terms of more substantive matters, there are also some similarities and differences. As to be expected in such works, there is not always an even treatment of figures or movements. The article on Thomas Reid (a key figure in Scottish Common Sense philosophy) by Keith Lehrer in the CD is both more exhaustive and definitive than that in the OC. But, in general, the articles in the CD are not as extensive as those in the OC. However, the CD has roughly twice as many entries.

As far as references to theological issues, the OC has more entries on God, philosophy of religion and related topics than does the CD. The article on “God and the philosophers” in the OC is a fair treatment of the philosophical concept of God throughout the history of philosophy (pp. 316–320). However, the author ends the discussion in the 1930s with logical positivism, thus omitting any reference to the important contributions of the Society of Christian Philosophers. Also, the article entitled “God, arguments for the existence of” in the OC is too brief and not very helpful, though it does reference Mavrodes, Plantinga and Wolterstorff in the bibliography. The topic “philosophy of religion” is treated in two ways in the OC, including the history of the philosophy of religion and the problems of the philosophy of religion, a quite helpful structure that is

used on many such entries. The article in the CD on "philosophy of religion" by Philip Quin is a concise, yet thorough, treatment of the arguments for the existence of God as presented by Anselm, Kant, Hume and others (pp. 607–611). The articles on ethical issues are of interest as well. For the most part, the OC again has more articles. For instance, "abortion" receives separate treatment in the OC while it is subsumed under the topic "moral status" in the CD, receiving but a few sentence treatments. In these articles, as well as in those on the topic of God, there is little if any reference to the role of revelation or to the triune God of Scripture vis-à-vis the philosophical or the onto-theological God. From an evangelical perspective such omissions weaken the overall treatment of these issues and undermine the conclusions that are reached.

In terms of articles on theologians, the more prominent figures are treated fairly evenly by both, though naturally more attention is paid to issues more directly philosophical than theological. This can be helpful, as in the discussion of Platonism's influence on the thought of Augustine in the article in the OC (pp. 64–66). However, readers of the article on Calvin by William Bouwsma in the CD may tend to doubt that his philosophical weaknesses led Calvinistic thinking to certain tendencies of natural theology that in turn eventually found expression in unitarianism and universalism (p. 99). In terms of less prominent figures there is some variance; for example, Barth receives treatment in OC but not in CD, while Joseph Butler is in CD and not in OC. As for articles by Christian philosophers, George Mavrodes (OC), William Alston and Nicholas Wolterstorff (CD) are perhaps the sum of such contributors.

In addition to those mentioned above, there are some further weaknesses in both. Naturally, one would not expect to find the authors totally objective in their treatments. For instance, in the CD, the entry on capital punishment claims that the evidence "has convinced many educated persons throughout the world . . . that there is no place for capital punishment in a civilized society" (p. 121). And many theologians will be concerned about the lack of entries on prominent theologians. Both works, however, provide perhaps the closest thing to a complete library of philosophy in one handy, accessible volume. Consequently, they are an indispensable source of information for research and provide much material for intellectual stimulation. Both volumes are a must for any school or college library and are a worthy consideration for one's own personal library as well. Given the reasons mentioned above, however, the OC may be preferable. At the least, these works should be consulted at those times when the fields of theology and philosophy intersect.

Stephan J. Nichols
Lancaster Bible College, Lancaster, PA

Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine. By Wayne A. Grudem. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994, 1264 pp. \$39.95.

Wayne Grudem's systematic theology is very complete, well reasoned, yet clear and readable, and handsomely printed. Very *biblically* based (as the title suggests), it is not dry, but engaging, challenging and personal. It is abreast of the latest writings and well-fitted for seminary classes, but can be read easily by lay persons. Grudem has a gift for simplifying, explaining and illustrating theological truths.

Grudem's methodology comes from John Frame's definition that "Systematic theology is any study that answers the question, 'What does the whole Bible teach us today?' about any given topic." In keeping with this definition, each of Grudem's fifty-seven chapters carries a question or two in the subtitle. Examples are: Chapter 21, The Creation of Man. *Why did God create us? How did God make us like himself? How can*

we please him in everyday living? Chapter 22, Man as Male and Female. *Why did God create two sexes? Can men and women be equal and yet have different roles?* Chapter 23, The Essential Nature of Man. *What does Scripture mean by “soul” and “spirit”?* *Are they the same thing?* Grudem exegetes pertinent Bible passages to craft his theological answers.

The book has seven parts: 1. Word of God, 2. God, 3. Man, 4. Christ and the Holy Spirit, 5. Application of Redemption, 6. Church, 7. Future. Any grouping is difficult. Part Four, for example, has four chapters on Christ, and only one on the Holy Spirit. Part Five contains thirteen chapters, including the Baptism and Filling of the Holy Spirit, while Part Six has two additional chapters on the gifts of the Holy Spirit. Nevertheless, the parts fit together well enough.

A unique feature of this theology is Grudem's stated purpose of *not* interacting with liberal theology. He states, “I write as an evangelical and for evangelicals. This does not mean that those in the liberal tradition have nothing valuable to say; it simply means that differences with them almost always boil down to differences over the nature of the Bible and its authority” (p. 17). This is a refreshing, positive feature. Grudem focuses on what the Bible says, not the denials or denunciations of the critics. He defends the truth, but from the strength of ascertaining what Scripture says and means. Grudem's work is scholarly, aware of diverse views, yet cogently argued to present positive truth.

Each chapter is well organized and follows the outline format of a textbook. Each chapter also has a section of “Questions for Personal Application,” containing thoughtfully composed questions for personal reflection and/or discussion. Some chapters have a list of “Special Terms” that could serve as a reminder to students of what might appear on an exam. Each chapter also has a bibliographical list that divides standard evangelical works into sections—Anglican, Arminian, Baptist, Dispensational, Lutheran, Reformed, Renewal and Roman Catholic (Traditional and Post-Vatican II). There is also a complete bibliography at the end of the book.

The above groupings are generally clear, but sometimes blurred. The Baptist section frequently lists the works of Gill, Boyce, Strong, Mullins, Carl Henry, Erickson and Lewis/Demarest. Carl Henry, a Baptist, is not widely known for covering Baptist theology. However, Henry Thiessen, clearly a Baptist theologian, who died as President of Los Angeles Baptist Theological Seminary, is listed in the Dispensational section. This points up the difficulty of categorizing some theologians. Still, the listed dates and pertinent pages of each theology facilitate further reading.

Each chapter suggests a passage of Scripture to memorize and prints several verses of a hymn appropriate to the lesson—something used by Grudem in his seminary classes. Charts and diagrams are rare, but appear more often than in other theologies. Eight charts illustrate church polity; five God and creation, four each the trinity, the Christological controversies, and eschatology. Two are on justification, one presents Spirit baptism and another sanctification. A three-page chart shows the gradual formation of the Apostles' Creed. Five appendices are found, including forty pages of historic confessions—from the *Apostles' Creed* to the *Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy*.

There are four indices—authors, sixty hymns, Scriptures discussed in some detail, and subjects. Each is superbly done. Grudem cites his own writings more than any others, followed by L. Berkhof, D. A. Carson, Calvin, John Murray, Erickson, A. Hoekema and Pinnock. Nearly 700 authors are indexed, but such neo-orthodox thinkers as Niebuhr and Tillich are missing, as are Emery Bancroft and Elmer Towns, who as Baptists each wrote extensive evangelical theologies.

Grudem's theology supports biblical inerrancy, the trinity, five-point Calvinism, premillennial eschatology, a posttribulation rapture, *all* spiritual gifts (except apostleship) for today, a loose definition of the church that includes Old Testament Israel,

and baptism by immersion for professing believers only. He ably presents a complementary view of man and woman.

Several weaknesses emerge. Grudem's definition of the church as all true believers for all time is disappointing. His arguments against Chafer and Erickson seem very weak, and he ignores Jesus' prediction of a church that is still future. He alludes to "the many New Testament verses that understand the church as the 'new Israel,'" when, in fact, there are none, and he gives none (p. 861). Grudem assumes uniformitarian geology and an earth 4.5 billion years old. He treats the young earth view poorly and raises straw men—that God must have created fossils and scattered them around to give an appearance of age. Who responsibly holds that view? No names are given.

Various logical fallacies are seen. Grudem categorically states that, "If God only answered the prayers of sinless people, then no one in the whole Bible except Jesus would have had his or her prayers answered" (p. 385), apparently forgetting Adam and Eve before the fall. Also, it would be better to say that Eve's desire to usurp Adam's authority and the conflict in their relationship were *results* of sin, rather than "that God is introducing" the conflict and sinful rebellion into their relationship (p. 464).

Again, Grudem says it is "quite possible" that the animal kingdom was "subject to death from the moment of creation" (p. 292). But the most natural interpretation of Romans 8:19–23, not mentioned in Grudem's excursus, is that God subjected the creation to decay upon the sin of Adam, not before. It also seems erroneous to equate the eating of a piece of fruit with the *death* of the plant. In heaven we will eat of the tree of life, but it does not die, just as Adam and Eve could eat of it and other trees in the garden without death coming to the trees.

On biblical grounds, Grudem disagrees with Murray Harris's resurrection view, but strangely fails to cite any of Norman Geisler's works on the subject, even in the chapter bibliography that includes almost twenty other works on the topic. In the section on soul sleep (pp. 819–821), I feel it is an oversight to refute Catholic writers on purgatory but to ignore Seventh-day Adventists who are vocal proponents of soul sleep. Grudem's section on eternal punishment is excellent, but his suggestion that believers will one day receive an outwardly bright appearance appropriate for their reign with Christ and status as image bearers and servants of Christ is at least novel.

Grudem's definitions are clear and precise. For example, "Prayer is personal communication with God" (p. 376). His work is very original. I appreciate his six excellent reasons *for* fasting (pp. 390–391), and the great section on God's wisdom as applied to us. Fine personal applications accompany discussion of each of God's communicable attributes.

In the arena of textual criticism Grudem expresses his denial of the authenticity of Mark 16:9–20 (p. 365), and he refers to the minority readings as the "earliest and best manuscripts" (p. 384). Yet, strangely enough, when teaching that angels help us today, he says the Byzantine reading of Luke 22:43 has "substantial ancient attestation," where an angel strengthens Christ in Gethsemane (p. 406). But, when facing much stronger evidence for "and fasting" in Mark 9:29, he ignores it (p. 432). On John 1:18, Grudem avoids the RSV's "the only Son," and replaces it with his own translation, "the only begotten God," claiming that *theos* is better attested than *huios*.

In spite of the above criticisms, I highly recommend Grudem's theology. It will teach you, challenge you, expand your thinking, and warm your heart. Theologian, pastor and lay person alike will benefit greatly from this finely crafted work. It comes from the heart and mind of one of the church's finest servants and most careful and able scholars.

James A. Borland
Liberty University, Lynchburg, VA

Systematic Theology: Biblical, Historical, and Evangelical. Volume 2. By James Leo Garrett. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995, x + 872 pp., \$45.00.

James Leo Garrett is Distinguished Professor of Systematic Theology, Emeritus, at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Fort Worth, Texas. He has enjoyed a long and distinguished teaching career, having held positions at Baylor University and The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, as well as several visiting professorships at such institutions as the Hong Kong Baptist Seminary and Trinity Evangelical Divinity School. Garrett has published numerous earlier works. This volume represents the second and final installment of a study which distills the fruit of forty years of teaching historical and systematic theology.

The book follows a traditional approach to organizing systematic theology. It begins with "The Work of Jesus Christ" and follows through to "The Last Things." Garrett's method is indicated by the subtitle of the volume. In each section he first lays out a biblical perspective on the subject matter. He normally looks first at Old Testament texts that relate to the doctrine in question, moving next to intertestamental literature and finally to the New Testament. His surveys of the biblical literature are sometimes quite thorough. In some areas, on a subject where the number of relevant texts is too expansive, he looks only at the more important passages. Garrett next considers the doctrine in its historical setting, examining the various options and developments of the particular *locus* in question. He ends with an attempt at constructive presentation.

Systematic Theology is primarily a work of systematic doctrinal explication. It details the data of theology to be confessed and taught in college, seminary and church. The biblical foundations and historical explications assembled by Garrett make a genuine contribution to the field of systematic theology, to a historical perspective on systematics and to the genre of systematic theology textbooks. The work has less to contribute, however, in the field of apologetical theology. The author pays little attention to philosophical issues. Only three references are made to Plato and none to Heidegger, Hegel, Quine or Whitehead. It seems clear, then, that Garrett wishes to make his impact on doctrinal and historical analysis and on the biblical foundations of evangelical theology. This review will confine its attention to examining Garrett's contribution in three specific areas: his organization of material, the depth of his analysis, and his solution to the problems of dogmatics.

Garrett follows the pattern of organizing material found in most standard evangelical works on theology written after the mid-nineteenth century. His first volume concluded with a discussion on "The Person of Jesus Christ" and this one begins with a section on "The Work of Jesus Christ." Successive sections are "The Holy Spirit," "Becoming a Christian and the Christian Life," "The Church" and "The Last Things." Aside from the title of the third of these sections, there is nothing unexpected or unusual about the main headings.

The development of each of the five parts of the book is not determined by any personal agenda. Rather, this theologian seems to allow three criteria to determine the manner in which he deals with each block of material: biblical teachings, historical concerns, and current points of conflict and discussion. He develops the section on "The Work of Christ" by devoting three chapters to theories of the atonement. Two chapters follow on the resurrection and the ascension and heavenly session of Jesus. One other chapter considers three issues: the extent of the atonement, the atonement and bodily healing, and Jesus' descent into Hades. In this part of Garrett's work, three chapters are devoted to classical historical issues, two to systematic theology questions that arise directly from biblical and textual considerations, and one chapter deals with a hodgepodge of historical and contemporary problems.

This division of labor is a regular feature of the work. Classical historical problems in theology are given careful attention, yet contemporary concerns are not ignored. Some chapters are quite fresh, even unique. In the section dealing with "Becoming a Christian and the Christian Life," Garrett has a chapter on stewardship and another on discipleship. In the second on the Holy Spirit there is an entire chapter on spiritual gifts. One would look in vain in most other systematic theology works for such presentations. Professor Garrett eschews novel and faddish issues. There is no chapter on ecology or nuclear disarmament, which is as it should be in a systematic theology text.

