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THE TYNDALE NEW TESTAMENT COMMENTARIES: A REVIEW ARTICLE

With the appearance of Leon Morris' commentary on the Gospel of Luke, the well-known series of Tyndale New Testament commentaries stands completed. It is appropriate now to take stock of the series as a whole and to assess what strengths and weaknesses may be evidenced. Although we shall be forced to do this in rather general terms, we shall have occasion to speak of the volumes individually and conclude with some general comments about the series.

It is perhaps worth saying at the outset that the Tyndale commentaries drew their name from Tyndale Press (not Tyndale House of Wheaton), the publishing arm of what was formerly the Inter-Varsity Fellowship of Great Britain (now officially named Universities and Colleges Christian Fellowship). The series, which has been concurrently published in this country by Eerdmans, is exclusively the product of British scholarship (if we may extend that designation to include Australia and New Zealand).

From its inception in 1956 to its completion in 1974, the series has been under the editorship of the distinguished R. V. G. Tasker, professor emeritus of New Testament exegesis at the University of London, who himself authored four of the twenty volumes (James, 2 Cor., John, Matt.). We can only regard ourselves as fortunate in that a lion's share of the series has gone to Tasker and Leon Morris, principal of Ridley College, Melbourne, who also authored four volumes in the series, including the last two to appear (1 and 2 Thess., 1 Cor., Rev., Luke). (It should be noted that for various reasons Tasker had taken Matthew on reassignment as did Morris the commentary on Luke.) Only one
other person authored more than one volume in the series, namely R. A. Cole, lecturer at Moore Theological College, Sydney (Mark, Galatians). The remaining ten volumes include well-known names: D. Guthrie (Pastoral Epistles), A. M. Stibbs (1 Peter), E. M. Blaiklock (Acts), R. P. Martin (Philippians), F. F. Bruce (Romans), J. R. W. Stott (Epistles of John), and E. M. B. Green (2 Peter and Jude), as well as a few lesser-known names: H. M. Carson (Colossians and Philemon), T. Hewitt (Hebrews), and F. Foulkes (Ephesians). The series as it stands is thus the product of 13 scholars and extends across an 18-year time span. The commentaries have, of course, enjoyed widespread popularity, both in Great Britain and in the U.S.A., and have gone through numerous reprints, although hitherto without any revision of the original editions.

As expressed in the editor’s general preface (which remains the same until the last volume), the primary concern of the series is to present exegetical commentaries that promote a truly Biblical theology, but also that include a full consideration of critical questions in the introductory sections and in various notes throughout the commentaries. In this review we shall first look at the handling of critical questions and then at the exegesis, our attention in the first instance being directed primarily to the introductions and in the second to the commentaries proper.

I. Questions of NT Criticism

Commentaries written for “students and serious readers of the New Testament” must of necessity confront the issues raised by contemporary NT criticism. That these commentaries intend to deal with such matters is indicated not only by the editor in his preface but also by the relative length of the introduction in each volume (the subtitle for each volume in the series is “An Introduction and Commentary”). How does the series do in handling the key questions of NT introduction and related critical issues?

a. Authorship and Dating of Disputed Books

One of the crucial concerns of introduction is the matter of authorship. With its evangelical orientation, the Tyndale commentaries regularly argue for the traditional conclusions concerning authorship and dating. But how effectively are these conclusions defended?

We begin with the Pauline corpus. So far as the Hauptbriefe (Gal., 1 Cor., 2 Cor., Rom.) and a few other epistles (1 Thess., Phil., Philem.) are concerned, there has of course been no serious questioning of Pauline authorship by even the more radical critical scholars. With respect to other matters, Cole carefully presents the argument for the North Galatia theory, says that “almost as good a case” can be made for the South Galatia theory, but then somewhat abruptly concludes it likely that Galatians was written to cities of South Galatia (and accordingly dates the epistle before the Council of Jerusalem). We may note that whereas Cole understands Gal. 2 as referring to the “famine relief” visit of Acts 11:27-30, Blaiklock regards Acts 15 as the parallel of Gal. 2. Morris and Tasker agree that Paul wrote four letters to Corinth that we are aware of, the first and third (or “painful”) letters being lost. Tasker is effective in arguing the unity of 2 Cor., describing 6:14—7:1 as a conscious digression and the change of tone in chs. 10-13 as Paul taking up the “recalcitrant minority.” F. F. Bruce, although allowing the circulation of different recensions of Romans, finds no insuperable reason why Rom. 16 cannot have been originally addressed by Paul to the church at Rome.

The remaining epistles of the Pauline corpus include those where authorship is in varying degree in doubt: 2 Thess., Col., Eph., and also the
Pastorals. Morris is superb on the authenticity of 2 Thess. The objections are clearly noted and effectively answered. Unfortunately the same cannot be said for Carson on Colossians. He makes mention of the problems and suggests answers, but all too quickly and effortlessly concludes that Pauline authorship is "inescapable." Less than two pages is given to the question in what is the thinnest volume by far in the entire series (112 pp.). Foulkes, by contrast, is very good on the authorship of Ephesians. The evidence is carefully and fully presented, despite the comment in his preface that the question is not important for the understanding of the epistle, and the conclusion is that it is far more likely that Paul, rather than an imitator of Paul, wrote Ephesians. The most difficult challenge of the Pauline corpus—the authorship of the Pastoral Epistles—fell to the able Donald Guthrie, and he has done his work exceptionally well. The authorship question is handled extensively and effectively, not only by means of a lengthy introduction but also in a 17-page appendix containing a detailed examination of (and answer to) P. N. Harrison's linguistic arguments against Pauline authorship. One cannot but be impressed by Guthrie's fairness and candor, and also by his arguments in favor of Pauline authorship.

As for the Synoptic Gospels, Tasker honors the tradition that connects Matthew with the gospel we know under his name, speculating that Matthew himself may have translated the gospel into Greek, but cautiously concluding that we do not know who composed the Greek gospel, nor its date more accurately than sometime after A.D. 70. In his unusual and somewhat opaque introduction, after surveying the patristic evidence in some detail Cole accepts Peter's preaching as the source of the second gospel, tentatively argues for John Mark as the author and leaves the date undecided ("nearly two generations after the events," denying literary dependence of Matthew and Luke on Mark). Morris is, as usual, excellent on the authorship of Luke, dating it in the early 60's, but carefully speaking to the arguments of radical criticism. Morris' introduction on Luke makes up for the weaknesses of Blaiklock's introduction, where Acts is dated at A.D. 62 but the serious claims of radical criticism are all but ignored. (Lucan authorship, for example, is argued from the medical language.)

Hewitt satisfactorily reviews the problem of the authorship of Hebrews and hypothesizes that Silas was its author, Jewish Christians of Rome its addressees, and its date near A.D. 65. Tasker is effective in discussing the canonicity of James and argues that James the brother of Jesus wrote the book in about A.D. 60 shortly before his martyrdom. The long introduction by A. F. Walls to A. M. Stibbs' commentary on 1 Peter is outstanding. It contains a thorough examination of the authorship of the epistle and convincingly defends it as the work of Peter through his secretary Silvanus, written from Rome about A.D. 63 or 64. (The sufferings were those "common to first-century Christians" and the urgency of 4:12 ff. was caused by the beginnings of Nero's persecution.) As might be expected, E. M. B. Green, who in 1961 wrote a monograph on the authorship of 2 Peter (2 Peter Reconsidered, Tyndale Press), has an excellent defense of the traditional apostolic authorship. Fair and forthright, Green acknowledges that he is willing to accept 2 Peter as a pseudopigraph, but finds that in the face of all the evidence he is still inclined to Petrine authorship and a date between A.D. 61 and Peter's death. The authenticity of Jude is defended, Jude being the brother of the Lord and the date somewhere between the mid-eighties and ten or fifteen years earlier. On the relationship between 2 Peter and Jude, Green finds it impossible to decide on priority and suggests that both are dependent on a common source rather than one borrowing from the other.

