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When I was quite small, my chief longing as one particular Christmas approached was for a model train set. We had a catalogue giving details of what was available, and before Christmas I knew by heart the description that began, "This is the largest and best of the complete model railway sets..." The publishers of the present work might well want to state in their catalogue that this is "the largest and best" Bible encyclopedia of recent years.

The Bible student already has available a number of Bible encyclopedias, and these are detailed in the article "Bible Dictionaries" in ZPEB by that indefatigable bibliophile, Wilbur M. Smith (who has also contributed a survey of Biblical "Commentaries"). British scholars, such as the present reviewer, are most familiar with The New Bible Dictionary (1962) edited by J. D. Douglas, whose
expertise is also revealed in *The New International Dictionary of the Christian Church* (Zondervan, 1974). *The New Bible Dictionary* contains a remarkable amount of compact information in the Biblical field and is especially strong on the archaeological side. At the same time those who wanted fuller information have been able to turn to *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, a lavish work in four volumes with many illustrations. We are not so familiar with the one-volume *Zondervan Pictorial Bible Dictionary* (1963), which has not enjoyed such a wide circulation in Britain.

But now we have this new mammoth-sized work from Zondervan, and it is good to know that it is also to be marketed in Britain by Marshall, Morgan and Scott. It runs to just under 5,000 pages of text, interspersed with many illustrations in black and white and accompanied by colored plates in each volume and also a set of Rand McNally maps in the final volume. Among the illustrations special mention must be accorded to the quite superb set of 71 photos in color of Biblical coins, for which we are indebted to Gleason L. Archer.

The success of a work must be judged in the light of its stated aims. This encyclopedia is intended to supply more detail for scholarly study than was possible in the one-volume ZPBD, which was intended for the use of pastors and others. It claims, therefore, to deal in greater detail with technical matters and to be a comprehensive survey of general Biblical and theological knowledge.

The scope of the work is thus very similar to that of IDB, and comparison will show that the general format of the two works is very similar. Indeed it is not surprising that on many subjects where the facts are not in dispute ZPEB and IDB each contain virtually the same material in their own words. In general, the later work has the advantage of being able to be more up-to-date, and my sample comparisons suggested that ZPEB need not fear being placed alongside IDB. Where IDB scores over ZPEB in a number of cases is in the provision of fuller and more technical bibliographies. For example, my random sampling shows that ZPEB provides no bibliography for "Christian," "Mithraism," "Nazarene," or even for "Septuagint" (although there are a few references in the text).

Over 240 scholars drawn from America and overseas have taken part in this production, so that the editors have been able to draw on the particular expertise of scholars who have already established their reputations in the fields on which they are writing here. Thus we have the expert opinions of G. S. Candsale on the fauna of Palestine and W. E. Shewell-Cooper on the flora. We have K. A. Kitchen on Egypt (33 pp.) and D. J. Wiseman on Babylon. Gnostic and other post-apostolic writings are treated by A. K. Helmbold and R. M. Wilson. For textual criticism of the NT the editors have been able to rely on J. N. Birdsall, G. D. Fee, and J. H. Greenlee. Questions of canonicity are in the hands of R. L. Harris and D. Guthrie. In a work of this length it is possible to give broader coverage to areas that fall outside the Bible as such, and thus there is ample space given to the background of the Bible and to related literature. Here there are considerable contributions on "Archeology," "Greece," and "Roman Empire" by New Zealand scholar E. M. Blaiklock, who has acted as archaeology editor.

My attention has been directed mainly to the NT articles, since it can be scarcely expected of a reviewer to read the whole of so large a work, or still less to be qualified to comment on every aspect of it. Here there are some outstanding items. I would award highest marks to R. N. Longenecker's two complementary articles on "Paul, the Apostle" and "Pauline Theology" (especially the former), which are lively and stimulating. About twice as much space has been allotted to D. Guthrie's extremely comprehensive treatment of "Jesus Christ," which gives a general coverage of the history of modern criticism and then provides a fairly detailed account of Jesus' ministry and teaching. Unfortunately, however, Guthrie does not bring the two halves of his article into relationship with each
other, and one would never guess from the second half of the article that there are numerous historical problems in attempting to write a connected account of the ministry of Jesus. Both of these writers had the distinction of seeing their articles published earlier as separate books in their own right in order to whet readers' appetites for the coming encyclopedia.