What of the depth of Garrett's analysis? Studies in systematic theology are known perhaps more by what they leave out than by what they say. Or, perhaps they are known better by how much they are *able* to say in the words they use than by just how many words they actually employ. Karl Barth may have written so expansively because he was attempting to build an architectonic *Weltbild*, complete with geography, grammar, science and logic in constructing his dogmatics. But few theologians have such patience and no non-Catholic for-profit publisher would be likely to commit to a similarly expansive project anytime in the near future. Theologians, then, have to be good stewards of their word processors.

This Baptist theologian shows himself to be adept at compact and careful exposition. For instance, Garrett interprets Calvin on justification in three sentences. Noting that the Genevan explicitly espoused a declarative justification based on Christ's righteousness, he continues:

Calvin took sanctification in place of Bucer's "secondary justification" and reckoned both justification and sanctification as the consequences of the believer's union with or incorporation into Christ. Hence the essentially moral understanding of justification of his Reformed predecessors became for Calvin a christological understanding (p. 273).

In only a few aptly-chosen words, then, he gives his own read on a discussion that might employ several paragraphs of description in the hands of a less capable teacher. The rest of the volume is similarly compact. This volume of over 800 pages, covering the second half of systematic theology, spans a remarkable amount of ground in both historical and theological exposition.

Theology is filled with difficult issues. Garrett does a fine job of showing how these have been faced by church thinkers over the last two millennia. The question remains, what kinds of solutions does he offer? Some works in systematic theology go to great lengths to offer solutions to the major problems, spending perhaps more time in contending for specific positions than in exposition of other options. Schleiermacher charted a whole new course in his *The Christian Faith*, interpreting and comparing previous views only when it helped him to articulate his own model. Similarly, Tillich's *magnun opus* is more of a long theological essay on how systematic theology can be seen from within his own ontological paradigm.

What of Garrett? His assembly of the various historical positions on a given theological issue is vast. If a reader wishes to find a discourse detailing all of the major positions on Spirit baptism or on election, for instance, this is the resource to use. Garrett committed himself to leaving no stone unturned in presenting the alternatives from the church's assembled *repertoire*. His own position, however, is not always apparent. Garrett's positive constructions are brief, and he often does not indicate his own opinion on controversial topics. It is quite clear that he does stand within the evangelical, orthodox Baptist tradition. But he is less concerned to contend for "answers" than he is to explicate "options." Because of this, Garrett's contribution more nearly follows the genre of *systematic theology* than that of *dogmatics*. One might contrast this work with the

decade-old exposition by Millard Erickson or the recent volume by Wayne Grudem. Both of these works offer careful proposals for specific solutions to many theological problematics. Such is not the major concern of Professor Garrett.

No book does everything. Some readers are scouring for “answers.” Such evangelicals may wish to purchase Erickson, Berkhof or Grudem. But if one is searching for an extensive exposition of the biblical foundations and historical developments of the various *loci* of systematic theology, there is no more complete presentation in a relatively short work than this overture by James Leo Garrett. His collection and explanation of relevant biblical texts on each of the topics of theology is by itself easily worth the price of the volume. Pastors will especially find this feature to be a real help in teaching theology in their churches. Serious church leaders will discover in Garrett a gold mine of information. Personally, the reviewer finds this volume to be an indispensable contribution to the task of systematic theology. Pastors and theologians alike will neglect it to their detriment.

Chad Owen Brand
Assistant Professor of Christian Studies
North Greenville College, Tigerville, SC

Christian Scripture: An Evangelical Perspective on Inspiration, Authority and Interpretation. By David S. Dockery. Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 1995, xi + 257 pp., \$19.99 paper.

In *Christian Scripture*, David Dockery has provided a helpful little volume on the nature and authority of Scripture as well as a history of interpretation.

The book comes in two parts (and I would use them in different classes). The first part affirms that the Bible is divine revelation. It is inspired and true (inerrant). It has authority over our lives, and we can trust it in spite of our imperfect knowledge of its transmission and canonization process. Dockery covers a great deal of material in swift fashion and pleasant accuracy. If one knows the issues, one can see that Dockery has dealt with the major ones. He does not take the space to argue many points, nor to fill out the significance of his affirmations. He is not arguing in this book; he is stating conclusions. In this way, the brevity of the book is maintained without compromising the diversity of topics he addresses.

The second half of the book, on interpretation, takes a surprising turn. The first half stated conclusions and pieces of theology the wise student should affirm. The second part of the book begins by tracing the history of biblical hermeneutics for two chapters. I liked those two chapters so much (because of the brevity and accuracy) that I may use them for required reading in an upcoming class on hermeneutics. But the two chapters could have easily been left out based on the precedent established in the first half of the book. When Dockery proceeds to modern hermeneutics, he returns to instructions for the wise student to accept.

Dockery isn't breaking much new ground, but he is stating things in an accessible way for those who have not learned this material yet. This is a beginners book well designed for the Bible college/first year seminary student, a pastor without seminary education, or interested lay-person. It could profitably be used in an introduction to theology where the nature of the Bible is discussed or in a class on the general introduction of the New Testament.

This is a far gentler way to step into understanding the Bible than many other books. I greatly enjoyed it. Beyond this, there is a good deal of material in the introduction and appendix about Southern Baptists. If you don't happen to be one (and I am

not) then you can ignore those references and benefit from the standard evangelical theology found in the rest of the text. If you are Southern Baptist, you may revel in the success of one of your own and your own proud tradition.

Matthew A. Cook
Faith Bible Church, Millersburg, Ohio

Hans Frei and Karl Barth: Different Ways of Reading Scripture. By David E. Demson. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997, xi + 116 pp., \$18.00 paper.

This new monograph by David Demson undertakes a critical comparison of the interpretive methodologies of Hans Frei and Karl Barth. Utilizing Frei's and Barth's distinct presentations of Christology in the gospels as a test case, Demson inductively constructs the hermeneutical differences between the two.

The disciples are the key component in Barth's Christology. They were called to partake in Jesus' ministry and to learn about the kingdom of God through it. They are significant for Barth because their story is the vehicle through which the text becomes actualized for the reader. In the "calling-gathering-sending" of the disciples, the reader is also called, gathered and sent. Just as Jesus called the disciples to follow and obey in life and in death, so also he calls the reader to "be conformed to his life, determined for death" (p. 101).

The disciples are not an equation in Frei's Christology. For Frei, the gospel story is consciously "historical." The reader is compelled to ask whether the events in the story actually occurred. "For the person who believes, with the story, that Jesus is Savior, Jesus' not being factually raised becomes inconceivable" (p. 107). Thus, the aim of the gospel story is confirmation of the reader's faith. Frei's view demands "a belief in something like the inspired quality of the accounts," namely that they "actually took place" (H. Frei, *The Identity of Jesus* [Fortress, 1975] 150).

For Barth, "inspiration" is that characteristic of the gospel story by which readers become participants in the "calling-gathering-sending" of the disciples. The text enacts itself upon its readers, drawing them into the experiences and behavior of the disciples. Jesus himself, claims Barth, executes this process both in the past and in the present. It is this encounter with Jesus mediated through the text that is crucial—not the text itself.

Without minimizing Demson's contribution, one criticism needs to be highlighted. In point of fact, there is very little Biblical interpretation in the Christology of either theologian. Both men focus primarily on the "gospel story" in abstraction rather than specific Biblical texts. Their different conceptions of "inspiration," rather than affecting interpretation as such, enable them to identify points of theological significance in this "gospel story."

The distinction, though subtle, is a real one. Where Barth and Frei actually differ is in their understanding of the appropriation of the Biblical text. Mark Wallace (*The Second Naïveté* [Mercer, 1990]) has argued that although Barth and the so-called Yale theologians (Lindbeck, Holmer and Frei) share the same "realist" hermeneutic, Barth's theological program was widely influential, whereas the Yale theologians are seldom emulated. The reason is that Barth was acutely aware of the necessary relationship between revelation and appropriation, a relationship that Lindbeck's "cultural-linguistic" model and Frei's "narrative realism" have lost. I would argue that Frei has, in fact, retained this notion (though it is poorly articulated), and that the difference in "inspiration" that Demson points to is a difference in the identified locality of

that revelation. For Frei, it resides in the text; for Barth, it resides in the encounter between Jesus and the reader mediated through the text.

This criticism does not undercut the significance of Demson's thesis. A reader who is grappling with the differences between the Christological models of Barth and Frei could do no better than to read Demson's little volume. A reader who is interested in the hermeneutics of the two would be better served by reading Frei himself (*The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative* [Yale, 1974]) or by reading Wallace.

William A. Tooman
Madison, WI

Biblical Interpretation in the Era of the Reformation: Essays Presented to David C. Steinmetz in Honor of His Sixtieth Birthday. Edited by Richard A. Muller and John L. Thompson. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996, xvi + 351 pp., \$35.00.

David C. Steinmetz has produced a host of scholarly studies throughout his life on the intellectual history of the Reformation. Early in his career, he focused on Luther and his relationship and his spiritual mentor at the Augustinian monastery, Johann von Staupitz. He then went on to study Luther's exegesis within the context of the history of biblical interpretation. His most recent research has turned to Calvin and the Reformed movement with the goal of placing the Genevan reformer within the context of the history of exegesis. His scholarly publications have contributed to a better understanding of the continuity of Reformation thought with medieval and patristic tradition.

Steinmetz has also mentored a host of doctoral students at Duke University who have gone on to publish significant works in the history of both exegesis and theology. Two of his most prominent proteges, Richard Muller and John Thompson, have edited this fitting tribute to one of the most respected "doctor-fathers" of this generation. In addition, Steinmetz's own mentor from Harvard, Heiko Oberman, pays tribute to his student in the foreword.

Oberman correctly notes the contemporary tension between the intellectual and social history of the Reformation. However we historians of Christian thought may chide our social history colleagues for their alleged lack of compelling documentation, we face the inherent difficulty of separating our own theological and cultural biases from the subjects we study. Oberman credits Steinmetz with helping to overcome such a handicap. Oberman also correctly notes that this type of study demands specialized training in history, theology, biblical and other foreign languages, so that there is only a handful of scholars who are really capable of writing significant works about the history of exegesis.

Muller, in the introduction, discusses the continuity of biblical exegesis between medieval and Reformation thought. He points out that the study of the exegesis of the Reformation has grown significantly over the last two decades, largely due to the work of Steinmetz. Older studies such as that of Farrar tended not to interpret the reformers within their medieval context, but in late-nineteenth and early twentieth-century categories. Muller argues that the Reformation era benefitted from the Renaissance's emphasis upon the return to original sources. Improved knowledge of the biblical languages was a major factor in the gradual shift from the fourfold method of exegesis to the quest for the literal meaning of the text.

This collection of essays brings together some of the finest experts in the field. For example, W. P. Stephens, who has published extensively on Zwingli, looks at Zwingli's commentaries on John 6:63, the determinative passage for him in interpreting the

words of institution. Erasmus and Augustine were important sources for Zwingli on this passage. What is particularly impressive about this article is that Stephens shows how Zwingli's views on the presence of Christ in the elements developed over the years leading to the Marburg Colloquy in 1529.

This book contains several other essays of particular interest. No work on Reformation exegesis of Scripture would be complete without some reference to Erasmus. John B. Payne does not disappoint in his comparison of Erasmus's comments on Matthew 11:28–30 with those of Zwingli and Bullinger. He notes that Bullinger was more dependent on Erasmus than the humanist Swingli on this text.

Other articles include Timothy Wengert on Melancthon's use of rhetorical criticism, Lyle Bierma on Ursinus's interpretation of the Sabbath, John Farthing on Zanchi's exegesis of Gomer in Hosea 1–3, and Susan Schreiner on Calvin's view of certainty of salvation in the context of sixteenth-century exegetical debates on the subject. Finally, Mickey Mattox has produced a helpful biography of Steinmetz's works.

In the conclusion, Muller and Thomson present an interesting essay that attempts to revalidate the usefulness of the precritical exegetical method of the Reformation. They argue that precritical does not mean uncritical. What is particularly compelling is their argument that the Reformation exegetes did not interpret Scripture in isolation but saw themselves as members of a centuries-old cloud of witnesses. They interpreted the Bible within the context of the explications of their predecessors. Contemporary biblical interpretation at times dismisses older biblical scholarship and looks at the text in isolation. By contrast, Luther, Melancthon, Calvin and their contemporaries all saw immense value in patristic and even medieval exegesis. Both Luther and Calvin particularly held Bernard of Clairvaux in high regard. The reformers, however, were free to disagree with their predecessors based on better philological information or a more complete understanding of the historical or geographical background of the text.

The editors and contributors have done an outstanding job of bringing to life the exegetical tradition that our Reformation forbears have left behind. We would do well to follow their example by interacting with the classic commentaries of past generations and even learn from them as we interpret Scripture in light of our own era. My only criticism of this book is the unfortunate lack of an index and bibliography of works cited.

Martin I. Klauber

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School and Barat College, Lake Forest, IL

God the Almighty: Power, Wisdom, Holiness, Love. By Donald G. Bloesch. Downer Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1995, 329 pp. \$24.99.

In his two volumes *Essentials of Evangelical Theology* (1978), Donald Bloesch crafted an evangelical theology widely read both within and beyond evangelicalism. The summit of his long teaching and writing career is the ongoing seven-volume *Christian Foundations*, of which *God the Almighty* is the third and, to Bloesch's lights, the most crucial installment. This book is dedicated to the memory of Karl Barth and Emil Brunner. As Bloesch makes clear, however, memory is not about insipid nostalgia but about dynamic retrieval and critical reappropriation. Bloesch nowhere calls his theology one of crisis, but there is a definite situation, which goes far beyond academic theology to mainstream cultural trends, that Bloesch feels compelled to address. Few today take God's power with anything approaching seriousness.