On the vexed question of the authorship of the Johannine writings, Tasker argues that the authority of John the son of Zebedee ultimately lies behind the
fourth gospel (dated in the last decade of the first century), although he himself was probably not the actual writer. Stott is satisfactory on the authorship of the Johannine Epistles, although he is somewhat briefer at certain crucial points than he should be. He questions the existence of a presbyter John (in contrast to Tasker, who seems to allow 2 and 3 John to the Elder), and on the basis of the similarity of the epistles to the gospel attributes all three to the apostle John. Morris is very good in defending the authorship of Revelation by the apostle John, dating the book between A.D. 90 and 95.

b. Questions of Historical Reliability

Radical criticism has thrown a large question mark over the historical reliability of two key NT books (leaving aside the Synoptics, for the present): the Acts of the Apostles and the Gospel of John. Blaiklock speaks to the problem in his section on the sources of Acts and touches on it here and there in the commentary. He appeals to the eyewitness reports in the second half of the book and to Luke's personal contract with Paul, Timothy, Silas, Barnabas, Philip, Mark, etc., as well as his access to a written account of the early events in the book. The speeches of Acts are genuine reports of what was said, but not verbatim or without traces of Luke's style. All of this is quite good, but one wishes that Blaiklock had tackled the problem a little more aggressively. The historical discrepancies seen by many between the narrative of Acts and the Pauline Epistles are given little attention, and the theological "bias" of the author, so conspicuous to radical scholarship, is ignored. One would hardly suspect from Blaiklock's treatment of the subject that Luke-Acts is a "storm center in contemporary scholarship," as van Unnik has so vividly put it. In discussing the character of the Gospel of John, Tasker rightly dismisses the notion that in the Synoptics we have history while in John we have theology. There is history and theology in all four Gospels, and Tasker shows how the theology of John is not inconsistent with the Synoptics. It would have been helpful, however, if Tasker had addressed more specifically the question of the historical reliability of John. In the commentary he tends to presuppose his conclusions without arguing them. Two cleansings of the temple are accepted; the discourses are accepted as the words of Jesus (but 3:16-21 are "comments by the evangelist"); the "preparation of the passover" is understood as preparation for the sabbath (i.e., in agreement with the Synoptics).

c. Redaction Criticism and the Synoptic Gospels

Nothing is more inimical to an evangelical view of Scripture than the radical conclusions of form, redaction, and composition criticism. One would expect the problems raised by these methodologies to be attacked head-on in the introductions and to be referred to here and there at appropriate places throughout the commentaries. Surprisingly, however, Tasker on Matthew ignores the subject, Cole on Mark has only the slightest mention of it, and only in the latest commentary, Morris on Luke, does it surface to any degree. Tasker has a good section on the theology of the gospel in his introduction, but he does not pursue what impact the theological concerns may have had on putting together the narrative itself. Cole quickly dismisses form criticism by saying that when it goes beyond descriptive cataloguing of material to judgments about origin and trustworthiness it has passed "out of its own sphere into another, where it has no right to be heard." Even if Cole is right on this point, we are not thereby excused from hearing, weighing, and responding to the claims made by serious critical scholars. While of course refusing certain conclusions of redaction criticism, Morris welcomes this approach to the gospels for what light it may shed on them and correctly stresses that "it is possible to see the Evangelists as theologians and still as men with a profound respect for history." Another quotable quote: "We
may agree that Luke was writing to meet the needs of his day without drawing
the conclusion that he reflects only his own situation." Morris discusses the
theology of Luke in a very helpful section of the introduction, but again does not
explore sufficiently how the final product may have been affected by the
theology. Our criticism is not only that in these three volumes no attempt is made
to relate the positive aspects of redaction criticism to the actual texts being
expounded, but also that insufficient attention is given to the negative aspects of
redaction criticism in terms of response to the questioning of the historicity of
the narratives.

We may also note here that Morris alone of the three Synoptic
commentaries treats the Synoptic problem at length. In a fine summary of
the arguments, Morris opts tentatively for Marcan priority, a plurality of sources
(rather than a single Q) to account for material common to Matthew and Luke,
and a document that Luke worked on (but short of a Proto-Luke) before he
encountered Mark's gospel, material of which he then inserted into his own work
as appropriate. A table of parallel passages in the Synoptics is found at the end of
Morris' volume.

II. EXEGESIS

We turn now to a brief look at the commentaries proper, which the general
preface describes as "primarily exegetical and only secondarily homiletic." Exegesis
is the main goal of the series and it is here pre-eminently that evaluation
must be made, with due allowance for the moderate size of the commentaries. It
is impossible to refer to specific passages, so we shall have to be content with
generalizations (which are always to some extent unfair).

The volumes by Tasker and Morris are excellent examples of
straightforward and helpful exegesis. It is a disappointment to find that the
commentaries on Matthew and John because of space limitations necessarily
proceed section by section rather than verse by verse. Yet it must be admitted
that Tasker is very adept at cutting through to the essential meaning of a
pericope, and this approach is to some extent counterbalanced by the effective
employment of "additional notes" at the end of each section. The difficulties of 2
Corinthians are nicely exegeted by Tasker; the commentary on James comes
across quite homiletically, but this is probably the result of what happens when
one exeges that particular book! As one would expect from Morris, the
commentaries on 1 Corinthians and the Thessalonian Epistles are first rate.
Some three years after the Tyndale commentary on the latter, Morris gave us the
New International Commentary on the same epistles, where he was able to write a
larger commentary, making use of materials gathered in preparing his first
commentary. The commentaries on Revelation and Luke are, if anything, even
better than his earlier commentaries in the series. The approach to Revelation
seems so remarkably sane, being rooted firmly, as it is, in the historical setting of
the original recipients. If our curiosity is not satisfied at every point, if every
question we may have about the meaning of a certain passage is not answered,
that may well be due to the fact that Morris separates the central from the
supportive and gets at what is really important to the writer. He also refuses to
press for a systematization that was of no concern to the author. The
commentary on Luke is also outstanding and has been worth waiting for. It is
quite a bit longer than any of the other commentaries in the series—350 pages
and, with compressed printing, more words per page. This allows a verse by
verse approach, and one cannot help wishing that the rest of the commentaries
were a little bit larger. The exegesis throughout is solid and helpful. In this last
volume the English version commented on is, somewhat belatedly, the RSV. The
commentaries on Mark and Acts do not achieve the same level of excellence. Exegetically they are somewhat on the thin side. Cole on Mark proceeds verse by verse, but often fails to give exegetical help and does not do justice to the theological aspect of Mark. Nonetheless, he is often interesting and helpful in homiletical application of the gospel narrative.

The commentary on Acts is the only other (in addition to Matthew and John) to proceed by sections rather than verse by verse. Blaiklock is often quite good, but there are many places where the commentary is simply too brief to be of any real exegetical or theological help. The "additional notes" are good but, given its format, the commentary needs many more of these. The strong point of Blaiklock's commentary is the background material he provides (but again, one wishes for more). In his commentary on Romans, Bruce provides us with one of the most solid volumes in the series. Not only do we have concise and forceful exegesis here, but also excellent Biblical theology, both in the introduction and body of the work. The economy of Bruce's style shows how much can be done in a relatively small amount of space.