The excellence of ZPEB lies in its summaries of the Biblical material. When it comes to matters of criticism, on which a student may reasonably expect some help in terms of proper and fair statement of the problems together with reasoned discussion of solutions, there will be some disappointment. The worst example of this kind is the brief article on "Q," with its curious assertion that the effect of the Q hypothesis is "now mainly in the past." On the contrary, the Q hypothesis is very much alive and kicking, as is witnessed by a number of weighty and detailed studies that have appeared over the last few years, some of which are mentioned in the article and some of which demand the most careful refutation by conservative scholars. Indeed, the synoptic problem generally receives scanty treatment in ZPEB. In the same way, the treatment of the problems of Acts is quite inadequate. When a discussion of the sources of Acts commences with the words, "This theme is one of comparative simplicity," the student can only stand aghast, and wonder whether the contributor has read any of the modern literature. A glance at a bibliography which has no mention of C. K. Barrett, H. Conzelmann, J. Dupont, E. Haenchen, J. C. O'Neill, and U. Wilckens must inevitably raise serious misgivings. It is a pity that this article was not assigned to the book review editor of JETS! Fortunately, these shortcomings are made up for to some extent in W. T. Dayton's article on "Luke, the Gospel of."

Another feature that reduces the value of the work to some extent is its repetitiousness. Several themes are treated in more than one place. Thus in addition to the substantial treatment of the teaching of Jesus in D. Guthrie's article there is also another article headed "Teaching of Jesus," much shorter than Guthrie's section on the theme and covering essentially the same ground. The theme of "inspiration" is covered both in an article with that title and in another article on "Scripture." The article on "New Testament" is in effect a summary of the articles on the several Books of the New Testament and does not add any fresh information. Another article on "Languages of the Bible" repeats what can also be found in articles on "Hebrew Language," "Aramaic Language," and "Greek Language." There really was no need for separate articles on "Biblical Criticism" and "Biblical Criticism, History of," since both articles tend to treat the subject historically.

A subject of particular interest to evangelicals is the use of the OT in the NT. Here we have a fine article by an acknowledged expert in the person of R. H. Gundry, but one feels that he could have been allocated more space with considerable advantage. One looks in vain, however, for an article on "Typology," although "Allegory" gets a substantial treatment. The article on "Midrash" is rather dated.

It is perhaps in areas of background that ZPEB comes out best. High praise is due to D. A. Hagner for his fine, factual articles on "Pharisee" and "Sadducee" and his treatments of intertestamental books, and to W. L. Liefeld writing on "Mystery Religions." There are also excellent treatments of "Temple, Jerusalem" by H. G. Stigers and of "Synagogue" by W. White, Jr. And how fortunate we are to have H. W. Hoechner's ample discussion of "Herod!"

Considerable space is devoted to discussion of theological issues. There is a lively and full article on "Myth" with special reference to modern hermeneutics by A. C. Thiselton. Generally speaking, the theological articles are concerned with presenting a systematic survey of their themes rather than what the Biblical writers themselves thought. This is particularly obvious in C. F. H. Henry's
lengthy discussion of "God"; in some 17 pages the only Biblical text cited is James 1:17. The article on "Government" by H. M. Carson makes a fine attempt to relate Biblical teaching to the modern situation. "Christology" is dealt with on a Biblical basis by R. A. Cole, but the contents of the article are largely repeated in the separate articles on the various Christological titles such as "Messiah" (a good treatment by J. Jocz), "Son of God" (also by R. A. Cole), and "Son of Man" (far too brief and out-of-date). One of the oddities of the volume is the inclusion of three articles on "Baptism" from the "Sacramentarian," "Baptist," and "Reformed" viewpoints. Each writer discusses the theme in terms of his particular outlook, and the sad result is that nowhere is the Biblical evidence presented comprehensively and exegetically. Also, the possible backgrounds to Christian baptism in Jewish and other rites scarcely get mentioned. By contrast, "Lord's Supper" receives an excellent, up-to-date discussion from G. F. Hawthorne.

These comments are obviously somewhat random, the fruit of dipping into this rich work rather than reading it systematically (after all, one does not normally read a dictionary!). If they have drawn attention to weaknesses in the work, these must be seen in proportion to the excellences that it also possesses. The technical production of the work leaves nothing to be desired—beyond a minor grumble that the volume numbers do not appear on the front and back of the dust cover of each volume as well as on the spine. The print is easy to read, and misprints are few (chiefly in ancient and foreign languages). The photographic work is excellent, and much care has obviously gone into matching the pictures to the text. A large number of sketch maps place geographical names in their topographical setting. It is clear that these volumes are going to be of tremendous value to theological students and to all who teach and preach the Word of God. And the scholar will not fail to profit from the sheer wealth of knowledge present in this work. It has been Tenney's special service to evangelicalism to provide his colleagues and students with a series of admirable teaching aids by means of which the Bible is presented against its background. In this crowning achievement of his teaching career he has placed us all greatly in debt to him, and this reviewer for one will be keeping the Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible close to his elbow as a valuable tool for his own study.