Cultural decline may have accelerated since Bloesch's earlier systematic theology, but his methodology has undergone few if any noteworthy changes. Then, as now, Bloesch engages both friends and foes and after—often in the midst of—conversations and skirmishes sets forth his own views. He describes his stance as a dialectical one, criticizing both modernity and postmodernity. Neither does he wish to be premodern, which was perhaps Thomas Oden's departure in his three-volume *Systematic Theology*. In the preface Bloesch names names, acknowledging debts to mentors (Barth, Brunner, Reinhold Niebuhr) and friends (Kierkegaard and Thomas Torrance among others). Prickly foes include the likes of Paul Tillich, John Cobb and Rosemary Ruether. Question marks for Bloesch are in the persons of, among others, Karl Rahner, Jurgen Moltmann and Wolfhart Pannenberg. Even a "progressive evangelical" like Clark Pinnock is not totally beyond suspicion.

Of the four divine traits Bloesch highlights in his subtitle, holiness and love are central. They "constitute the inner nature of the living God" (p. 141). God's love is holy and his holiness is merciful. The other theological options that Bloesch regularly canvasses—deism, pantheism, panentheism—get the balance between love and holiness wrong and stumble in virtually all other explications of God's character. A position to which Bloesch would seem to warm—the free-will or "open-view" theism of *The Openness of God* (1994)—is found to be dangerously close to process perspectives. Bloesch remains steady with his "biblical-prophetic" stance.

What might be considered the centerpoint of theological discourse shifts with the times. Two generations ago, Bloesch's work would seem progressive and maybe even in some ways liberal. The older Calvinism of a God seemingly bound by his decrees, which view Bloesch critiques, was at that time much more central in the world of evangelical theology. Now such decretal theology has seemingly been marginalized by the likes of *The Openness of God*. Where then should Bloesch be located? It is a question worth asking, since Bloesch is very interested in the company he keeps.

Bloesch pumps new relevance into the Kierkegaard-Barth axis of the "infinite qualitative difference" between the divine and the human. Others are saying similar things from beyond the evangelical world; for example, William Placher's *The Domestication of Transcendence* (1996). Bloesch is not simply parroting Barth, however. Between Barth and Bloesch the renewal of trinitarian theology interposed, calling into question the very fact Bloesch trumpets in his title: God is almighty. Now it becomes a question: Under what conditions, if any, can God be considered almighty? Bloesch's God is almighty in essential nature, rather traditionally figured and understood, but willingly and freely ("freedom" perhaps belongs in this work's subtitle) suspends this as he condescends to create the world and redeem it through Jesus Christ.

Unnecessary mistakes occasionally detract from Bloesch's otherwise solid performance. We are told on p. 23 to refer to God as "the Absolutely Different" and "the Wholly Other" but warned one page later not to follow God as "Absolutely Other," since this is the God of mysticism (which phenomenon Bloesch seems unable to appreciate in the least) and existentialism. On the whole, though, *God the Almighty* shows a reputable evangelical theologian at the top of his form. Bloesch's engagement with a host of Protestant traditions, as well as Catholic and Orthodox voices, is a model for accomplishing evangelical theology. When completed, *Christian Foundations* will stand as a landmark in late twentieth-century evangelical theology.

Roderick T. Leupp
Asia-Pacific Nazarene Theological Seminary, Manila, Philippines

The Holy Spirit. By Sinclair B. Ferguson. Contours of Christian Theology. Gerald Bray, general editor. Downers Grove, IL, 1996, 288 pp., \$14.99.

In many respects this study incorporates much that is standard fare in Reformed dogmatics, while at the same time staking out a number of highly significant departures from that tradition. Overall, Ferguson's recasting of Reformed theology follows closely on the heels of his senior faculty colleague, Richard B. Gaffin, Jr., to whom frequent reference is made. Ferguson's discussion, like Gaffin's, is not always clear, nor convincing. But the present work does serve to introduce the reader to changes in the contours of contemporary theology. Whether all facets of this theological exposition can be deemed "Christian" (i.e., evangelical and Reformed) is the pressing question. Viewed in the best light, this work, like other volumes in the series, aims to combine the rich insights of biblical theology with traditional (Reformed) dogmatics. In the hands of the present writer, however, the final product is a modification—at times *radical* modification—of the system of doctrine. Chiefly, there is the shift of emphasis from the traditional *ordo salutis*—the temporal and logical ordering of the various benefits of Christ's atoning work in the application of redemption by the Holy Spirit, who is the Spirit of Christ—to the doctrine of union with Christ as that is articulated in these pages. Before looking at this material, some comments about the work as a whole are necessary by way of review.

Ferguson begins by considering the basic meaning of "Spirit" (Heb. *ruach*, Gk. *pneuma*). He rightly concludes that "*ruach* denotes more than simply the energy of God; it describes God extending himself in active engagement with his creation in a personal way" (18). The Spirit's work encompasses both creation and redemption. (The closing chapter is entitled "The Cosmic Spirit," underscoring the comprehensive role of the Spirit of Christ in the renewal of the heavens and the earth.) The "Let us make" in Gen 1:26 is construed as a reference to the trinity, however indirect and obscure. (The full-bodied teaching on the triunity of the Godhead awaits the New Testament.) Though referring the reader to the insightful study of Meredith Kline, *Images of the Spirit*, Ferguson ends up misinterpreting this OT text. Particularly helpful is Ferguson's treatment of the following subjects: the gift/gifts of the Spirit, the *filioque* clause in the Nicene Creed, and the real presence of Christ in the sacrament of the eucharist. Prominent throughout the book is an exposition of covenant theology, at least a variety that is rapidly becoming dominant in contemporary theology. Most startling of all is Ferguson's scant treatment of the doctrine of justification, that which occupies a major section in standard texts in pneumatology, for example, the studies of John Owen and Abraham Kuyper which are commended by Ferguson. The reason for this neglect becomes apparent when the attentive reader captures the new direction taken by the author (see below).

Generally speaking, Ferguson's covenant theology embodies some of the distinctive elements found in dispensational theology. Early on, Ferguson speaks confusedly of regeneration (i.e. the new birth) as a peculiarly NT experience, whereas "new life" in the old economy was anticipatory of the new (pp. 25–26). Twice in this book the author deals with the experience of David who, in the author's opinion, feared losing his salvation after committing grievous sin. The *permanent* indwelling of the Spirit is understood here as strictly a new covenant experience. "In the old covenant, God was immanent among his people through the Spirit; the consummation of this immanence is found in Christ, and one who is anointed with the Spirit's presence and power; the consequence of his work is the giving of the Spirit to indwell believers" (p. 176). The implication is that salvation (at least in the OT) is *losable*. According to Ferguson, only under the new covenant is the intimacy of one's saving relationship with God experienced at all, and not just some (p. 30).

From the author's point of view, the covenant between God and humankind is a dynamic encounter reflecting the historical ambiguities of human experience in this present world-age. Ferguson's formulation of the "tension" between covenant and election stands in contrast to the proper balance struck by Reformed orthodoxy. The same problem resurfaces in Ferguson's exposition of the doctrine of union with Christ. According to Ferguson, it is union with Christ that is "the dominant motif and architectonic principle of the order of salvation" (p. 100). Is this statement intended to complement B. B. Warfield's contention that the Biblical doctrine of the covenants was the architectonic principle of the Reformed system of doctrine (as reflected, for example, in the *Westminster Confession of Faith*)? What precisely does Ferguson have in mind? After all, Reformed dogmatists have always—since the time of John Calvin and Caspar Olevianus—emphasized the importance of the biblical teaching on union with Christ. What is new in the present discussion is the inordinate stress given to the *eschatological tension* between the "already" and "not yet" of the Christian's life in the Spirit.

The recent approach in biblical-theological studies is to accent "the vital eschatological dimension (and tension) which features so largely in NT thought" (p. 102). According to this school of thought, the older dogmatic model (which posits a "chain" linking various benefits in logical, if not temporal sequence) obscures the already/not yet tension, specifically, how "each blessing is capable of its own distinctive consummation" (p. 102). Ferguson's model, which is by no means original with him, *relativizes* the definitive aspect of soteric justification, despite efforts to affirm the decisive, once-for-all act of God reckoning sinners righteous in his sight by means of the imputation of Christ's righteousness. In precisely what sense does justification (as one of many benefits of Christ's death and resurrection) *await* future consummation? Clearly, Ferguson is saying something different from traditional Reformed theology.

The crux of the new theology lies in its repudiation of the classic Protestant law/gospel distinction. There is no place in Ferguson's theology of the covenants for this antithetical contrast with reference to the history of God's covenant dealings with humankind. Ferguson knows of only one *covenant of grace* in creation and redemption (*à la* the Torrance school). Rather the relationship is always one of complementarity; it is law *in* grace, or grace *in* law. Thus, reasons the author, the end of the law spoken of in Rom 10:4 is the believer's *sanctification* (p. 144). With respect to godliness the indicative and imperative of biblical religion operate within the context of the single covenant of grace, before and after the Fall. Law becomes a dead letter only when it is divorced from the indicatives of grace. As a corollary, Ferguson recognizes only the fulfillment of the moral law for the believer, not its abrogation, a point of contention in the history of evangelical and Reformed theology. (Compare further my article, "The Search for an Evangelical Consensus on Paul and the Law," *JETS* 40/4 [December 1997] 563–579).

Over and against the modern view, Reformed orthodoxy has always maintained the clear distinction between justification and sanctification in the *ordo salutis* (as well as all the other benefits accruing to the elect of God). No ambiguity or fuzziness here. Unlike Ferguson and the new school, historic Reformed theology held unanimously to the twofold doctrine of the covenants—the Covenant of Works and the Covenant of Grace—the very doctrine that Warfield (and others like Geerhardus Vos) hailed as the distinguishing achievement of Reformed thought. This doctrine, however, has largely been abandoned in contemporary Reformed theology, of which Ferguson's ruminations are a part. What we find here is an attempt to place side by side two disparate and irreconcilable theologies. It has the effect of cloaking Gaffin's interpretation to appear as something other than it really is—an adaptation of neo-orthodox teaching. On virtually all points in dispute, the theology of Ferguson and Gaffin is at sharp variance with

that of John Murray, their predecessor in the systematics department. The reader is advised to peruse *The Holy Spirit* with caution and discernment, making careful comparison with the teaching of Scripture itself and that of historic Reformed orthodoxy.

Mark W. Karlberg
Warminster, PA

Are Miraculous Gifts for Today? Four Views. R. B. Gaffin, Jr., R. L. Saucy, C. S. Storms, D. A. Oss. Edited by Wayne Grudem. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996, 368 pp., \$16.95 paper.

Cessationism, the doctrine that “miraculous” spiritual gifts died with the apostles, remains a hot topic among Evangelicals, the issue being the focus of a recent ETS national meeting in Jackson, Mississippi, in November of 1996. Recently, *Christianity Today* listed cessationism and spiritual gifts as three of the top ten most significant issues among evangelicals.

In *Are Miraculous Gifts for Today?* Wayne Grudem has now coordinated and edited an extensive formal debate by four representative perspectives on cessationism. The positions and their proponents are “Cessationist” (Richard Gaffin, Jr., Westminster Seminary), “Open But Cautious” (Robert Saucy, Talbot Seminary), “Third Wave” (C. Samuel Storms, Vineyard) and “Pentecostal/ Charismatic” (Douglas Oss, Central Bible College, Assemblies of God). The book arose out of some seventeen hours of face-to-face discussion, with much labor beforehand and afterward.

The chief value of this discussion is three-fold: 1) The format encouraged the proponents to respond to each other’s position at a careful, sophisticated level. 2) Due to the high caliber of scholars assembled, none of the constituencies for any position can seriously claim its case was not well articulated or defended. 3) The book brought attention not only to the differences surrounding the debate on the continuation of spiritual gifts, but also to the sizable area of agreement held by the participants—far outweighing the differences.

This last observation leads us to a peculiar paradox that emerges in the discussion. All of the participants are both “cessationists” and “continuationists” (Gaffin’s word). Even Gaffin, an avowed “cessationist,” insists on the continuation of some gifts (p. 41) such as miracles (in the sense of healings) and revelation (at least in the sense of the illumination of scripture and personal guidance, p. 343). The “continuationist” positions (Storms and Oss) deny the continuation of at least one gift (apostleship, pp. 45, 291), a denial that eviscerates two of the continuationists’ main proof texts (1 Cor 12:29 with 13:8–12, and Eph 4:11–13), as Gaffin rightly notes.

All the participants are eager to protect the canon of scripture (p. 341). All appear to be arguing not so much *that* divine works (healing, revelatory guidance) appear today as much as *how frequently* and *how intensely* these events should be expected (pp. 342–343). For example, Gaffin allows for illumination or leading (both “revelatory” events, according to Saucy, pp. 142–143), so long as one is not “carried along” by the Spirit (p. 53). Or, God may heal “miraculously” today, though one cannot claim that the event is the result of the “gift” of healing or miracles (pp. 41–42). Accordingly, scriptural references to the *means* of delivering once-for-all revelation (i.e. revelatory or miraculous spiritual gifts) do not express their face value to the reader today. Presumably this applies to such commands as “desire earnestly the best gifts, especially that you may prophesy” (1 Cor 14:1). Saucy similarly argues that since miracles cluster around “foundational” events, we should expect far fewer of them today (p. 126). One is left with the

feeling that the whole debate could be bypassed by a simple change in labels (not “prophecy” or “a word of wisdom,” but “leadings”; not “gifts of healing,” but “healings”), thereby encouraging at least some expression of these divine works!

By contrast, the “continuationists” insist that all scripture narrating the life experiences of role models (Jesus, the apostles and others), as well as the clear commands to replicate them, are *parenetic*. Thus, the ministry of Jesus and its expressions of power were normative for his disciples and their disciples, *ad cateneum*. Also, the essential and normative expression of the Kingdom and Spirit of God is charismatic power.

In a book this size, exegetical minutiae was necessarily limited. The many questions the writers were asked to address in the book’s format detracted from a good deal more illuminating exegetical work that could have been done. For example, while the standard passages (1 Cor 1:4–8; 13:8–12; Eph 2:20; 4:7–11; Heb 2:4) were examined, they could have received a great deal more attention. Other passages connecting spiritual gifts with the end of this present age (e.g. 1 Thess 5:19–22; 1 Pet 4:10–11) were left undeveloped, despite their considerable potential for the continuationist position. Also ignored was the universal principle about continuing *charismata*, to which Paul appeals in the specific case of the salvation of the Jews (Rom 11:29).