Cole is very good in the commentary on Galatians. The closely knit argumentation of the epistle is very nicely expounded with special attention to the theological import of key words. An added feature is a running paraphrase of the epistle. Foulkes is equally good on Ephesians; here we find excellent exegesis and fine theological insight into Paul's message. Another outstanding commentary in the series is Martin on Philippians. Again we have a model of clear, concise exegesis and theological assimilation. On the other hand, the most disappointing commentary in the series is Carson on Colossians and Philemon. One of the main problems is the brevity of the volume—a mere 77 pages are given to Colossians. The result is that much that is exegetically important is neglected or given slight consideration. Guthrie's volume on the Pastorals provides excellent exegetical comments and stands among the better commentaries in the series. It is somewhat hindered by space limitations, but Guthrie's effective conciseness largely overcomes this disadvantage.

While it is now and then exegetically thin, Hewitt's contribution on Hebrews is satisfactory. The additional notes are often useful. More would have been desirable, especially on theological aspects of the epistle. Stibbs is very good on 1 Peter. The exegesis is excellent, and theologically the volume has the advantage of a fine fifteen-page appendix summarizing the teaching of the epistle. The volumes by Green and Stott are both first-rate so far as exegesis is concerned. Green is lucid and concise, but without sacrificing essentials. Stott is very thorough and in his own synthetic style constantly refers the reader to cognate passages elsewhere in the NT. He includes a series of helpful additional notes throughout the volume.

III. Concluding Observations

It would be perverse to judge these commentaries in terms of expectations different from those of the editor and publishers. In the opening remarks of his general preface, Tasker makes the purpose of the series quite clear: the providing of commentaries "which avoid the extremes of being unduly technical or unhelpfully brief." Further, one reads that the purpose is "primarily exegetical and only secondarily homiletic," the promoting of "a truly biblical theology" and the offering of assistance in understanding the meaning of the NT "as fully and clearly as possible." To the extent that these goals are realizable by moderately sized commentaries, the series must be judged an outstanding success. There simply is no series of medium-length commentaries that approaches the excellence of the Tyndale commentaries. The best commentaries
in the series are superlative, and even the weaker volumes criticized above are not particularly bad commentaries. They merely fall somewhat below the high level of excellence of the others.

When one looks for weaknesses, as a reviewer must, one cannot help noticing again and again that those discovered in these commentaries are almost always related to the limitations of space forced on the contributors. This may well cause us to wonder whether the goals of the series are realistic. Perhaps our frustrations would have been less if the volumes had been somewhat larger on the whole (as, say, in the case of Luke, the last volume to appear). But then we may only have again wished the volumes to be a little larger than that! Can the needs of "students and serious readers of the NT" be met by commentaries of moderate size? Certainly this series very nearly comes as close to doing so as possible.

It is unfortunate that only the last volume of the series (Luke) is based on the text of the RSV. It is true that when the series was initiated, nearly twenty years ago, the Authorized Version (KJV) had a strong hold on the evangelical public. During these two decades, however, the RSV has enjoyed increasing popularity and the series would have benefited by switching to the RSV much earlier. One suspects that Tasker was not overly enthusiastic about using the KJV in the series. As early as 1958, in his commentary on 2 Corinthians, Tasker seemed to favor the RSV over the KJV, and in 1961 in his commentary on Matthew he included an enthusiastic appendix on the translation of Matthew in the New English Bible which he concluded by referring to the KJV as often being "obscure to the point of being unintelligible to men and women of the mid-twentieth century." Yet repeatedly the Tyndale commentators must use up valuable space in correcting the KJV or defending the RV or RSV. (Fortunately this process itself can be educational!) We can be grateful, however, that no space is wasted with an unnecessary printing of the full text of the NT writings.

So far as critical questions are concerned, the commentaries generally summarize and assess arguments in rather brief compass, arriving rather quickly at the traditional, conservative conclusions. The rather facile position is often taken that since none of the evidence against the conservative view is decisive, the conservative view remains the correct one. That is, the truth of the conservative view is presupposed, and the burden of proof falls on those who may choose to differ. Now this may be all it is fair to ask commentaries of this format to do. After all, they are written for an audience already persuaded, and at least it is shown to that audience that the conservative position may be argued, and argued sensibly. For those who begin with or are drawn toward the opposite view, however, something more is needed. Sensitive, evangelical scholars would do well to tackle specific problems and specific passages more directly and in more detail through specialized publications. Students of the NT in the modern world find themselves increasingly in need of assistance in understanding and answering radical criticism. Commentaries cannot be made to do everything.

These commentaries will not often exasperate the reader by committing the cardinal sin of waxing eloquent on the obvious and ignoring the difficult. One may often wish for more discussion of a point, but seldom will one be utterly disappointed. These commentaries are genuinely exegetical. One will certainly not agree with every exegetical conclusion in them. Still, if one agreed with everything in a commentary it would be worth pondering whether the purchase was a wise one.

The Tyndale commentaries are full of good things. Reading them on a regular basis, as others have suggested, will enrich one's comprehension of Biblical theology as well as make one alive to the art of exegesis. It really is a set that no thinking Christian, professional or layman, should be without, and it may
be especially recommended for those who preach and teach, where sound
exegesis is a fundamental requirement. In reviewing the first volume of the
series, J. W. Wenham wrote, "If the other commentaries in the series attain the
same high standard, they will be a great gift to the Church of God" (EQ 29
[1957], p. 117). Now we may gratefully add, so has it proved to be.

D. A. Hagner

Wheaton College, Wheaton, Illinois 60187

FESTSCHRIFTEN

Current Issues in Biblical and Patristic Interpretation. Edited by Gerald F.

This valuable collection of essays was produced by a group of former
students of one of the most distinguished senior members of our Society and
presented to him on the occasion of his seventieth birthday. The one so honored
is Merrill C. Tenney, formerly professor of New Testament and dean of the
graduate school of Wheaton College and the second president of the ETS.

In the area of historical studies beyond the limits of Biblical studies per se are
the following: "The Extent of the Old Testament Canon" by Norman L. Geisler
of Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, "The Development of the Concept of
'Orthodoxy' in Early Christianity" by Robert A. Kraft of the University of
Pennsylvania, and "The Power of Giving and Receiving: Reciprocity in
Hellenistic Benevolence" by Stephen C. Mott of Gordon-Conwell Theological
Seminary.

On the Old Testament are essays by Carl Edwin Armerding of Regent
College ("Were David's Sons Really Priests?") and Larry L. Walker of
Southwestern Baptist Seminary ("'Love' in the Old Testament: Some Lexical
Observations"). The New Testament contributions are more numerous with
essays by David E. Aune of St. Xavier ("The Significance of the Delay of the
Parousia for Early Christianity"), W. Paul Bowers of Igbaba Theological
Seminary in Nigeria ("A Note on Colossians 1:27a"), Carl E. DeVries of the
University of Chicago ("Paul's 'Cutting' Remarks About a Race: Galatians
5:1-12"), E. Earle Ellis of New Brunswick Theological Seminary ("The
Composition of Luke 9 and the Sources of Its Christology"), Eldon Jay Epp of
Case Western Reserve University ("Wisdom, Torah, Word: The Johannine
Prologue and the Purpose of the Fourth Gospel"), Walter C. Kaiser, Jr., of
Trinity ("The Weightier and Lighter Matters of the Law: Moses, Jesus, and
Paul"), Leslie R. Keylock of the College of Mount St. Vincent ("Bultmann's Law
of Increasing Distinctness"), Richard N. Longenecker of Wycliffe College
("Literary Criteria in Life of Jesus Research"), David M. Scholer of
Gordon-Conwell ("Sins Within and Sins Without: An Interpretation of 1 John
5:16-17"), Russell Shedd of the Baptist Theological Faculty of Sao Paulo
("Multiple Meanings in the Gospel of John"), Russell P. Spittler of Southern
California College ("The Limits of Ecstasy: An Exegesis of 2 Corinthians
12:1-10"), and G. Henry Waterman of Wheaton ("The Greek 'Verbal
Infinitive' ").

In the area of patristics there are two superb contributions: "A New English
Translation of Melito's Paschal Homily" (with annotations) by Gerald F.
Hawthorne, the editor, of Wheaton; and "Charismatic Theology in the Apostolic
Tradition of Hippolytus" by John E. Stam of Latin American Biblical Seminary in
Costa Rica. More strictly theological are contributions on "The Deity of Christ in
the Writings of Paul" by Walter Elwell of Belhaven College, "Some Reflections
on the Mission of the Church" by David M. Howard of Inter-Varsity Christian

A simple listing of the essays and contributors gives an indication of the wide influence of Tenney on the world of scholarship through his students, even apart from his own not inconsiderable contribution through his writing and editorial projects. It is a fitting testimony to and token of appreciation for the work of an outstanding Christian scholar that this work was produced. And all of us are the benefactors thereof.

W. Ward Gasque


Without doubt Werner Georg Kümmel of Marburg is one of the most influential New Testament scholars of the present day. It is therefore no great surprise to find that he has merited a Festschrift, indeed one with a list of contributors that reads like a Who's Who in the field of New Testament studies today. Furthermore, those who have deplored polarization and provincialism in this field in the past will be pleasantly surprised at the breadth of the book: the number of articles from the English-speaking world equals the number from Germany; a quarter of the authors (six) are continental scholars from outside of Germany; Roman Catholic scholarship (e.g., Mussner, Schnackenburg and de la Potterie) is well represented; evangelical scholars (e.g., F. F. Bruce and B. M. Metzger) are conspicuous by their presence. But, indeed, we should have expected just such a balanced approach from the editors, and they are to be congratulated for succeeding in maintaining this balance.

The articles themselves, arranged in alphabetical order by author, are a mixture. Most are Pauline or Synoptic studies, though two discuss Jesus in more general terms (Cullmann, "Von Jesus zum Stephanuskreis und zum Johannesevangelium," and Grässer, "Der Mensch Jesus als Thema der Theologie") and one concerns itself with Acts (Dinkler, "Philippus und der ANER AITHIOPS [Apg 8,26-40]"). Johannine studies are virtually absent, only receiving mention in Cullmann's article and that of de la Potterie ("Charis paulinienne et charis johannique"). On the other hand 1 Corinthians, Romans and Mark are especially well represented.

The scope and intent of the articles are wider than one might at first think. On the one hand we find archaeological studies (e.g., B. M. Metzger, "The Nazareth Inscription Once Again"), and on the other we find theological studies (e.g., E. Lohse, "Die Gemeinde und ihre Ordnung bei den Synoptikern und bei Paulus"). In between lies a wide range of linguistic and exegetical studies.

Of course, the nature of the articles also varies. Bruce's contribution, "Further Thoughts on Paul's Autobiography," is a summary of his conclusions on the relationship of Paul to Jerusalem Christianity, complementing his lectures on Galatians in the _Bulletin of the John Rylands Library_. Cullmann offers a different type of complement, for he seeks to go a step beyond his recent work _Der
johannische Kreis and thus leaves us with an air of anticipation. E. E. Ellis' "Weisheit' und 'Erkenntnis' im 1. Korintherbrief" is also related to previously printed work, for it is a translation of his Tyndale New Testament Lecture for 1973 (which appears in English in Tyndale Bulletin 25 [1974]). This translation will naturally please German readers more than North Americans. Bultmann has contributed what may well prove to be one of his last published articles ("Die Interpretation von Mk 4,3-9 seit Jülicher"), a short survey which is a fine introduction to the subject, although it suffers from a lack of reference to the most recent literature, including an article by Kümmel.

It is obvious, then, that the articles are mixed in quality and content; but if it is possible to rate such a collection as a whole, we must conclude that the work is first-rate, sampling as it does such a wide range of leading Neutestamentler. Many of these articles will remain significant contributions to New Testament studies, while others are judicious summaries of research to date or of the mature thought of the contributor. Most are well worth reading. Some will be particularly helpful to evangelicals (e.g., C. F. D. Moule, "On Defining the Messianic Secret in Mark," which is distinguished by delightful English style as well as depth of content). Certainly all serious students of the New Testament will need to read—if not own—this work, and no theological library can afford not to purchase it.

Peter H. Davids
Bibelschule Wiedenest, 5275 Bergneustadt 2, Germany


In view of the long and distinguished career of Leon Morris, it is appropriate that his sixtieth birthday should be marked by a Festschrift. This tribute takes the form of nineteen essays on NT topics, ten of them devoted to some aspect of reconciliation and the remaining nine to the eschatological theme of hope. Both of these areas have occupied the attention of Morris, and the essays themselves make frequent reference to his notable contributions and interact with his thought. The volume appropriately includes a select bibliography of Morris and an illuminating appreciation of the man himself by David A. Hubbard of Fuller Seminary.

The volume is quite international in scope, though all the articles are written in English. Since this is the first Australian Neutestamentler to be so honored, it is fitting that six of the contributions should come from that land. Generally speaking, the contributions are aimed at New Testament scholars. The footnotes are extensive, the Greek references are copious, and the discussion is sophisticated. The book's usefulness is enhanced by full indexes. Unfortunately the type is quite fine, and the technical quality is marred occasionally by printer's errors. However, the book is well worth the price for those who are interested in the current state of NT studies.

In the first essay Birger Gerhardsson discusses "Sacrificial Service and Atonement in the Gospel of Matthew." He interprets Jesus' ministry as a spiritual service of sacrifice and sees Matthew as taking away the demarcation between Jesus and his followers and between Jesus' work in the past and the Church's work in the present. While Matthew is eager to demonstrate that Jesus' death was in all points perfect, he depicts Jesus as the perfect prototype of all "children of God." Next comes John Painter's philological study of "Eschatological Faith in the Gospel of John." His treatment of the Johannine situation of persecution helps to explain the motifs of judgment and unbelief, of
revelation and response. Particularly helpful is his discussion of superficial versus authentic faith. F. F. Bruce reviews "The Speeches in Acts—Thirty Years After" he delivered the first Tyndale NT Lecture on the same subject. Surveying the recent literature, he sees no reason to revise his high estimate of these speeches as valuable and independent sources for the history and theology of the primitive Church.

Earle Ellis offers a brief but useful study of "Christ Crucified." In 1 Corinthians 1-4 this phrase suggests not only the message Paul proclaims but the one who speaks through that message, the serving and sacrificing Christ. Herman Ridderbos furnishes a fine study of 1 Corinthians 15:3 when he writes on "The Earliest Confession of the Atonement in Paul." He argues that Paul remained faithful to the original Christian confession and gave it classic expression in increasingly wider circles.

The only German contribution comes from the pen of Günther Bornkamm, who attempts to put Paul's autobiographical account in Galatians 1 into the context of his doctrine of justification and reconciliation. The Heidelberg professor is anxious to escape the two danger zones in the current exegesis of Galatians 1—the Scylla which tends to overload Paul's autobiographical statements with psychological speculations, and the Charybdis which is inclined to underestimate the theological motifs which they contain and not to make them sufficiently visible.