Nevertheless, *Miraculous Gifts* represent a major breakthrough in the debate on cessationism. Nothing quite like it in terms of depth and sophistication has ever previously appeared in one volume. Despite this, the participants remain, to varying degrees, theologically in thrall to the confining, historically-conditioned terms of the cessationist debate as framed by the Reformers. Future discussion on cessationism cannot advance fully until the interlocutors break this spell and develop a radically biblical understanding of the following concepts underlying cessationism: 1) sign/miracle/attestation, 2) apostle, 3) “foundation,” and ultimately, 4) the essential expression of the Christian gospel beyond “word” to “word and deed” (as in Lk 24:19; Rom 15:18).

Jon Ruthven

Regent University of Divinity, Virginia Beach, VA

Worship, Community and the Triune God of Grace. By James B. Torrance. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1996, 130 pp., \$12.99 paper.

In a warm pastoral style, James Torrance shows us the necessity of the doctrine of the trinity for the administration of both Word and sacraments and the worship of God through an investigation of the Nicene Creed, the Fathers and the Biblical text.

He begins with an investigation into the varieties of worship within the Christian Church, whether unitarian or trinitarian. For the most part the Church has drifted away from a trinitarian understanding of God, a position for which the Greek Fathers and Reformers argued so fervently, and thus has lost a trinitarian understanding of worship. Torrance continues with a superb chapter on the mediation of Christ as our sole High Priest; most importantly, he articulates the trinitarian nature of grace that is mediated through Christ. By grace God gives himself *to us* for worship and adoration and by grace God incarnates himself to do for us what we cannot do for ourselves. This understanding of the double meaning of grace (the doctrine of recapitulation), Torrance argues, is central to understanding Christ as mediator between man and God through the Spirit of God and is foundational for the worship of God. Finally, he discusses the triune nature of the sacraments of baptism and the Lord’s supper as modes to communion with God.

In the final chapter on “Gender, Sexuality, and the Trinity,” Torrance discusses language used in reference to the Godhead. The author engages “re-imagers” by arguing

that God has commandeered human language in his self-revelation. Language concerning God should not be limited to human terms. For example, "Father" in reference to God carries a different meaning than "father" in reference to earthly, finite men. Torrance properly engages "re-imagers" by showing that they are projecting themselves upon God and thus fall into the pit of mythologizing. He correctly shows that theology seeks to understand God as he has revealed himself to us, on his own terms, using his own language.

Torrance ends the book with an appendix on "Human Language for God," where he continues his discussion on feminine metaphors for God in the Bible. This is a helpful section on the use of *simile*, *metaphor*, *parable*, *analogy* and *name* in relation to God. Torrance again shows that God has not left himself to be unknown to us but has revealed himself using human language. Again, one must not fall into projecting oneself upon God but seek theologically to understand the language God has commandeered in revealing himself.

This text provides a wonderful foundation into the core of trinitarian theology as it is applied practically and pastorally to Christian life. Torrance must be commended for his ability to take the central doctrinal belief of the Christian faith and show with simplicity its usefulness for understanding worship, community and grace. *Worship, Community and the Triune God of Grace* will prove to be a wonderful introduction into the theology of worship, trinitarian theology, and trinitarian ecclesiology at the parish, Bible college or seminary level.

Robert Leach
University of Aberdeen, Aberdeen, Scotland

Baptists in the Balance: The Tension Between Freedom and Responsibility. Edited by Everett C. Goodwin, foreword by Bill Moyers. Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1997, 416 pp. paper.

The subtitle of this collection of essays expresses the major concern of the editor and the twenty-four contributors to this study of problems facing Baptists today. The unusually full introduction traces the historical development of Baptists in America and shows that conflicts among them have punctuated their experience since they emerged as a distinct Protestant movement in the seventeenth century. The book has five divisions and editor Goodwin has supplied a helpful introduction to each of them. This feature enhances the coherence of the book, even though the authors have written about various topics from diverse points of view.

Part II, "The Search for Authority: Baptist Use and Interpretation of Scriptures," is the heart of the book because all the other controversies that have agitated Baptists reflect their attitudes toward this issue. Several contributors affirm that Baptists are people of the Bible, but their essays show substantial disagreement about the character and meaning of Scripture. Although historic Baptist confessions of faith uphold the trustworthiness and supreme authority of the Bible, those confessions have not deterred Baptists from adopting beliefs and practices contrary to them. *Baptists in the Balance* makes this obvious.

It appears that the editor and authors of these essays believe that broad diversity is not only a reality among Baptists but a sign of their enduring strength. Baptists began as Arminians but soon developed a potent Calvinistic branch that became the English progenitor of Baptist development in America. From its inception in the New World, the Baptist movement has been involved in so many divisions that it is almost impossible to define the term *Baptist* without fear of contradiction. How those divisions occurred

and their relevance for current conditions in Baptist organizations is the substance of this book. Here are found examples of Baptist feminism, ecumenical inclusivism, and lamentations because conservative Southern Baptists have employed “superficial sloganizing about the inerrancy of the Scriptures . . . in a political power struggle” (p. 223).

The one evident deficiency in this anthology of diversity is that no one speaks for the conservative, confessional point of view that the contributors reject either formally or by implication. All of them represent the moderate/liberal theological perspective. Even they put limits upon diversity.

James Edward McGoldrick
Cedarville College, Cedarville, OH

The Orthodox Church. By Thomas E. Fitzgerald. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1995, 240 pp., n.p.

Thomas Fitzgerald has produced an interesting volume covering the history of the Orthodox Church in America. Orthodoxy has recently gained significant attention in western circles as the walls of the Soviet empire have collapsed and many western missionaries have poured into eastern Europe. In addition, many evangelicals, most notably former Campus Crusader Peter Gilquist and Franky Schaeffer, son of the late Francis Schaeffer, have moved to the Orthodox camp. Part of the appeal of Orthodoxy is its desire to remain faithful to its apostolic roots. For most in the West, however, Orthodoxy is culturally foreign with its elaborate liturgies and its emphasis upon images and icons.

The author begins his work with a brief history of Orthodoxy from the early ecumenical councils to the rise of Islam and the events leading up to the Great Schism with Rome such as the western insertion of the *filioque* into the Nicene Creed. He details the break from the Roman Church over the East's contention that the Pope should hold primacy of honor rather than universal jurisdiction. Since the split between East and West in the year 1054, both churches have journeyed down quite different paths. One of the major reasons for the lack of dialogue between the two traditions lies in the history of domination of the Orthodox by the Ottomans, Muslims and Communists. A second reason would obviously be theological differences and Fitzgerald provides a brief overview of the distinct aspects of Orthodox thought. However, this volume focuses on the history of Orthodoxy in America rather than on a detailed account of Orthodox beliefs.

Most of us in North America fail to realize that Orthodoxy has a unique and rich tradition in America. The story of Orthodoxy in America began with the Alaskan mission on Kodiak Island in 1794. Russian missionaries began to convert the natives in Alaska using the island as a base. By the time the United States purchased Alaska in 1867, the Orthodox had firmly established the faith. Fitzgerald notes that by time of the October 1917 revolution in Russia, there were over one hundred thousand Orthodox in Alaska.

The author points out that it was immigrants from eastern and southeastern Europe who established the first Orthodox parishes in the U.S. from 1891–1920, for example, over four hundred thousand Orthodox came from Greece alone and it was the Greeks who established the first Orthodox parish in the U.S. in 1864. By 1921, there were one hundred thirty-eight Greek parishes in this country. One of the major difficulties of these early churches was the lack of a resident bishop or a formal diocesan structure. The churches were governed by a board of trustees.

By 1933, however, there was a multiplicity of jurisdictions among the Orthodox churches in America, divided along nationalistic lines. Most Orthodox did not see themselves as an organic unity but as separate churches. In addition, the majority of early Orthodox immigrants lived within a closed sub-culture in which marriage outside of the ethnic group was looked upon with disdain.

In spite of these ethnic divisions, the Orthodox in America faced a series of new challenges in the post-World War II era. The issue of modernization included the need for updating the liturgy and increased dialogue with other parts of Christendom in the West. By 1960, the various Orthodox groups formed an organization for promoting more cooperation called the Standing Conference of Canonical Orthodox Bishops in America (SCOBA). Fitzgerald outlines how SCOBA became the basis not only for dialogue among the Orthodox but also for real ecumenical activity with other Christian bodies.

Dialogue was the order of the day with various Protestant bodies and, after Vatican II, with the Roman Catholic Church. The meeting between the Pope and the Patriarch of Constantinople in 1964 led to the formal lifting of the anathemas between the Orthodox and the Roman Catholics that had remained in force since 1054.

The author provides a helpful biographical dictionary of the key players of Orthodoxy in the U.S. including such notables as Georges Florosky and John Meyendorff. He also includes a chronology of key events, a listing of all the autocephalous and autonomous Orthodox churches in the world, a bibliographic essay and index. These additions make this work exceedingly useful for further research.

Martin I. Klauber

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School and Barat College, Lake Forest, IL

Reclaiming the Great Tradition: Evangelicals, Catholics & Orthodox in Dialogue. Edited by James S. Cunsinger. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1997, 214 pp., \$18.99 paper.

The text is a collection of papers presented at Rose Hill College (Aiken, SC) May 16–20, 1995, where nearly two hundred scholars, pastors, and laypersons came together to discuss whether an “ecumenical orthodoxy solidly based on the classic Christian faith as expressed in the Scriptures and ecumenical councils, could become the foundation for a unified and transformative witness to the present age” (p. 8). The conference featured six plenary speakers (Peter Kreeft, Richard John Neuhaus, Harold O. J. Brown, Patrick Henry Reardon, Kallistos Ware and J. I. Packer) and six respondents (Theodore Pulcini, S. M. Hutchens, Father Andrew [Isaac Melton], William Abraham, Robert Fastigi and Bradley Nassif).

This ecumenical group gathered to test their disagreements to see if there is a center by which they might be unified. Neuhaus put it this way: “Our unity in the truth is more evident in our quarreling about the truth than in our settling for something less than the truth” (p. 8). This premise is in direct opposition to liberal ecumenical gatherings that tend to suppress differences and conflict at the expense of essential truth. This assembly, by contrast, did not want to compromise the soundness of the great Christian tradition; rather, it sought to explore a common center despite the acknowledged differences.

Three major themes arose from the discussions: 1) the relationship between the one Church of Jesus Christ and our present culture, 2) the relationship between Scripture and Tradition, and 3) the promise of the doctrine of the Trinity as revealed through Jesus Christ as a center by which all three traditions can find common ground.

Peter Kreeft calls our attention to the ancient diabolic plan to divide the Church and crush the rock on which it is to be built. He proposes that our alliance against the forces that seek to bring down the kingdom must be the Church’s common center. For Kreeft the relationship between Church and culture is the fundamental problem facing real ecumenics today. Unfortunately, his paper gets misdiagnosed by its respondent, Theodore Pulcini, who sees Kreeft’s solution as contributing to the problem (pp. 39–40). Pulcini would much rather see traditionalists create a religious subculture that influences the world than Kreeft’s appeal for a civil generic religion.

Harold O. J. Brown writes a confrontive paper on the relationship between Scripture and Tradition in which he persuasively shows the necessity of Tradition without damaging the Reformation's *sola Scriptura*. His respondent, Father Andrew (Melton), affirms his premise but qualifies Brown by noting that the Reformation tended to separate Scripture from Tradition whereas the two should not be seen as separate categories.

The doctrine of the Trinity, according to Kallistos Ware (Orthodox), proves to be a valuable starting point for ecclesiastical unity, especially when it is expressed christocentrically. The reality of the communion of the Godhead as revealed in Jesus Christ shows promise for the reality of the communion of saints within the Church.

This text records healthy theological dialogue between these three traditions without softening critical issues in ecumenics. Readers will be enriched by the deep theological discussions and the hope for unity based in our triune God.

Robert Leach
Hermeneutika Bible Software, Ennis, Montana

Colloquies: The Collected Works of Erasmus, vols. 39 and 40. By Desiderius Erasmus. Translated and annotated by Craig P. Thompson. Toronto: Toronto, 1997, 1,227 pp., £150.

Never one to spare even himself from the pointed end of his razor wit, Erasmus once cited his writing of colloquies as proof that the end of the world was near and that no calamity was lacking. The calamity, of course, as we now know, would be the absence of the *Colloquies*, not their production, a calamity admirably forestalled by the University of Toronto Press's landmark edition of the Dutchman's famous tales. Entertaining and instructive, *The Colloquies* are fiction with a purpose, both moral and pedagogical. Published first in 1518 by Froben's Basel press, the work appeared without Erasmus's approval and corrections, which he supplied to another edition the following year. That re-issue was the first of more than twenty in the next three years.

Erasmus himself oversaw the expansion and reproduction of his colloquies for the rest of his adult life. It was a task to which he set himself with nonchalant erudition, eloquence and profundity. Almost nothing, from war and peace to alchemy and salt herring, falls outside his purview. Nor does the Roman Church, to which he belonged, a favor it returned with a vengeance by placing the *Colloquies* on the Index of Prohibited Books, from which it was subsequently withdrawn, greatly to the Church's credit, I must insist. Prohibited or not, this is a wonderful book, a treasure house of theological wisdom dressed in the finest verbal ornament of the age. That the colloquies are now more widely available in Thompson's polished English, and that they are so copiously and admirably annotated, is some of the best news in Reformation era scholarship in years. But be prepared: Erasmus's riches bear a high price.

Michael Bauman
Hillsdale College, Hillsdale, MI

On Being a Theologian of the Cross: Reflections on Luther's Heidelberg Disputation, 1518. By Gerhard O. Forde. Grand Rapids and Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1997, xiv +115 pp., n.p.

Among contemporary English language writers, few have communicated the central insights of the young Luther's theology with greater ease and clarity than Luther Seminary's Gerhard Forde. In his *Justification by Faith: A Matter of Death and Life*

(Sigler, 1991), Forde interpreted the classic Lutheran teaching about justification not in the forensic terms with which many are familiar, but in terms of life itself. Now Forde brings his intimate familiarity with the young Martin Luther to bear not on the question of the theology of the cross per se, but on the problem of being, as he puts it, a theologian of the cross.