Ralph Martin examines "Reconciliation and Forgiveness in the Letter to the Colossians," paying special attention to two extended passages (Col. 1:12-23; 2:13-15) with a view to setting them against the background of their historical context. He also provides a stimulating discussion of Paul's redaction of traditional elements. James Dunn is critical of "substitution" as an adequate term to expound "Paul's Understanding of the Death of Jesus." He thinks it is too one-sided, not giving sufficient prominence to the point of primary significance—that God was the subject. He also finds "substitution" to be too narrow, smacking too much of individualism to represent Paul's thought adequately. Dunn advocates instead an emphasis on Paul's theology of Jesus as representative man and of his death as sacrifice for sin.

Richard Longenecker contributes a useful study on "The Obedience of Christ in the Theology of the Early Church," in which he quite properly reminds us that the "obedience of Christ in his death and the obedience of Christ in his life are corollaries that can never truly be separated, for by means of both Christ has achieved man's complete reconciliation to a holy, righteous and loving God" (p. 148). In "The Development of the Concept of Redemption in the New Testament," Howard Marshall traces the theme back to Jesus and reinforces the work of Leon Morris. Marshall correctly concludes that redemption is "one of the most frequently used categories of interpretation of the death of Jesus in the NT and excellently expresses its meaning."

Part II opens with Robert Banks' treatment of "The Eschatological Role of Law in Pre- and Post-Christian Jewish Thought." Banks is critical of W. D. Davies and others who claim that the idea of a New Torah was widely held in rabbinic literature. Robert Maddox studies "The Function of the Son of Man in the Gospel of John," not to answer traditio-historical questions but contextual ones. In spite of considerable differences of vocabulary and imagery, Maddox concludes that the fundamental significance of this title in John is not different from that which it has in the Synoptics. Darryl Palmer (following C. H. Dodd) analyzes the appearances of the risen Christ in "The Resurrection of Jesus and the Mission of the Church." He studies both form and function and appends an interesting discussion of the apocryphal writings which have a common emphasis on the attempt to prove the resurrection.
C. E. B. Cranfield's article is more significant than its modest title would suggest. "Some Observations on Romans 8:19-21" is a lucid exegesis of a much misunderstood passage and also a timely reminder of the Christian's responsibility to the sub-human creation and the whole subject of the environment. Bishop D. W. B. Robinson provocatively discusses Paul's purpose in writing the Epistle to the Romans in terms of Rom. 15:15 f. The subjects Paul writes about spring from the nature of his special apostleship to the Gentiles, but these are set forth deliberately as the experience of a justified Jew. Davis McCaughey re-examines the development of Paul's argument in 1 Corinthians 15 in order to see what light can be cast upon some current presuppositions about death. His analysis of non-Christian views is especially illuminating.

W. J. Dalton writes on 1 Peter 1:3-25 but also has much to say that is helpful regarding recent scholarly writing on the authorship of 1 Peter. G. R. Beasley-Murray's contribution is one of the finest defenses this reviewer has seen for the retention of the Apocalypse in the canon of the NT. He answers his own question, "How Christian Is the Book of Revelation?" with a powerful refutation of the views of Dodd and Bulmann. The final essay by George Ladd is a perceptive study of "Apocalyptic and New Testament Theology." Ladd argues that the NT owes its basic structure to Jewish apocalyptic which in turn was derived from the OT.

This is a worthy tribute to one of the great evangelical scholars of our day and offers a rich exegetical feast to the student who is prepared for the hard work of "testing all things and holding fast to that which is good."

Allison A. Trites
Acadia Divinity College, Wolfville, Nova Scotia, Canada BOP 1X0

BIBLICAL WORLD


When many North Americans think of German NT scholarship, they tend to think of the work of the radical critics who seem to capture the academic headlines with extremely creative but highly improbable new hypotheses with apparently disastrous results for historic Christianity. Yet the bulk of German Biblical scholarship is not of this character at all. One need only think of the great lexicon of Walter Bauer, the monumental theological dictionary founded by Gerhard Kittel, and the textual criticism being carried on by Kurt Aland and his associates at Münster, to realize what a great debt all of us owe to the Germans. And it would not be difficult to extend this list to include scores of other important contributions which are essentially unsensational. The contributions of Martin Hengel definitely fall into this category.

Hengel, formerly a student of Otto Michel and now professor of NT and Early Judaism in the University of Tübingen, is one of the more important figures in contemporary German Biblical scholarship. He will be known to the readers of this Journal as the author of three small but important studies: Was Jesus a Revolutionary?, Victory Over Violence: Jesus and the Revolutionists, and Property and Riches in the Early Church, all published by Fortress Press. He is also the author of an important study on the Zealots (Die Zeloten, Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Spätjudentums und Urchristentums 1 [Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1961], his doctoral dissertation) which, unfortunately, has not been translated into English. Now his magisterial study of the encounter between Hellenism and Judaism in Palestine during the early Hellenistic period (i.e., ca. 300-150 B.C.) is available in a form
which can be readily used by all students of the NT and Judaism who do not read German.

One of the significant conclusions of Hengel is his questioning of the distinction which is so often made between "Palestinian" and "Hellenistic" Judaism, a distinction which passes "too lightly over the fact that by the time of Jesus, Palestine had already been under 'Hellenistic' rule and its resultant cultural influence for some 360 years." Thus even in Palestine during the NT period Judaism had a long history of Hellenistic influences behind it. In this way Hengel renders suspect a cardinal assumption of much of contemporary NT scholarship.

The text of the book is contained in volume one. The second volume consists entirely of extensive footnotes that document the statements in the text and also more than fifty pages of bibliography (II, 211-66) and is a storehouse of valuable information for the student. The text itself is divided into four main sections: (1) Early Hellenism as a Political and Economic Force (the historical framework, Hellenistic war and the Jews, administration and taxation in Palestine under Hellenistic rule, and Hellenistic influence on trade, commerce and social structure in Palestine); (2) Hellenism in Palestine as a Cultural Force and its Influence on the Jews (the Greek language in Palestinian Judaism, Greek education and culture and Palestinian Judaism, and Greek literature and philosophy in Palestine); (3) the Encounter and Conflict Between Palestinian Judaism and the Spirit of the Hellenistic Age (supposed Greek influence on the later books of the Hebrew OT, the development of Jewish literature, Koheleth, Ben Sira, Wisdom Speculation, the Hasidim and Jewish apocalyptic, and Early Essenism); and (4) the Greek Interpretation of Judaism and the Hellenistic Reform Attempt in Jerusalem (the Jews as philosophers, identification of the God of Judaism with Greek conceptions of God, and the failure of the Hellenistic reform in Jerusalem). Each subject is dealt with carefully and systematically, and each section is concluded with a summary statement of results of the investigation.

Hengel does not offer a history of NT times or a detailed commentary on the NT, though he does from time to time comment on the importance of a particular observation concerning the early Hellenistic period for an individual NT text or custom. What the author does offer is an essential prolegomenon to the history of NT times, particularly the gospels, which is based on careful, historical research and which cuts through many statements made by contemporary scholars who are not, in fact, familiar with the historical data first-hand. Thus Judaism and Hellenism will take its place alongside Jeremias' Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus (E. T. 1969), Schürer's The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (vol. I, rev. ed. 1974), and the recently inaugurated Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum (vol. I: The Jewish People in the First Century, 1974) as a standard guide to the history and culture of the land and people immediately preceding and during the time of our Lord's earthly sojourn.

The translator and the publisher also deserve praise for their fine work. John Bowden, an editor for SCM Press, has proved his abilities as a translator before, and once again he has provided us with a superbly accurate and idiomatic translation which is a model for other aspiring translators to follow. Fortress Press is to be congratulated for its contribution to American Biblical scholarship for taking the financial risk of producing this magnificent volume. We can only hope that the sales are sufficient to encourage further publications of this technical nature and high quality. The work is also enhanced by very full indexes, which will doubtless be of great value to the student.

Hengel's study should be in the library of every university, seminary,
Christian college, and Bible college, and also in the personal libraries of those Bible students and teachers who can afford the cost. When one thinks of the great quantity of material contained in these two volumes (in contrast to the typical slim offerings of so much contemporary theological writing), the price is not really so high; one need only forgo three or four of the more superficial books to be able to purchase this invaluable set.

We look forward very much to Hengel's second study of the subject, which will carry the story down to the time of Jesus and which is promised in due course.

W. Ward Gasque

THEOLOGY


The diversity of essays in this volume vividly illustrates a serious weakness in the contextual theology of Paul Lehmann of Princeton, Harvard and Union, in whose honor they were contributed. "The demands of contextual obedience," Lewis Mudge observed, "are tearing the ecumenical movement apart" (see "Nairobi: The Theological Challenge," in Christian Century [November 5, 1975], p. 995).

The fifteen contributions by significant theologians contain no adequate presentation of the place of the Bible in formulating a Christian approach to the cultural context in which one finds himself. The closest thing to this is Willis' essay, "Rhetoric and Responsibility in Calvin's Theology." He seeks to show that Calvin's thought is not primarily characterized by dialectical diastrasis but by rhetorical correlation. Far from being totally other, God has accommodated himself to man's varying capacities of apprehension. In Calvin, "experience is constantly being corrected from a reinterpretation of Scripture."

Contextual theology seems destined to oppose just such normative correction of Scripture. According to Benjamin Reist's essay, "to think is to think relativistically." Contextual theology "is constantly involved qua theology in the pluralism of man's searching for meaning." Hence, "the theological task is one of description, not definition." Although Reist's title is "Beyond Ideological Theology" he has omitted the Biblical basis for transcending human ideologies. He has not learned what Mudge learned at the Accra Faith and Order meetings in the summer of 1974, that "the only language capable of producing general agreement is biblical language. The minute we move away from that, our affirmations become confessionally, ideologically, culturally limited" (loc. cit.).

Clifford Green's essay understands Bonhoeffer to say that basic Christian concepts are fully understandable only in relation to sociality (i.e., in the community of the saints). Not the Biblical or the epistemological context but "human sociality holds most theological promise." He uses Paul Lehmann's terminology: "the Christian community as the new-humanity-of-Christ-being-actualized is engaged in the humanization of man." The question is, whose concept of humanization? Since there is no successful transcendence of ideology apart from supernaturally inspired Scripture, one person's (third world) ideological perspective on humanization from his context is alleged as against another's. There are no absolute moral norms to which both are accountable!

Jurgen Molmann calls for liberation from colonial rule—"liberation as independence, then liberation as social justice, then liberation as human dignity,
and then liberation as the full development of the human person.” But will the real person please stand up? Will it be the realization of a person’s full potential as in the TM undifferentiated Thatness common to all persons and things? Or the person created in the image of God for realization of his distinctives in the body of Christ and fellowship with a personal transcendent Lord for eternity? Without Scriptural norms, we cannot properly define ourselves! And so we cannot liberate the true self!

Bruce Morgan in “Theology in the Context of the Social Sciences” says that “the style most appropriate for the relation between theology and social sciences as described above might be called ‘intranudane anonymity.’ ” That may be the best one can do without an authoritative, propositional message from the Lord of the universe and all its social contexts. But for a believer in the cognitive truth of Scripture, its normative statements must always take precedence over the descriptive information gained from the social sciences, valuable as that may be. The social sciences will not finally have “come of age” until their understanding of God’s world is brought into harmony with a sound interpretation of God’s Word.

The book provides a brief biographical tribute to Paul Lehmann, a leading exponent of contextual theology, by Horace T. Allen and Robert Matthewson’s “A Paul Lehmann Bibliography,” containing all his published works to January, 1974. This collection of materials on contextual theology will be of value to observers of the contemporary theological scene. While conservative evangelicals will lament the sea of relativity it represents, hopefully they will be challenged to show with increasing effectiveness the perennial relevance of Biblically informed thought and life for every cultural context on earth.

Gordon R. Lewis
Conservative Baptist Theological Seminary, Denver, Colorado 80210


In this, the thirteenth in a projected nineteen-volume series on dogmatics, Berkouwer has developed his doctrine of Scripture. His study is both traditional and contemporary. It is the former because he reaffirms the Protestant view, especially as it was formulated by Calvin, transmitted by the Belgic Confession and elaborated by Kuyper and Bavinck; it is the latter because he has broken new ground in relating this doctrine to current concerns in theology, especially as these are being expressed in Europe. For this reason, as Pinnock has said, it will “help to carry the evangelical discussion on inspiration forward, and lead it to a higher level.”

Although Berkouwer is a faithful transmitter of Protestant “tradition,” he has left his own unique stamp on the result, not least in his elucidation of the work of the Holy Spirit. This, in fact, is the thread that is woven through each of the thirteen chapters and that binds them together. Berkouwer begins where other studies on Scripture have ended. The first chapter is entitled “Holy Scripture and Certainty,” and the key note of the Spirit’s work is struck unmistakably. Confidence that this is indeed God’s Word as well as human writing is not a logical deduction from a doctrinal a priori. It is not produced by reasoning that since we have a Bible authenticated as pure we can be confident in it. Rather, this conviction is wrought in the heart by the Spirit as the Biblical Word is experienced. In the chapters that follow, the work of the Spirit is frequently highlighted especially as this relates to the inspiration of Scripture (ch. V), its appropriation by the believer (chs. VI and VII) and its interpretation
and proclamation (ch. XII). The qualities of the Biblical Word, such as its reliability (ch. IX), clarity (ch. X) and sufficiency (ch. XI) are the results of the Spirit's work, and even the chapters on the canon (ch. III), criticism (ch. XIII) and translation (ch. VIII) are brought into this orbit.

Berkouwer's emphasis on the Spirit has caused concern in some circles, for it has seemed to be more in accord than it ought to be with the neo-orthodox tendency to dissociate the revelatory element of the Word from the Biblical text. Berkouwer is insistent, however, that it is an error either to Sunder or to confuse the human and divine elements in Scripture. He refuses to accept the fashionable dichotomy between personal and propositional revelation. God's revelation, through the process of spiration ("outspiratio" might be a better term than "inspiration"), is given in and through the written Scriptures. The Spirit authenticates this written Word in the believer's life, but his work coincides with and is not separate from the written Word.

In recognition of the Word-character of this revelation, Berkouwer sees the reason for using terms like plenary and verbal to describe the Scripture's inspiration, but he believes they are susceptible to serious misunderstanding and should be avoided. He is less sympathetic to the concept of inerrancy and speaks instead of Scripture being trustworthy and reliable. When the Biblical authors had occasion to write on cosmology, for example, they wrote as men of their own time. Their inspiration did not sharpen and transform their scientific knowledge of the world so that they were spared from making errors. The intent of their writing, however, is what inspiration governed; in making us wise to salvation, they are reliable and trustworthy witnesses. It would be easy to charge Berkouwer with positing a dichotomy between truth as it relates to faith and truth as it relates to the spatio-temporal world; whether it would be fair to do this is another matter.