From the outset it is clear that this book originates in the context of an institution and from a theologian dedicated to training persons for pastoral ministry. The *Sitz im Leben* for this book, much like that of the *Heidelberg Disputation* itself, is that of a professor deeply dissatisfied with the direction of contemporary theology. Contemporary theologies of victimization, as Forde seems to see the matter, have led to a sentimentalized version of the gospel expressed in therapeutic terms more consistent with the presuppositions of late modernity than those of biblical Christianity. While he admits that therapeutic concerns with self-esteem, affirmation and the like have their place on a this-worldly level, he objects to their being mistaken for the ultimate concerns with which the Christian message of redemption has to do. Through a close reading of the twenty-eight theses Luther prepared for debate at Heidelberg in 1518, Forde seeks to make Luther his ally in the struggle against such sentimentalized forms of the gospel. Following an introductory chapter, Forde offers commentary upon the theses from the *Heidelberg Disputation* in four succinct chapters, explaining in order Luther's polemic against any reliance on good works for salvation, his understanding of the bondage of the human will apart from grace, the distinction between theologies of glory and the theology of the cross, and the righteousness of faith. Forde skillfully unfolds the compact and sometimes hyperbolic language of Luther's theses with an expert's sure-footed sense for the terrain. The style throughout is clear and accessible, a fact which makes the book both a logical choice for seminary students and an edifying read for the pastor or educated lay person.

One might fear that a book which takes as its point of departure the author's deep dissatisfaction with contemporary theological trends would devolve into a dyspeptic diatribe against all things modern. Such is not the case here. In truly evangelical fashion, Forde not only allows Luther's assessment of the human condition apart from grace to do its work, but also lays out in clearest terms Luther's understanding of the wondrous promises of the Gospel. Only when God has become our most relentless enemy and truly slain us with the Law does he raise us up to new life by means of the Word. In both cases, as Forde points out, it is God who takes the initiative; the sinner suffers both the condemnation of the Law and the promise of the Gospel as realities given from without. In this sense, one can speak of being a theologian of the cross only as one created by God, and not of becoming one as if it could be done through the exercise of some innate human capacity. To see things as they are, to know the self as put to death by God and raised to life by that same God, is itself a gift of God. This knowledge in turn enables the Christian to distinguish between theologies of glory and the theology of the cross.

Readers familiar with Luther studies will recognize that there is a certain redundancy in the publication of yet another book about Luther's theology of the cross. See, *inter alia*, Regin Prenter's *Luther's Theology of the Cross* (Fortress, 1971), Walther von Loewenich's *Luther's Theology of the Cross* (Augsburg, 1976), and Alister McGrath's *Luther's Theology of the Cross* (Blackwell, 1990). Still, so long as self-help theologies of glory in one form or another continue to rear their ugly heads in contemporary Christianity, indeed, so long as it remains the tendency of fallen people to seek to justify themselves, there will remain a need for books like these. Forde's compact and accessible contribution is a welcome addition to the fold.

Mickey L. Mattox
Concordia University, River Forest, IL

John Calvin and the Will: A Critique and Corrective. By Dewey J. Hoitenga, Jr. Foreword by Richard A. Muller. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1997, 162 pp., \$12.99.

The author of this study on Calvin and the will, a time-honored debate in the history of Christian doctrine, presents in rather short space an engaging discussion of the subject (including a historical overview). After an introductory chapter on the powers of the soul respecting both the intellect and the will, Hoitenga takes up the question of the primacy of the one to the other. He then moves to his critical analysis of Calvin's views, before offering his own proposal for reformulation. The author's criticism of Calvin extends to the Reformed theological tradition as a whole.

Fundamentally, Hoitenga detects a number of ambiguities and inconsistencies in Calvin's thought, leading him to conclude that Calvin's understanding of the will is mistaken and in dire need of correction. However challenging and provocative his argument, at the end of the day Hoitenga fails to achieve his stated goal. The author has not convinced this reader of any fatal flaw in Calvin's theologizing (or in the Reformed tradition more generally). The remarks which follow come from one who is a theologian, not a philosopher. But Hoitenga's venture into the arena of theological debate invites such response. Calvin himself, as Hoitenga correctly observes, was highly suspect of philosophy, specifically its tendency toward speculation. Rightly or wrongly, Calvin was prone to equate philosophy with human speculation. I share Calvin's reservation and the comments below will provide some indication why I do so. If any correction is to be made concerning the Calvinist doctrine of (free) will, it is to be made along the lines of clarification and redefinition of terms.

Our author asks: how can one say that since Adam's fall into sin the will has become enslaved and at the same time meaningfully uphold genuine accountability for human words and actions? To argue that the will is incapable of choosing between good and evil—that the will is inclined only to sin (as Calvin and Reformed theology understand Scripture to teach)—suggests to Hoitenga that fallen humanity cannot do good of any kind. The logic of Calvinistic doctrine is contradictory and incoherent, or so Hoitenga would have us think. We are warned: "If Reformed theologians remain preoccupied with expositing, restating, or reinterpreting Calvin, they will accomplish little in the way of providing a consistent development of his thought" (p. 20). Well now, Hoitenga has my complete attention!

According to our provocateur, Calvin's mistake is philosophical, not theological. Had Calvin given closer attention to the philosophical ramifications of his theologizing (that is, had he overcome his unwarranted reservation concerning philosophy), he would have been spared of obvious, glaring error. Following Calvin on the fallen will, reasons Hoitenga, we are left "with a will that is even less than a shadow of its created nature. On Calvin's view, the fall not only corrupts the will, but nearly destroys it" (pp. 69–70). As a consequence, Calvin "cannot explain adequately the moral character of human action in that state, when it still makes choices between good and evil" (p. 70).

As suggested above, the flaw in thinking concerning the will and its powers of choice lies chiefly in Hoitenga, not in Calvin and his successors. But having said that, a case nevertheless can be made against certain scholastic hangovers found in Protestant/Reformed orthodoxy. The culprit here is the speculative dichotomy between nature and grace descriptive of the human constitution in both the state of creation and the state of redemption; it is a psycho-philosophical dualism, a vestige of medieval scholasticism. The speculators confusingly distinguish between God-given natural gifts, on the one hand, and supernatural gifts, on the other. Hoitenga admits: "In fact, these latter terms are misleading, since both the natural and supernatural gifts originate in God, who as creator of the natural gifts is no less supernatural with respect to them than he is with respect to the supernatural gifts of his grace" (p. 71). In spite of this stricture, Hoitenga vigorously maintains the nature/grace dualism in his formulation of the creaturely

powers of the soul, fallen and unfallen. And yet he also opposes explicitly any suggestion of "a realm of 'pure nature' in human life, thought, and action that is essentially unimpaired and unaffected by the restoration of faith and true piety in a converted human being." He acknowledges: "I agree with the long-standing Protestant objection to a 'two-story' relationship between nature and grace" (p. 113).

Here's the point: in the original state of nature (or state of integrity) Adam's "gifts," comprising just so many aspects of his creaturely constitution, were supernaturally bestowed; his very creation as God's image-bearer is expressive of the Creator's goodness, not of his "grace" (the saving benefits applied by the Spirit of Christ to undeserving sinners, those elected from among fallen humankind since the foundation of the world). Contrary to Hoitenga's view, salvation is not the addition of (irresistible) grace to nature, fallen and corrupted though nature had become through Adam's transgression. Had Adam successfully passed probation, the reward of eternal life (and the gift of immutability) would not have been a reward of "grace." Grace is a distinctively *soteric* category. Accordingly, Hoitenga is incorrect in saying that the supernatural gifts of "grace" were lost through Adam's fall. Hoitenga's logic would seemingly call into question the "fairness" of the divine imputation of Adam's sin and inherited depravity, including the will's bondage to sin. (Implicit in Hoitenga's discussion here is the essential Reformed doctrine of the covenant of works.)

After reading Hoitenga's critique of Calvin, I was tempted to philosophize with him. But that I cannot do. Calvin has taught the biblical philosopher-theologian to think God's thoughts after him. Calvin refused to elevate reason above Scripture. The paradox between divine sovereignty and human responsibility cannot be resolved along the lines suggested by Hoitenga. But the author is to be commended for demanding of his readers the exercise of *reason informed by Scripture* (p. 61). Would that he reconsider once again the issues raised in his book in light of the biblical teaching that there is none who seeks after righteousness, that there is none who does good, and that every inclination of the thoughts of the sinner's heart is only evil continually (see especially the opening chapters of Romans). On the basis of this clear, pervasive teaching of the Bible the Reformed doctrine of common grace alone makes sense of the human predicament and makes meaningful the limited "goodness" of human science and endeavor. Finally, after mastering the writings of Cornelius Van Til, perhaps Hoitenga would favor us with a critique and corrective of the philosophical theology of Alvin Plantinga. What Christian theology desperately needs is the consistent application of a thoroughgoing Reformed (biblical) presuppositionalism.

Mark W. Karlberg
Warminster, PA

The Concept of Equity in Calvin's Ethics. By Guenther H. Haas. Waterloo, Ontario, Canada: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1997, 205 pp., \$24.95 paper.

Students of Calvin have long recognized that his work as a theologian was influenced by his training as a humanist. Four decades ago E. H. Harbison noted that, "Like Jerome and Erasmus, Calvin came to sacred studies through an enthusiasm for the pagan classics, and the way he adapted the techniques learned in classical scholarship to the study of Scripture is often reminiscent of both predecessors" (*The Christian Scholar in the Age of the Reformation*, 138). In recent decades scholars have shown an increased interest in Calvin's use of his classical education. For example, *The Westminster Theological Journal* has published a three-part essay on "Stoic Elements in Calvin's Doctrine of the Christian Life" (*WTJ* 55/1-56/1) and a lengthy book review dealing with his rhetoric (*WTJ* 59/2, 348-352).

In that tradition, Guenther Haas has produced a thorough and informative study of how Calvin adopted and adapted the classical and late medieval understandings of equity. Chapter 1 describes Calvin's education and his discussion of equity in his pre-conversion commentary on Seneca's *De Clementia*. Chapter 2 traces the historical development of the concept of equity from Aristotle through Thomas Aquinas. In chapter 3 Haas explores the concept of equity in Calvin's contemporaries, including both humanists (Erasmus, Budé, Alciati and Zansius) and reformers (Zwingli, Bucer, Luther and Melancthon). Chapter 4 through 9, constituting the bulk of the book, examine Calvin's treatment of equity as it relates to a number of topics: (4) love and justice; (5) natural law; (6) biblical law in general; (7) the commandments of the second table; (8) the state and the church; (9) usury. The endnotes, bibliography and indices take up nearly as much space as the text itself.

Haas concludes that Calvin employs several of the classical concepts of equity. However, the Reformer subjects these traditional notions to the teaching of Scripture and so transforms them in significant ways. Equity is the basic principle of natural law, but natural law does not come from nature; it is based on the holy character of God. The fundamental idea of equity is giving each person his due, but sometimes our neighbor's rights conflict with our desires. Therefore we must transcend our natural self-love in order to behave equitably. The only persons who can do so are those who have been regenerated and participate in the self-giving love of Christ.

The law of God is permanent, but the cultural expressions of that law are not. Equity is the principle that provides guidance for applying the second table of the law to specific cultural situations, including that of ancient Israel. When Calvin examines the Old Testament civil code by the yardstick of equity, he discerns several points at which it is not truly equitable. He explains these instances as concessions to the sinful obstinancy of God's people. Calvin, however, has not elevated the principle of equity above *sola Scriptura*, for he finds the goal of equity summarized in the "golden rule" (Matthew 7:12). Thus, his use of equity for evaluating the Old Testament civil code is an example of interpreting Scripture by Scripture.

Haas' work is a useful contribution to the study of Calvin's ethics. He hopes that it will also stimulate reformed thinking about the ethical challenges facing our generation.

John K. La Shell
Grace Community Church, Allentown, PA

Spiritual Life in Anabaptism. Ed. and trans. Cornelius J. Dyck. Scottdale, AZ: Herald Press, 1995, 310 pp., n.p.

Cornelius J. Dyck has produced an interesting compilation of texts from Anabaptist sources focusing on the devotional and spiritual aspects of the Christian life. "Spirituality" has become somewhat of a hot topic in recent years as witnessed by the popularity of works by such authors as Richard Foster. Dyck defines spirituality as "a personal relationship with God and the life in the Spirit." Spiritual life was an integral part of Anabaptism and their ardent piety shone forth in times of persecution. It is not surprising that they modeled their suffering after the martyrs of the early church.

The author begins with a brief description of Anabaptism and its major tenets. He argues that discipleship was extremely important for the Anabaptists who took the Sermon on the Mount so seriously that many practiced the sharing of material possessions. Spirituality within the Anabaptists movement took on particular themes. It was more active than medieval monasticism and was carried out within the context of the entire community. One of Anabaptism's most important themes was spiritual renewal. The rejection of state control over religious beliefs and the denial of the entire

sacramental system led to their persecution and yet was a vital part of their spiritual life. They saw themselves as returning to the purity of the early church and desired a fresh break with medieval tradition.

The author arranges his chapters in topical order and covers a wide range of topics including the Apostles' Creed, regeneration, word and spirit, discipleship, prayer and meditation and letters of faith and encouragement. The common theme throughout these selections is the strong personal and communal commitment to Christ. The chronology of the book runs from 1524 to 1684. The author provides a helpful introduction to each chapter along with prefaces for some of the more important selections.

The inclusion of Menno Simons's account of his conversion is especially interesting. Menno struggled for a full decade with his decision to leave the Roman church. Given the persecuted and scattered nature of Anabaptist life, it is not surprising that one would count the cost carefully before making the plunge. Written at the age of fifty-eight, Menno explained how he was so strongly called by the Holy Spirit and grew so weary of what he considered to be the hypocrisy of the priesthood that he finally could wait no longer to make the move to Anabaptism. The emotion that Menno displays is quite moving and indicates the level of his commitment to following Christ at any cost.

Dyck considers the section from Pietersz' *The Way to the City of Peace* the most important selection in the book. This piece attacks the worldliness of seventeenth-century society and contains a very interesting criticism of smoking. Dyck categorizes it as "spiritual, devotional pilgrim literature" within the same literary genre as Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*. This type of work took the place of an actual pilgrimage to a holy place by substituting a spiritual journey.

The major weakness of this book is that the author fails to distinguish between various forms of Anabaptism. There was a world of difference between the Swiss Brethren and the revolutionaries in Münster, or between contemplatives such as David Joris and the principal author of the *Schleitheim Confession*, Michael Sattler. Certainly, the sixteenth century Anabaptists were anything but a monolithic group. Dyck makes no distinction and includes selections of various "Anabaptist" traditions within the same chapters. This will undoubtedly prove bewildering to the reader and is unnecessary given the tremendous output of scholarly material on the "Radical Reformation" since the 1960s. The purpose of the book, however, is to present classic devotional selections from this broad tradition. The selected bibliography, general index and Scripture index make this volume more usable.

Martin I. Klauber

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School and Barat College, Lake Forest, IL

German Calvinism in the Confessional Age: The Covenant Theology of Caspar Olevianus. By Lyle D. Bierma. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996, 201 pp.

Caspar Olevianus is best known to scholars of the post-Reformation period for his role in the composition of the *Heidelberg Catechism* along with his colleague Zacharias Ursinus. Ursinus has the reputation of being the greater theologian of the two and Olevianus the better preacher, but Bierma's work shows that Olevianus was a significant theologian in his own right. Furthermore, he was one of the most important figures in the development of Reformed theology in the Palatinate.

Post-Reformation theology has experienced somewhat of a resurgence in recent years as a host of scholars led by Richard Muller have rehabilitated these figures from the charge of destroying the Christocentric purity of early reformers such as Calvin and Luther. Bierma's analysis of Olevianus fits within the Muller framework, which is not surprising since both studied under David Steinmetz at Duke. Bierma dismisses the

traditional notion that covenant theology was an antidote to the excessive predestinarianism of Reformed scholastics such as Beza. In fact, Bierma notes that many of the covenant theologians held to a strong form of supralapsarian, double-predestinationism.

Covenant theology is also quite relevant to American history because its legacy was passed over to the early Puritans who used William Ames's *Marrow of Sacred Divinity* as one of their major theological texts. Olevianus was a major figure in the early development of covenant theology. Bierma's goal is to discover what Olevianus had to say about the covenant and to place him within the framework of the history of the development of this form of theology.

The author recognizes Olevianus as a transitional figure between the first and second generation reformers and the well-developed federal theology of the seventeenth century. Olevianus was not a full-blown federalist. His theological system used the covenant as a major theme, but he still organized his system around the Apostles' Creed. For Olevianus, the covenant was a unifying theme rather than the controlling theme. One of the major reasons for Olevianus's development of the covenant was his education in Roman law. He used legal terminology to clarify and explain the biblical concept of the covenant.

Bierma traces the development of the conception of the covenant from the first-generation reformers (Zwingli) to the second generation (Musculus, Bullinger and Calvin) and notes that as all of these theologians were dealing with the threat of Anabaptism, they developed their concept of the covenant within the context of their discussion of the sacraments and the relationship between the OT and the NT. Real changes in the use of the covenant came in the third generation as the threat of Anabaptism waned. Theologians such as Ursinus and Olevianus began to use the covenant throughout their entire theological system rather than in just a couple of *loci*.

Is the covenant relationship between God and his people unilateral or bilateral? This is one of the most important questions related to the development of covenant theology. If it is unilateral, it leaves open the charge of antinomianism. If it is bilateral, it can potentially make man's fulfillment of his end of the contract as a work, thereby questioning the doctrine of justification by faith. Bierma argues that Olevianus portrayed the covenant as having bilateral and unilateral aspects, in contrast to all sixteenth-century Reformed theologians who saw it as unilateral. Olevianus answers the charge of synergism by explaining that the ability of people to fulfill their part of the bargain is entirely dependent upon God. Olevianus, therefore, followed his Reformed forebearers in his doctrine of human depravity.

Bierma also concludes that Olevianus recognized three covenants in the Bible that his Reformed predecessors did not see. Bierma notes, however, that these covenants are not well developed in Olevianus's theological system. These "new" covenants included a pretemporal covenant between the Father and the Son whereby the Son obligated himself to complete his redemptive work. A second covenant was the covenant of creation whereby God gave us natural law. This *foedus creationis* was annulled by the Fall, but man still owed obedience to God. The failure to obey would result in punishment. Natural law was not completely erased, but weakened, by human depravity. A third covenant was between man and Satan which resulted from the Fall. Here, Adam paid homage to the devil and believed his promise that Adam would not die and would become like God. The only way to break the *foedus Satanae* is through redemption in Christ.

This monograph is the revised version of Bierma's dissertation written over fifteen years ago. The book was set to be published by Labyrinth Press, but technical difficulties with the publisher delayed its publication. Finally, when Baker bought the rights to Labyrinth, the book came out. It represents the state of scholarship of post-Reformation Reformed thought up to about 1984. There has been a vast amount of material published on the post-Reformation period since that time. This particular book does not reflect these recent publications. Bierma's conclusions, however, probably would not

have changed significantly had he updated the book. His work on Olevianus and the *Heidelberg Catechism* is a significant contribution to our understanding of the development of Reformed theology in this important era of formation.

Martin I. Klauber

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School and Barat College, Lake Forest, IL

Politics, Religion and the British Revolutions: The Mind of Samuel Rutherford. By John Coffey. Cambridge Studies in Early Modern British History. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997, xii + 304 pp., \$59.95.

For a superb analysis of the life and career of Samuel Rutherford (1600–61) and his impact on theology and political theory, this is the work to consult. I have reversed the order from that provided in the book title. Not only does theology have priority in Rutherford's thought—and, therefore, is the window for understanding his life and work—but the author himself has mastered his subject by virtue of his own command of theology, Reformation and modern. This book will prove invaluable for understanding this period in British ecclesiastical and political history, while at the same time providing the necessary background for understanding the American scene today. Coffey is to be commended for skillfully guiding his readers through difficult and complex issues in Calvinist political theory. He correctly sees the ambiguities and the complexities in Rutherford's thinking as grounds for divergent readings of Rutherford held by contemporary Reformed theologians, both Reconstructionist and non-Reconstructionist. Happily, Coffey's argument effectively calls into question the theonomist interpretation of God's law for civil rule.

After an opening introduction highlighting the contemporary relevance of Rutherford, Coffey proceeds to survey his life as scholar, Puritan pastor and theologian, political theorist, ecclesiastical statesman and national prophet. This fascinating and absorbing study is exceedingly well written. One almost forgets just how complex the issues addressed really are. In the course of discussion, Coffey helpfully identifies both strengths and weaknesses in Rutherford's work. By the end of the book the reader, hopefully, can better appreciate the daunting (if not impossible) task of constructing a Reformed/Protestant doctrine of natural law which would appeal to secular political theorists. Perhaps we theologians should be content "to render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's." I am not urging Christians to abdicate their participation in the public square, but rather reminding us to let the church be the church. We must not at any point or to any degree confuse the mission of the church with that of the civil magistracy. (The legitimate exercise of civil rule is itself a manifestation of God's common grace in the world.) This, it seems to me, is the lesson we must learn from the life and teachings of Rutherford.

Rutherford was a highly respected Scottish Covenanter, a delegate to the Westminster Assembly, and author of the influential treatise, *Lex, Rex* (1644), dealing with civil rule and the right of disobedience against ungodly magistrates. It is this writing which receives primary attention in Coffey's study. Although an articulate exponent of Reformed covenant theology, Rutherford, as Coffey convincingly argues, failed to attain a correct understanding of the relationship between church and state as defined in the Bible. His conception of a religiously-based, covenantal nation and natural law theory proved ultimately irreconcilable. Coffey rightly labels *Lex, Rex* as "a deeply Thomistic book" (p. 152), one which assumes "the compatibility of natural reason's conclusions and God's revelation in Scripture" (p. 153). (See further my "Reformation Politics: The Relevance of Old Testament Ethics in Calvinist Political Theory," *JETS* 29 [1986] 179–191.)

It was not only Rutherford's writing of *Lex, Rex* that has shown him to be a skilled controversialist; it was also his defense of divine-right Presbyterianism. With tireless energy Rutherford engaged in several ecclesiastical disputes. To be sure, the political and ecclesiastical issues of his day were closely intertwined. In this study Coffey exposes "the fundamental tension in Rutherford's ecclesiastical thought between the idea of the church as a pure gathering of the godly and the idea of the church as a comprehensive national institution." He contends: "This tension can be said to parallel the tension we have seen in *Lex, Rex* between the politics of natural reason and the politics of true religion" (p. 189). Alongside his devotional and polemical writings, Rutherford was a passionate preacher, a man of intense emotion. Coffey captures well Rutherford's colorful and, at times, eccentric personality. All told, Rutherford was a remarkable and captivating figure in seventeenth-century Calvinism, a tower in the midst of storms.

The various stands of Rutherford's life can best be brought together by seeing Rutherford first and foremost as a prophet of God's covenant, one in a long line of prophets (extending back to OT times) calling wayward sinners to repentance, obedience and devotion to God's law. Writes Coffey: "Rutherford's preaching and writing in the 1630s provides us with a classic example of 'the Scottish jeremiah tradition'. At the root of this tradition lay the assumption that a covenant existed between God and his chosen people, one which made analogies between Scotland and Israel wholly appropriate" (p. 228). Coffey concludes: "The supreme irony of Rutherford's life was that he had misread the times. He lived not at the end of history, but at the end of an era in which religion had formed a sacred canopy covering every area of life, and in which the principle of 'one realm, one religion' had been taken for granted. There lay ahead not the kingdom of God on earth but a world in which religion would eventually be pushed to the margins of political life" (p. 255). In brief, Rutherford "was trying to save a sinking ship. The fragmentation of Protestantism was too far advanced, the demands of intolerance too onerous, the attractions of pluralism too great" (ibid).

If the church is to speak prophetically in our day, it is necessary that Reformed/Protestant Christians understand that, contrary to the thinking of the framers of the *Westminster Confession*, the state has not been given the task of either protecting or contending for the biblical faith. And whatever the political vicissitudes, the church alone wields the sword of the Spirit. To avoid repeating the mistakes of the past, the church must learn that her warfare is spiritual, not temporal. Anything else would be a betrayal of covenant theology, rightly interpreted. (Compare the study by Charles S. McCoy and J. Wayne Baker, *Fountainhead of Federalism: Heinrich Bullinger and the Covenantal Tradition* and my book review in *WTJ* 54 [1992] 396–400.)

Coffey's study is not easy reading, but it is exceedingly worthwhile. And as one would expect from a work of this caliber, an excellent and comprehensive bibliography is appended, including among the primary sources Rutherford's many letters, sermons and treatises.

Mark W. Karlberg
Warminster, PA

The Federal Theology of Thomas Boston. By A. T. B. McGowan. Rutherford Studies in Historical Theology. Edinburgh: Paternoster, 1997, 228 pp., n.p.

The reading of Andrew McGowan's book, what began initially as a doctoral study under Professor James Torrance, is both a delight and a disappointment. Generally speaking, the author evinces a solid grasp of the rudiments of Reformed theology, as surveyed in his treatment of the writings of the important Scottish minister and theologian Thomas Boston (1676–1732). From the standpoint of vigorous academic schol-

arship, however, McGowen's discussion is at times shallow. The work suffers from a lack of adequate interaction with the secondary literature on the historical development of covenant theology, particularly interaction with the numerous critical studies that have appeared in the last two decades or so. As a popular treatment, however, McGowen's book should find a useful niche.

The "Foreword" by Sinclair Ferguson is a rather curious piece of writing. Both McGowen and Ferguson studied under James Torrance, yet they arrived at contrary assessments of federal theology. This fact is not brought out by Ferguson. Rather, one is given the impression that these two are in basic agreement. Comparison of the present study with Ferguson's doctoral dissertation proves otherwise; see his "The Doctrine of the Christian Life in the Teaching of Dr. John Owen" (2 vols., Ph.D. thesis, University of Aberdeen, 1979). The difference between these two writers can be stated this way: whereas McGowen is highly critical of the Torrance school, Ferguson is sympathetic. The Torrance school objects vigorously to federal theology's doctrine of the twofold covenants. The chief issue in this debate is whether or not the contrast between the two covenants, the "covenant of works" in creation and the "covenant of grace" in redemption, is biblically warranted.

In the course of surveying Boston's teaching on the subject of the application of redemption (what in the science of dogmatics has been designated the *ordo salutis*, the order of salvation, in distinction from *historia salutis*, the history of salvation), McGowen convincingly demonstrates that the views of Scottish divine Thomas Boston were in full accord with traditional Calvinistic teaching. After reviewing Boston's doctrine of the covenants, McGowen proceeds to a discussion of Boston's understanding of Christ's person and work. In sum: "Jesus Christ, the incarnate Son of God, entered into a covenant with God on behalf of the elect. As a public person, or federal head, he stood where Adam stood and succeeded where Adam failed. He rendered to God full and perfect obedience thus fulfilling the conditions of the covenant of grace, namely, his seed, the elect. For the elect the covenant is absolute and not conditional, resulting in justification by the righteousness of Christ" (p. 15).

How, more precisely, did scholastic Reformed orthodoxy (of which Boston is representative) conceive of the relationship between the "covenant of works" and the "covenant of grace"? The answer to this question is not as simple as some might suppose. The modern interpreter must address the vexing question whether or not revived scholasticism in seventeenth Reformed Protestantism was, at all points, a help or hindrance in the theological enterprise. Specifically, was the reintroduction of scholastic distinctions and terminology justified in every instance? Problematic also was appeal to the rational "proofs" for the existence of God. Interaction with the important studies of Richard Muller, among others, would have enriched McGowen's argument.

Basic to understanding the contrasting covenants ("works" and "grace") is the Protestant doctrine on "Law" and "Gospel." Apart from a proper understanding and application of the antithetical principles of law and grace, i.e. "Law and Gospel," the Protestant doctrine of justification by faith (alone) and the Reformed doctrine of the covenants are unintelligible. It was this concern that became the focal issue in the Marrow controversy. In that debate Boston and several others came to the defense of teaching found in *The Marrow of Modern Divinity*, a treatise written about a century earlier. That publication was the centerpiece in the dispute, the work which Donald MacLeod correctly identified as "quintessential Federal Theology" (p. xvi). McGowen suggests that Boston "was himself one of the finest popular exponents of that theological perspective, establishing it among the common people by his influential volume, *The Fourfold State*" (p. 206). He maintains that "Boston believed that the parallel between Adam and Christ was the *key* to understanding the Christian faith" (p. 25, emphasis mine).