One of the more interesting chapters is entitled "The Servant-Form of Holy Scripture." The author is not impressed by the analogy between the incarnation of the Word in Jesus and the linguistic containment of the Word in Scripture. It is true, of course, that both forms of the Word have their human and divine components, but in the case of Jesus there is a hypostatic union between them which is lacking with respect to Scripture. It is right to worship Christ and wrong to worship the Bible. However, Scripture is also a servant and as such is not above its master. Necessarily, it "shares the revilement of Christ and evokes the hostility of man." Given this servant role, whereby Scripture's identification with Christ in his work in the world is accentuated, it is odd that Berkouwer should then go on to use, and to use repeatedly, expressions like "having faith in the Bible," "confession of faith in Scripture," "revering" the Biblical Word, "reality of faith in Scripture." The terminus of faith is not in Scripture itself—a point which this chapter in fact makes—but in the Christ of whom Scripture speaks. Men have faith through the Biblical propositions but not in them.

These themes—inspiration, inerrancy, the nature of Biblical truth—are what have absorbed the attention of American evangelical literature. Berkouwer's book, however, is broader in scope, more comprehensive in treatment and more cosmopolitan in outlook than anything else produced by evangelicals. Issues centrally related to Biblical revelation and often slighted in other volumes have here been given extensive treatment. These would include the difficulties posed in general by Biblical criticism but in particular by form criticism, the new hermeneutic, the closing of the canon, translation of Scripture (and not least of Scripture by the Biblical authors themselves) and many other issues raised by contemporary scholarship. His volume, like those that have preceded it in this series, is a means of dialog both with the past and the present.

The editor of the volume excised about a third of the original to make it
more readable for the average reader. A few of the footnotes have either been so heavily edited that they now have little value, or Berkouwer originally placed so little in them that they should have been eliminated by the editor. Berkouwer's style, while it is a paragon of simplicity and clarity when compared with most German theologians, still leaves something to be desired. It is flawed by awkward contortions that interrupt its flow. And unlike Denney and Forsyth, he rarely ever goes straight to the point. Instead, he tends to circle each problem very cautiously, making quick, sharp jabs at it. The cumulative effect of this is substantial and it does have the virtue of "airing" the problem from all sides. On the other hand, any central, driving argument tends to become buried beneath a fresh pile of valuable historical allusions, Biblical quotations and perceptive insights each time he circles. This demands careful study.

These, however, are minor blemishes in a brilliant, thorough, magisterial piece of work. There will be those who will find themselves more conservative than Berkouwer and others who will find themselves less, but to a broad swath of evangelical thinkers this study will, as Pinnock says, "stand for years as the most complete defense of the full authority of Holy Writ."

David F. Wells
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, Ill. 60015

PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION


Walter Kaufmann is a well-known Nietzsche scholar and critic of religion. *Without Guilt and Justice* is his attempt to present a distinctively anti-Christian post-death-of-God morality that emphasizes autonomy, the need for self-identity, and what he calls "the new integrity." Kaufmann believes that guilt and justice are two roadblocks to autonomy. Justice is invoked, he claims, by people who are afraid of making fateful decisions (decidophobes). For this reason Kaufmann launches attacks on retributive and distributive justice from which he concludes that nobody is, or should feel, guilty. The latter part of *Without Guilt and Justice* is devoted to elaborating the author's replacements for guilt and justice.

Kaufmann has that all-too-rare ability among philosophers to write so that non-philosophers can understand him. And he has given philosophical expression to some popular sentiments about retributive justice and guilt feelings in a work that is now available in an inexpensive paperback. These factors make *Without Guilt and Justice* a book that will probably be influential on a popular, if not philosophical, level.

There is much here that I would disagree with, but in a review of limited length it is probably best to point out only the flaws in his attacks on justice and guilt. Much, but not all, of Kaufmann's constructive proposals depend on the success of these attacks.

Kaufmann's argument is based on the premise that "the conception of justice that underlies retributive and distributive justice is the same: distributions and punishments are considered just when each gets what he deserves, and unjust when this is not the case. In other words, justice consists of meting out to men what they deserve" (p. 39). Kaufmann also constructs guilt as meaning that someone is, or feels that he is, deserving of punishment. He has cleverly linked the concept of desert to all three—retributive and distributive justice and guilt; now
all he has to do is show that there is something fishy about the concept of desert and he will have killed three birds with one stone. This is precisely his avenue of attack. What is wrong with the concept of desert is that it is, according to Kaufmann, "incalculable." It is from this that his conclusions—"punishments can never be just" (p. 56), "distributions can never be just" (p. 67), and "nobody is guilty or should feel guilty" (p. 112)—follow.

The first move in this argument is questionable. Few would object to the claim that desert is involved in retributive justice, but to claim that moral desert is or should be the basis for the distribution of social goods and services is quite controversial. Kaufmann nowhere argues for this thesis, even though there are cogent objections to it (see Joel Feinberg, "Justice and Personal Desert," in Doing and Deserving: Essays in the Theory of Responsibility [Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1970], pp. 88-94; and Feinberg’s Social Philosophy [Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1973], pp. 112-114, for criticisms and references to others who have opposed this theory).

One might also question whether Kaufmann’s conclusions follow (granting him his controversial first premise) on the strength of his critique of desert. His claim that desert is incalculable is not damaging, nor is it a surprise. Justice is an ideal that is more or less approximated because of the number of factors involved in some cases. Kaufmann seems to think that justice must be exact or else it is not justice. This is like saying that if everyone in the family deserves an equal share of a pie and no division will be equal (someone will always get a few crumbs more or less than someone else), then no division can be just. This is the sense in which Kaufmann believes that no distribution or punishments are just.

Kaufmann’s third conclusion is this: “Once it is seen that nobody deserves punishment it follows that nobody is or should feel guilty” (p. 112). Unfortunately, Kaufmann’s arguments do not establish that “nobody deserves punishment”—only, if anything, that nobody gets what he deserves because it is incalculable. This is like saying (to return to the pie example) that because no division is perfectly equal nobody deserves a piece of pie. It should be obvious that there is a logical gap here.

It is somewhat ironic that Kaufmann should spend so much of his book periodically criticizing John Rawls’ A Theory of Justice (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1971), when this book is precisely one that draws a number of distinctions that it would have been useful to Kaufmann to recognize. For example, Rawls distinguishes different types of distributive justice (pp. 84-86); he gives an argument why moral desert should not be a basis for social distributions (pp. 310-315); and he has a much better understanding of the function of guilt and other moral emotions than is evidenced by Kaufmann (pp. 440-445, 479-490).

T. Pence
Purdue University, West Lafayette, Ind. 47907

CHRISTIAN WORLD VIEW


"Whether we like it or not," said the eminent art historian, Erwin Panofsky, "it is the movies that mold, more than any other single source, the opinions, the taste, the language, the dress, the behavior, and even the physical appearance of a public comprising more than 60 per cent of the population of the earth." Drew discerns the potency of film but criticizes its message.
For Drew, a college lecturer in English in Kent, England, the basic purpose of art is "to define and redefine man." Thus the author sees film directors as preaching such "typical" modern philosophies as "I copulate, therefore I am," and "I kill, therefore I am." In general, he could have made a more convincing case for each philosophy by analyzing in-depth one or two major films; instead he strings together a plethora of titles and quotes only briefly from their scripts.