Serving as a *leitmotif* in his book, McGowen argues that the covenant of works "is an act of God's grace" (p. 4). He says: "It is of the utmost importance to grasp the fact

that even the first covenant was an act of condescension and grace" (p. 5). "In other words," explains McGowen, "God was not obliged to give man anything, but out of the riches of his grace he entered into this covenant and promised a great and eternal benefit, upon condition of obedience. To regard the covenant of works, then, as a matter of putting law before grace is simply to misunderstand the nature of the covenant—at least as Boston taught it" (p. 11). This formulation of the biblical covenants, however, is subject to criticism. The modern interpreter must reckon with the fact that remnants of Roman theology, notably, distinctions that were speculative in origin, found a place in Reformed theology, beginning as early as the late sixteenth century.

Corruption had been (re)introduced into dogmatic formulation when the scholastic distinction between nature and grace was applied to the original order of creation, what the Reformed federalists identified as the first covenant (the "covenant of works" or the "covenant of nature"). It became commonplace in orthodox scholasticism to distinguish between an initial state of nature and a subsequent covenantal arrangement, one that was established by God with Adam as federal head of the human race. Another distinction which (directly or indirectly) factored into the federal interpretation of the divine covenants was that between *meritum de congruo* and *meritum de condigno*. Many of the Reformed federalists came to view the covenantal order imposed on the prior state of nature as a *gracious* arrangement, wherein Adam would merit—not in strict justice, but congruously—the reward of eternal life promised by God upon his successful completion of probation. "Thus Adam would not have been left forever in a state of subjection to the covenant of works," explains McGowen, "but there would have come a time when God judged that Adam had been obedient for a reasonable period" (12). It was deemed fitting or "reasonable" that God would so favor Adam with everlasting life on grounds of his obedience. The dual question of the origin and validity of the scholastic dichotomy between nature and grace and the Roman conceptions of merit is not addressed by McGowen. This is a significant oversight. When our author speaks of Boston's "gracious form of federal theology" (p. 209), is he suggesting that there is a *legalistic* form of federal theology? I think not. Legalism and federal theology, he would agree, are altogether contrary systems of doctrine.

The criticisms raised in this book review are, generally speaking, applicable to Philip Ryken's related study, "Thomas Boston as Preacher of the *Fourfold State*" (D.Phil. thesis, University of Oxford, 1995). In our day, the task of separating the wheat from the chaff in post-Reformation Reformed thought is the pressing need for those engaged in the study of the history of doctrine. Scholastic federalism did have its shortcomings. But these considerations aside, *The Federal Theology of Thomas Boston* is a welcome addition to the growing corpus of historical-theological studies from an orthodox Reformed point of view. Clearly, the Barthians do not have the last word in critiquing the strengths and weaknesses of confessional Reformed orthodoxy. McGowen convincingly shows that they need to listen again to what Boston and other scholastic dogmaticians have to say. Good scholarship does not import new meaning into old words. The Rutherford House is to be commended for making McGowen's doctoral study available to the wider reading public.

Mark W. Karlberg
Warminster, PA

The Domestication of Transcendence: How Modern Thinking about God Went Wrong. By William C. Placher. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996, 222 pp., \$20.00 paper.

William Placher, Professor of Philosophy and Religion at Wabash College, is often cited as the "unofficial historian of postliberal theology." In his recent book, *The Domes-*

tication of Transcendence, Placher directs his attention not to the modern inability to believe in God but to the “characteristically trivial images of God” produced in the modern era (p. xi). His thesis is that traditional thinking about God underwent a radical change beginning with the seventeenth century and that certain elements of classical theism need to be critically reclaimed to correct the errors of modernity.

Placher argues that seventeenth-century thought brought an increased confidence in human ability to understand God that triggered a corresponding decrease in acceptable theological reasoning that stems from faith. He substantiates his claim by comparing the views about God of Aquinas, Luther and Calvin with their major interpreters in the early modern period. “Before the seventeenth century, most Christian theologians were struck by the mystery, the wholly otherness of God, and the inadequacy of any human categories as applied to God” (p. 6). With the modern turn, God was subjected to the same analysis and systematizing as objects of this world.

Placher first examines Aquinas’s five proofs for the existence of God and concludes that they are not really meant to prove God because Aquinas operates within the context of faith and does not claim that the “proofs” demonstrate God’s existence. Placher also seeks to correct misunderstandings about Aquinas’s analogical language about God. For Aquinas, terms such as “good” and “wise” in reference to God are neither univocal or equivocal, but analogical. Yet, we do not know exactly how the analogical terms apply to God. However, if God language is not univocal, how does one attain certainty of belief? Aquinas would answer that belief about God gains certainty on the basis of divine authority and the inner working of the Holy Spirit, not by rational proofs. Placher remarks that Aquinas has not given us a “metaphysical system that would place God within our understanding . . . but metalinguistic rules that remind us of the limitations of our language about God” (p. 31).

In a different way, Luther’s theology of the cross also spoke of a mysterious God. The path to salvation does not lie in human achievement but in the agony of recognizing one’s sins. The God that one meets in one’s suffering is a suffering God. This would mean that God remains hidden even in God’s self-revelation on the cross, for a suffering God transcends our comprehension and can only be grasped by faith. Thus, revelation does not dissolve the divine mystery, but rather leads us into it.

Calvin’s theology is characterized by a reluctance to speculate beyond the biblical texts and a willingness to leave questions unanswered. His aim was to help his readers develop the right orientation rather than give them exhaustive and systematized knowledge. For Calvin, knowledge of God is limited by God’s accommodation to our language and capacities. Moreover, knowledge of God cannot be divorced from reverential piety and the work of the Holy Spirit. Thus, knowledge of faith is grounded on assurance rather than comprehension, and assurance comes through the inner working of the Holy Spirit.

Placher then turns to the modern period and its domestication of the unknowable God. The unknowability of God characteristic of the theologies of Aquinas, Luther and Calvin was replaced by univocal language and rational arguments. Placher traces this development in the Catholic tradition through Cardinal Cajetan and Francisco Suárez, in the Lutheran tradition through Johannes Quenstedt, and then in the Calvinist tradition through Francis Turretin. All were moving toward univocity. Philosophical and theological thinking of the period maintained that God was similar enough to humans for humans to understand. God differed only in degree (omniscience, omnipotence, etc.). Thus, one could understand God through human language. The “shift to univocity” consequently marginalized the Trinity, for the Trinity cannot be rationally explained. Without the Spirit to give certainty, humans were left with only one option—to understand God through human categories. This shift obliterated the limits of human knowing that marked the thought of earlier Christian thinkers.

Reclaiming the mystery of God has far-reaching implications for how we do theology. For example, if God is a mystery, then divine action in the world is also a mystery.

Both Aquinas and Calvin taught that since God sustains all things, God is mysteriously in back of everything that happens in the world. Also, if God is a mystery, we are no longer sure what the terms “good” and “omnipotent” mean when referring to God and can therefore no longer engage in modern theodicy. Indeed, Placher argues that most theodicy done today is a product of the modern way of thinking about God and is thus defective.

Overall, the book is a significant contribution that is deserving of a wide readership. The only deficiency worthy of note is that Placher engages only three premodern theologians and then assumes that their thought is representative of the entire premodern tradition. The book’s primary virtues are that it shows some of the similarities and differences between premodern and postmodern thought about God and that it introduces Aquinas, Luther and Calvin into the postmodern dialogue. The book is a plea to reclaim what we have lost in the modern era—a sense of divine mystery and grace. It is a plea for contemporary theologians to be content with ambiguities and with how little we know about God. It is in a sense a plea to critically engage the Christian tradition without viewing it through the lens of modernity.

Richard A. Young
Chattanooga, TN

Knowledge of the Self-Revealing God in the Thought of Thomas Forsyth Torrance. By John Douglas Morrison. Issues in Systematic Theology Vol. 2. New York: Peter Lang, 1997, 386 pp., n.p.

Titles are getting cumbersome of late, but don’t let this one put you off. Morrison’s work is a well-organized and clear exposition of Professor Torrance’s theological epistemology.

Morrison’s fundamental concern is that Torrance’s efforts to eliminate dualist thought from his own theological project have fallen prey to an internal inconsistency. Torrance has his theological mentors (Kierkegaard and Barth) to blame for a transcendentalism which “has forced a schism within his theological thinking so that a gulf is found finally to exist between divine and human at the point of space-time relation in the world” (p. 319). As a result the only meeting point where divine and human knowing may coincide is through an “existential Word-event.” This Word-event is a timeless encounter where “the knowing subject’s historical existence and very humanity [are] finally lost or reduced as one is lifted up to the Word transcendently beyond the historical domain of the existing self” (p. 317). Kierkegaard, Barth and Torrance’s conception of “the way, the place, the mode, and the nature of the Word of God in our history” (p. 317) is in need of re-thinking. Their conception carries with it an implicit imperative that God can only be known directly and personally via a supra-historical event-encounter with God.

Morrison finds this to be inconsistent with Torrance’s stated objective to offer a unitary and realist theological paradigm and offers a corrective of his own, drawing on the thought of John Calvin and, to a lesser extent, Hans Frei.

Taking an important cue from the research of Ray S. Anderson, conducted twenty-three years ago under Torrance’s supervision, he draws in the idea of “historical transcendence” and ties it to Calvin’s understanding of Scripture. Scripture is the “. . . ‘inspired’ interaction, response, witness and interpretation” of the eternal Word’s incarnate reality (p. 330) and as such participates ontologically, through the ministry of the Spirit, in the movement of divine disclosure. Contra Torrance, whose position

forces him to understand Scripture as a “disposable conduit,” Morrison wants to expand the Barthian understanding of revelation as Being-Act and Act-Being to incorporate Scripture. The result would be Being-Act-Interpretation (Scripture). This upholds the transcendence of God while still providing a concrete point in human history for the divine-human relation. Like the Word made flesh, Scripture should be understood analogically and functionally as “kenotic” (p. 332). Torrance’s tendency to downplay Scripture as the conduit of revelation is then drawn alongside Hans Frei’s concern to pay close attention to the actual textuality of Scripture as a revelatory structure.

Morrison is fundamentally concerned that Torrance “arbitrarily limits the historical Word to the incarnation” (p. 337). This “limitation” is not as arbitrary as it might seem, if attention were turned to the theological personalism that underlies all of Torrance’s thought (as well as Barth’s) as opposed to the realist/objectivist category that is often employed. This would nudge interpreters of Torrance to look to his anthropological, ecclesiological and sacramental thought for the “historical transcendence” that Morrison grounds in Scripture. A consideration of what Torrance means when he comments that the church is “the earthly-historical form of [Christ’s] presence” as well as being Christ’s body would be especially helpful. These things cannot be said of Scripture (even though Scripture plays a vital role in the self-understanding of the Church) for reasons that substantiate Torrance’s personalism and hence his thought regarding Scripture. The Church, not Scripture, is truly “kenotic,” for without the Church Scripture would also have no historical context or contemporaneity.

Morrison’s work does point out an important concern that needs attention, and his proposal here seeks to address it: the mediation of the Word in human history. Colin Gunton has taken up this theme as well in his book *A Brief Theology of Revelation* (T & T Clark, 1995), proposing that a “deficient pneumatology” is to blame for proposals that do not take historical mediation seriously. Much work needs to be done in this area and Morrison furthers the conversation by drawing the thought of Torrance into constructive use. Morrison’s exposition of Torrance’s thought is clear and cogent, and he has mastered a great deal of material from diverse fields of inquiry. This is a valuable gift to those who continue to draw upon the thought of Professor Torrance for their own theological work. Morrison has also pointed out a weakness in Torrance’s epistemology that needs to be taken seriously, but it does not justify the claim that a restoration of the role of Scripture as a historical embodiment of God’s eternal Word will heal the dualism he has pointed out.

Eric G. Flett
King’s College, London

Reasons of the Heart: Recovering Christian Persuasion. By William Edgar. Grand Rapids: Baker/Hourglass, 1996, 126 pp., n.p. paper.

As Professor of Apologetics at Westminster Theological Seminary in Philadelphia, William Edgar stands in the Reformed tradition of presuppositional apologetics. The doyen of Westminster apologists, Cornelius Van Til (whom Edgar studied under), insisted that human thinking was not autonomous but rather depended on (presupposed) the self-revealing triune God. Edgar’s avowed purpose is to enlarge the presuppositionalist net to include not only the epistemic foundations of thought, but also the various dimensions of personal and spiritual selfhood. He senses that the contemporary situation poses new challenges for apologetics. Taking his cue from Pascal, Edgar argues that successful apologetics must now involve not only rational demonstration, but also

the total person's "reasons of the heart." As the center of personal and spiritual life, the heart both integrates human cognition, affection and will, and serves as the seat of God-consciousness. The ultimate goal of presuppositional apologetics is the Christian conversion of the total person.

Central to Edgar's presuppositionalist approach are four principles or (not necessarily sequential) starting points: the *point of contact* with the unbeliever's existential condition; the *disclosure* to the unbeliever that his presuppositions cannot resolve his predicament; *homecoming*, the presentation of the cure of the gospel in Jesus Christ; and the *matter of plausibility*, correlating the gospel solution with the psychological, social and cultural situation of the unbeliever so as to secure assurance and build faith. Some examples are provided to demonstrate how these principles work in various apologetic endeavors: 1) in the "religion is an illusion" charge, which is shown to be reversible in disclosure; 2) in religious pluralism, wherein human religiosity is evidence of the helplessness that only homecoming can heal; 3) in the mystery of evil, which is resolvable only in the atonement of Christ; 4) in religious doubt, best dealt with as faith seeking understanding. The responses portrayed in these instances border on the cliché, but they do exemplify the varieties of the heart's reasons in any turning.

Edgar has accurately prescribed the task of apologetics in our post-modern, post-rationalistic age. The result may be startling to not a few contemporary defenders of the faith. While it could be said that he stretches the meaning of classical apologetics, it is better to view this work as the necessary retrieval of the biblical concept (the proposal is biblically defended in two chapters). Edgar-style apologetics turns out to be a spiritual activity of the highest order. Centered in the worship of God, it *demand*s that *traditional apologetics be transformed into Christian witness* and lifestyle evangelism—the living out and articulate defense of the faith aimed at persuasion and conversion. There is little to be criticized in a book that calls the church into passionate engagement with the unchurched for the sake of the gospel.

As an Hourglass Book (imprint of Baker), *Reasons of the Heart* is a "tract for the times" addressed to the broader evangelical community. Edgar's writing is lucid (endnotes are used so as not to interrupt the flow of the text), and philosophical and theological concepts have been adequately translated for the broader audience. *Reasons of the Heart* belongs in church Bible study groups and undergraduate course in apologetics, evangelism and Christian witness. It should also be considered as supplementary reading at the graduate level.

Amos Yong
Boston University, Boston, MA

The Moral Quest: Foundations of Christian Ethics. By Stanley J. Grenz. Downers Grove, InterVarsity, 1997, 350 pp.

This is a fine book of Christian ethics from an evangelical perspective. As with all of Stan Grenz's work, it is a well-balanced engagement of the historical, contemporary, Biblical, theological and philosophical materials that are the central components in the advocacy of any Christian ethic.

Grenz writes to an educated audience, but is careful to define terms and concepts so that others without formal instruction in the subject matter may appreciate and benefit from what he is saying. The book is well documented and there are numerous paths to follow for anyone who wishes to delve further into the resources behind his argument. *The Moral Quest* is divided into three sections: historical survey (chapters 2–4), contemporary survey (chapter 5) and theological construction (chapters 6–8).

Each section carries on a dialog with the chapters that precede and follow, giving the work a developmental flow that strengthens the power of Grenz's argument.

After an opening chapter pointing out the need for, and renewed interest in, ethical discussion, Grenz begins his historical survey by tracing the development of the Western ethical tradition from the Greeks, through the Old and New Testaments, and into church history where he gives attention to the ethical thought of Augustine, Aquinas and Luther. A chapter devoted to contemporary proposals engages the writings of twentieth-century theologians whose ethical work Grenz broadly categorizes and briefly discusses. There is very little critical engagement or synthesis here and only enough space to introduce the personalities (thirteen of them!) and their central ideas. Additional space in this area would have strengthened the usefulness of the book. The final chapters continue the development of Grenz's theological project as he draws ethical implications from his interpretive motif of "community." He does this by focusing on the Trinitarian nature of the Christian faith and the creation of humanity in the image of God. Upon this theological foundation he builds a theology of "comprehensive love" as the content of a distinctly Christian ethic. Grenz seeks to ground the Christian theology of love in terms broader than the traditional focus on agape. He does this by pointing out the relevance of all of the "four loves" for the ethical health of the Christian community in the world: agape, philia, storge, and eros.

This book fills a large gap in the literature on Christian ethics and will be very useful for some years to come due to its broad scope, clear organization and creative theological work that seeks to engage contemporary culture while offering balanced critiques from an evangelical perspective.

On a more critical note, however, the implications of Grenz's work for the field of social ethics is only given occasional attention. Many of the illustrations provided are more "personal" in nature and we are given no concrete hints as to what "comprehensive love" might look like if it were socially embodied beyond the Christian community. Cause for this might be found in the fact that Grenz develops his ethic "from below"—moving from the field of general philosophical ethics, to religious ethics, to Christian ethics. Theological construction that moves in this direction is in danger of isolating the created order from the redeemed order by positing Christian ethics as the fulfillment of a more general human quest. This drives a wedge between church and state, private truth and public truth (each sphere being governed by its own principles) and makes Christian ethics simply the best *conceptual* grounding for moral action. Does the theological ethic outlined here have the force of public truth, or is its power limited to only the communities and persons who adopt it? One wishes Dr. Grenz had drawn out the social implications of this ethic more explicitly.

Eric G. Flett
King's College, London

Making Sense of Your World: A Biblical Worldview. By Gary Phillips and William E. Brown. Salem: Sheffield, 1996, 291 pp., \$13.95 paper.

Making Sense is an interesting introduction to contemporary Christian philosophy and apologetics. The goal of the authors is an explication and provision of a Christian worldview in light of competing religious and philosophical positions. *Making Sense* grapples with a number of historic problems and human responses including anthropology, ontology, pluralism, evil and the development of a Christian point of view. The material is readable and creatively presented and interspersed with quotations from experts in a variety of fields and relevant case studies. It can be loosely placed in the

current tradition of evangelical self-critique alongside such works as David Wells's *No Place for Truth*.

The work is divided into two sections: Part 1, "A View of the World;" and Part 2, "A View for the World." The first section deals primarily with an analysis of competing worldviews, for example, a comparison of naturalism, transcendentalism and theism and their prospective impact upon peoples' religious ideology. In naturalism we discover the roots of atheism, humanism and hedonism, while transcendentalism represents a cover term for New-Age spirituality including pantheism, panentheism and polytheism. A theistic perspective, on the other hand, lends itself to deistic explanations as well as a more traditional God concept. In this way, *Making Sense* is a book about gaining perspective; it is the stuff of religious philosophy comprehending roots and influences including societal and even subconscious populist positions which subtly oppose a biblical *Weltanschauung*. Consider the following: "The array of worldview options present in the United States is vast and confusing. Nowhere is this more clearly seen than in the world of entertainment, especially Hollywood films. The big box office draws offer a kaleidoscope of worldviews that no doubt contributes to the desultory quality of intellectual life in America. . . . A theistic view of life and world is rarely treated as credible" (p. 38). Conversely, the essentials of a Biblical worldview include a credible explanation of Christian theism, arguments for God's existence, an understanding of the revelatory process and the systematic confrontation of nonbiblical positions.

While the first section introduces the formulation of a Biblical worldview, the second section personalizes it via a lively discussion of the self, the family, the church and the world. The reader is exhorted to conform his or her thinking to a Scriptural model in all areas. Pragmatically, Christian ethics must be lived out in the lives of individuals in obedience to divine imperative. Failure to comprehend the Biblical message results in moral chaos and ineffectiveness—a failure of worldview.

The problem, of course, with books of this type—attempts at holistic philosophy and systematics—is that the nature of the project is unachievable. Postmodern thinkers have decried Diderot-like efforts to create any worldview that hopes to incorporate all human endeavor under its banner. The world is too difficult and complex an entity to ever be made sense of. Christianity itself represents a totalizing worldview that many would argue is too tightly woven. It is unable to allow for scientific progress and freedom of thought. The authors bravely confront this critique in an extended apologetic that is the work itself.

Eric A. Maass
Buffalo Grove, IL

Getting the Message: A Plan for Interpreting and Applying the Bible. By Daniel M. Doriani. Phillipsburg: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1996, 255 pp., n.p.

Doriani, professor of NT at Covenant Theological Seminary, has written technical articles on Biblical interpretation and has presented his "CAPTOR" plan of interpretation in one-day seminars at local churches.

His book provides a method for Bible study intended to help the reader move from "a casual and devotional reading of Scripture to a more theological and exegetical reading" (p. 10). The major chapters of the book relate to "phases of interpretation" and application of the Bible that follow the acronym "CAPTOR" (C = context, A = analysis, P = problems, T = themes, O = obligations, R = reflection). Five appendixes deal with more specialized information.

A major strength of the book is that it is well written and easy to read. Each chapter includes clear explanations, basic principles in interpretation, examples from the Bible and practice exercises. Modern-day illustrations, charts and diagrams are all used to portray key points.

Many useful principles are explained in the book that can help readers become more attentive to details of the Biblical texts. College and seminary students will find more technical guidance related to matters of interpretation in endnotes and appendixes. The author provides many fine interpretations of particular passages. He provides helpful information concerning narrative and discourse analysis.

The author seems to have too many audiences in mind. The CAPTOR method would appeal most to lay people, whereas footnotes and appendixes are more relevant for college and seminary students. The result is a book which is too long (255 pages) for a lay audience, but not sufficiently technical for a college and seminary audience. Although the CAPTOR method is easy to remember, it is problematic as a sequence of exegetical steps. It is inappropriate that application (O) precedes reflection (R).

Doriani divides all Biblical texts into two literary forms: narrative and discourse (p. 61). Little attention is given to the difference between literal and figurative language. Doriani argues that attention to literary genres should be relegated to later more specialized study. He devotes one appendix to applying various genres but does not give much attention to interpreting different genres. One wonders how one can do responsible exegesis and theological reflection without attention to literary genres.

Doriani argues for a very Christocentric reading of the whole Bible. He claims that "Every passage in the Bible presents Christ both as the remedy for human fall-enness and is the end point of God's plan of salvation" (p. 171). Such a claim is problematic for the OT. It does not emerge from a careful reading of the OT, but is a theological presupposition that the writer assumes but does not prove.

Stephen A. Reed
Jamestown College, Jamestown, ND

Biblical Hermeneutics: A Comprehensive Introduction to Interpreting Scripture. Edited by Bruce Corley, Steve Lemke, Grant Lovejoy. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1996, xi + 419 pp., \$39.99.

This volume is an anthology written by 24 contributors, all of whom are former students or current or former faculty of Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary in Fort Worth, Texas (R. W. Bernard, T. V. Brisco, J. A. Brooks, B. Corley, L. L. Cranford, E. E. Ellis, M. J. Erickson, H. Freeman, R. L. Hatchett, R. Johnson, W. D. Kirkpatrick, T. D. Lea, S. W. Lemke, G. Lovejoy, H. L. McBeth, C. Miller, C. C. Newman, J. P. Newport, B. K. Putt, R. R. Reeves, D. R. Sanchez, R. B. Sloan, J. Spivey, and W. B. Tolar). The book grew out of a need in the introductory biblical hermeneutics course at Southwestern for a textbook that was "written for beginning students and that introduces them to biblical hermeneutics within a philosophical and historical context, yet with a practical goal in mind: actually to study the text in a systematic fashion that produces insights which will be lived and proclaimed in and through the church" (p. x).

The book's 22 chapters are divided into three parts: (1) "Biblical Hermeneutics in History," (2) "Implications of Authority, Inspiration, and Language," and (3) "Applying the Grammatical-Historical Method." Part one is a survey of the history of biblical interpretation from ancient Jewish hermeneutics to contemporary philosophical, literary and sociological hermeneutics. A chapter on early Baptist hermeneutics explores the Baptists' views of the authority, interpretation and application of Scripture during

their formative era. Part two discusses the theological issues of the inspiration, truthfulness and authority of the Bible, including discussion of the modes of inspiration and arguments for and against inerrancy. Chapters discussing human language as the vehicle for God's word and issues of Bible translation are also found here. Part three includes chapters on the grammatical-historical method, inductive Bible study methods, textual criticism and sermon preparation.

The book achieves its intent to be "comprehensive" by giving only cursory treatment to some essential topics and merely mentioning others in passing. Its greatest weakness is giving insufficient space to the important topic of how to read the various literary genres of Scripture. The chapter "Reading the Genres of Scripture" is one of the shortest in the book and covers narrative, poetry, letters and prophecy together with apocalypse in a total of only 11 pages of general discussion. This can be compared to the more than 100 pages devoted to understanding biblical genres in Klein, Blomberg and Hubbard (*Word*, 1993). If used as a text, this book will certainly need to be supplemented by Fee and Stuart (*How to Read the Bible for all Its Worth* [1993]), Kaiser and Silva (*An Introduction to Biblical Hermeneutics* [1994]) or Klein, Blomberg, Hubbard (*Introduction to Biblical Interpretation* [1993]). Curiously, the book shortchanges literary genres but includes good discussions of topics that might not be covered in a hermeneutics course at all. Perhaps this reflects the particular structure and content of the course at Southwestern, but it may limit the book's use as a text for courses elsewhere. For instance, textual criticism might better be covered in an introductory New Testament or a Greek exegesis course; nevertheless, more pages are devoted to it than to reading literary genres of the Bible. The chapter on Baptist hermeneutics and most of Part two deal primarily with topics that might be covered in a systematics course on the doctrine of Scripture. The three chapters on developing sermons is material well-suited for a course in homiletics.

As this content indicates, the implied audience of the book is narrowly defined to the seminary. The inclusion of three chapters on sermon preparation suggests that the intended audience is not just seminary students, but specifically those preparing for the pastorate. At least one chapter on general principles of application would have made this book more useful to a broader audience, such as undergraduate students. Students not preparing for the pastorate would otherwise benefit from this book, especially since it is targeted for the English-only Bible reader.

As a textbook, the volume suffers somewhat from being written by 24 different authors. There is little continuity from chapter to chapter, first principles are often restated, and several topics are discussed two or three times from various perspectives while others, such as discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism, receive only a passing mention. While redundancy from different perspectives may sometimes be good pedagogy, the discussions of repeated topics have no continuity from chapter to chapter and are not integrated.

There is little discussion of the philosophical foundations of hermeneutics, which is not necessarily a weakness in an introductory textbook to biblical interpretation. The chapter on "Contemporary Philosophical, Literary, and Sociological Hermeneutics" attempts to cover too much. It gives only three paragraphs to Gadamer, one page to deconstruction, and less than a page each to the liberation and feminist approaches. Structuralism and narrative criticism are each described in general terms in less than a page with no practical examples. A course that includes more discussion of the theoretical basis of hermeneutics and of reader-response theory would have to supplement with additional sources.

The book does have its strengths. It includes the broad sweep of topics typically addressed in an introductory course in biblical interpretation. It is written in a clear textbook style, defines terms as they are introduced, and is attractively presented. A

bibliography for further study is included at the end of each chapter. In addition, an appendix contains a 31-page bibliography of reference books and commentaries. The student will appreciate the extensive glossary that often gives a full paragraph to definitions. The introductory chapter, "A Student's Primer for Exegesis," is the most practical material in the book and provides seven concise steps to writing an exegetical term paper. The extended index will assist student review and study.

This book introduces a wide range of topics of relevance to biblical hermeneutics. For those not put off by the deliberate Southwestern Baptist perspective and who are able to supplement the chapters with additional readings, this volume provides a comparable alternative to Klein, Blomberg and Hubbard.

Karen H. Jobes
Westmont College, Santa Barbara, CA