But by overemphasizing the didactic side of films, he neglects their entertainment value. For example, when he says the "American Graffiti" scenario "maintains there is nothing beyond man's five senses," he has turned a light-hearted story into a philosophic comment on mankind. Also, he forgets that when directors include scenes of sex and violence, they do not necessarily condone immorality. On the contrary, they may simply be forcing the viewer to recognize a seamy side to life. Still, Drew's concluding emphasis on the ethics of film directing and the need for developing a "Christian" perspective on viewing are well taken. Also, the film clippings chosen to illustrate the text are marvelous.

However, the chief flaw in Drew's book is methodology. By attempting to criticize "content" alone, he accepts the false dichotomy between form and content that modern criticism has fought so hard to eliminate. For judging films he chooses such dubious values as the presence of self-affirmation, moral absolutes, and a positive handling of religion. "It is," notes Brewster Rogerson, "when the critic assumes the prime function of a poem [or a film] is to deal in a morally positive way with experience,... when he judges the poem as a right or wrong reaction to life—that ethical criticism becomes overbearing." Such is the oppressive quality of Drew's diagnosis—it is the common artistic heresy of those influenced by L'Abri.

Ken Bazyn
Evangelical Minister's Book Club, 264 W. 22nd St., Apt. 2C, New York, N.Y. 10011

BOOK NOTES


Though technically a journal rather than a book, the Tyndale Bulletin appears only once a year and easily outweighs many scholarly monographs in terms of compressed content. Its publication is sponsored by the Tyndale Fellowship for Biblical and Theological Research, the academic Biblical arm of the Inter-Varsity Fellowship (newly named Universities and Colleges Christian Fellowship) and represents the best of the work currently being produced in these circles, generally by younger scholars.

The most recent issue, volume 25 (dated 1974 but actually published in 1975), contains the following essays: "What did the Cross Achieve? The Logic of Penal Substitution" by James I. Packer (pp. 3-45), "The Wilderness Itineraries" by G. I. Davies (pp. 46-81), "Wisdom and Knowledge in I Corinthians" by E. Earle Ellis (pp. 82-98), "Old Testament Textual Criticism: Its Principles and Practice. Apropos of Recent English Versions" by David F. Payne (pp. 99-113), and "Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School" by Robert P. Gordon (pp. 113-120). The first three were Tyndale Lectures for 1973, in Biblical theology, Old Testament, and New Testament respectively. Payne looks at The Hebrew Text of the Old Testament: The Readings Adopted by the Translators of the New English Bible by L. H. Brockington (1973) and uses the occasion for reflection on OT textual criticism as practiced by the translators of the NEB, JB, NAB, and RSV.

There is meat enough here for everyone, and the price is well below the current market price (especially for North Americans who have a very favorable rate of exchange for the dollar as against the pound at the time of writing). This issue of the *Bulletin* will be of interest to all students of the OT, the NT, and systematic theology, and possibly to others as well. Librarians would be well advised to obtain a complete run of the *Tyndale Bulletin* (vols. 17-25, 1966-1974), as well as the earlier *Tyndale House Bulletin* (vols. 1-16, 1956-65) insofar as these are available. The address for the *Tyndale Bulletin* is Tyndale Press, 39 Bedford Square, London WC1B 2EY, England; for *THB*, The Librarian, Tyndale House, 36 Selwyn Gardens, Cambridge CB3 9BA, England.

W. W. G.


Here we have in English dress five essays originally published in French in 1971 and an additional bibliography of structuralism and attempts to apply this new approach to the Biblical text (pp. 110-164). François Bovon, who seems to have been the initiator of the seminars sponsored by the Faculty of Theology of the University of Geneva where four of these papers were first presented, provides the reader with a general introduction to French structuralism and Biblical exegesis in his opening essay. This is followed by two essays on an OT text (Genesis 32:23-33) by a structuralist (Barthes) and by a Biblical scholar (Martin-Achard), and likewise for the NT (Mark 5:1-20; Starobinski, Leenhardt). Biblical scholars who read this work will be forced to look at the Biblical text from fresh angles, whether or not they hail this particular approach as opening a new era for Bible study.

W. W. G.


This work is intended to supplement the well-known introductions to the NT by Donald Guthrie and W. G. Kümmel by providing a discussion of some of the key issues raised by the most recent literature and by introducing the theological student to critical and exegetical techniques. Section one deals with the literary form "gospel" and general trends in recent study. Section two sketches the historical background of the gospels—Palestine from Alexander the Great to Bar-Kokhba and Judaism (including its literature). Section three offers a cautious and balanced account of the traditions behind the gospels, form and redaction criticism, the Synoptic problem, and a brief introduction to textual criticism. Section four discusses each of the gospels in turn (Mark - Matthew - Luke - John), with special emphasis on the theology of each (i.e., the major thrust of more recent scholarship). Here Martin not only supplements Guthrie and Kümmel but also fills the one gap in G. E. Ladd's otherwise admirable *A Theology of the New Testament* (Eerdmans, 1974). The fifth and final section seeks to apply the techniques discussed by reference to three key texts: Matthew 11:25-30, Mark 12:1-12, and John 13:1-20.

Martin's study is to be warmly recommended to all who are concerned to
teach the NT, both as a possible supplementary text in the area of NT introduction and also for personal reading to bring one up to date in the recent literature. If the book has a weakness, it is the tendency to lay too great stress on the most recent scholarly suggestions, many of which will be forgotten a few decades hence; but if it is used alongside Guthrie and Kümmel, this seeming weakness will be overcome.

We look forward eagerly to the second volume of *New Testament Foundations*, which is promised for the near future and is to cover the rest of the NT.

W. W. G.


These two collections of essays represent volumes 8 and 13 in the series, “Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity,” edited by Neusner. Each volume contains essays which, for the most part, have been published elsewhere but which have now been revised and brought together into one volume so as to be more readily accessible to students of Biblical literature and of Judaism.

Vermes, well known for his translation of and studies in the Dead Sea scrolls, offers thirteen essays listed under the headings: I. Qumran, II. Bible Exegesis, and III. Rabbinic History. Only the final essay, “Ancient Rome in Post-Biblical Jewish Literature,” has not been previously published. Of special interest to Christian scholars will be, *inter alia*, “The Qumran Interpretation of Scripture in its Historical Setting,” “Bible and Midrash: Early Old Testament Exegesis,” “He is the Bread”—Targum Neofiti Exodus 16:15,” and “The Use of Bar Nasha/Bar Nasha [Son of Man] in Jewish Aramaic.”

Neusner’s volume contains one hitherto unpublished essay, “The Meaning of Oral Torah.” Of particular interest to the readers of this *Journal* will be his rather extensive interaction with E. R. Goodenough’s *Jewish Symbols*, which occupies the bulk of the third section on “Art.” Although Neusner is very positive toward Goodenough’s conclusions, here one is not confronted by the polemical and ax-grinding tone which has made the latter scholar’s views so repulsive to many. In addition, Neusner has some very pertinent comments for New Testament scholars who seek to relate their discipline to early Judaism.

Both volumes contain useful indexes. It is unfortunate that the second volume contains so many typographical errors.

W. W. G.
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* * *

Dan Block has requested that the concluding statement in his review of Alec Motyer, *The Day of the Lion*, in the Fall 1975 issue of the *Journal* be changed to read as follows:

"The book (which, incidentally, may be used to good advantage in conjunction with his commentary on Amos in *New Bible Commentary: Revised*) is therefore highly recommended as a commentary, and anyone instructing a class on Amos in church or at the undergraduate level will be advised to consider using it as a text. The reviewer has encountered none better."