I. Howard Marshall

University of Aberdeen, Scotland

NEW TESTAMENT


Modern Synoptic Gospel research has come to involve three distinct though interrelated disciplines: literary criticism, form criticism, and most recently redaction criticism. In an attempt to provide a detailed exegesis of the so-called "Great Commission" of Matthew 28:16-20, Benjamin Hubbard has brought all three disciplines to bear on the passage. Undoubtedly, his most significant contribution is his suggestion that the commission narrative of Matthew 28:16-20 is modeled on the commissioning narratives of the Hebrew Bible. But Hubbard is also interested in how Matthew redacted a primitive apostolic
commissioning in order to form the conclusion of his gospel.

A full half of the book (excluding two appendices) is spent in examining the literary form of Matthew 28:16-20 because Hubbard is convinced that its form has never been satisfactorily explained. Following the lead of Wolfgang Trilling, Hubbard looks to the Hebrew OT speeches-of-God for a model; but, unlike Trilling, he focuses exclusively on commissionings. In order to analyze the OT commissionings into their component parts he borrows seven categories (introduction, confrontation, reaction, commission, protest, reassurance, and conclusion) from the form critical studies of OT commission passages by J. Kuntz, N. Habel, and K. Baltzer. He then proceeds to lay out methodically every commissioning passage in the OT in terms of the seven categories.

While it is possible to quibble with certain elements in his analysis, such as designating the Abrahamic covenants of Genesis 15:1-6 and 17:1-14 commissioning passages, in general Hubbard does an acceptable job of breaking down each commission into its component parts and showing that commissionings follow a basically similar pattern. He further demonstrates that certain terms and ideas consistently occur in the commissioning pericopes (e.g., “I am with you,” “fear not,” “go,” “all,” and “I command”).

It seems to this writer that Hubbard’s primary shortcoming in the first section of his book is his lack of attention to the role content has in determining literary form. The OT writers were perhaps not totally conscious of the fact that their commissioning passages followed a very similar literary form. In fact, it was probably content that largely determined the form. In short, Hubbard’s analysis could have been improved by considering the relationship between form and content.

In chapter three Hubbard attempts to demonstrate that “Matthew was significantly influenced by the [commissioning] Gattung and its vocabulary when he composed the missionary charge in 28:16-20,” while also endeavoring to provide an exegesis of the last five verses of Matthew. His exegesis of Matthew 28 is fairly standard; however, the real issue is to what extent Matthew was influenced by the commissionings of the OT. Essentially, Hubbard approaches the problem from the standpoint of similar form and vocabulary.

Unquestionably, Matthew 28:16-20 contains the same basic elements present in most of the OT commissionings; but so do the commissioning texts of Luke 24:36-53, John 20:19-23, and Mark 16:14-20. Furthermore, each of the abovementioned commissioning passages has vocabulary and thought patterns similar to the OT commissionings. Hubbard is not unaware of these facts, but he glosses over their significance. Given the similar form and vocabulary of the commissioning accounts in the gospels, it seems probable that the so-called commissioning form was present in the oral tradition and that the form itself was determined by the content and nature of the original apostolic commissioning. Nevertheless, it is possible that Matthew was conscious of the commissioning form as found in the OT; but even so, the thrust of the author’s argument requires modification.

In the final chapter of the book Hubbard attempts to prove that Matthew redacted a proto-commissioning tradition held in common with Luke and John. He compares the commissioning account of Luke 24:36-53 and John 20:19-23 with Matthew 28:16-20 in order to determine what constituted the original commissioning tradition; however, he fails to give sufficient evidence to prove that all three accounts came from a common tradition, especially in light of the dissimilarity in the setting and basic content of Matthew over against Luke and John.

The reconstruction of the original commission and a subsequent proto-commission remains hypothetical, particularly since Hubbard’s
reconstructions are based on the supposition that Jesus could not have given a universalistic commission. That the earliest disciples did not carry out a universal mission is true, but that is not surprising since the gospels and Acts indicate that their understanding of Jesus was highly inculturated. Furthermore, there is a nascent universalism throughout the teachings of Jesus as they are preserved in the gospels. Ultimately, Hubbard’s statements concerning Matthew’s redaction of a proto-commission suffer from the inconclusive nature of the evidence concerning the form of the commissioning tradition received by Matthew. He is on firmer ground in his contention that 28:16-20 reflects theological points harmonious with the rest of the gospel.

We should appreciate the author’s efforts in explicating the commission form, even if it is necessary to hold in question many of his conclusions.

Charles Wamaker
Faculty of Theology, The University, Durham, England


The heart of this book, and its *raison d’être*, lies in an exhaustive list, 140 pages long, of all the places where Matthew and Luke differ from Mark in a passage of Markan origin. The list was drawn up by T. Hansen as part of a doctoral dissertation at Louvain, submitted to the Synoptic Seminar at the 1972 meeting of the *Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas*, and then revised and restructured for publication. It takes account of all previous lists and indicates which cases have been included by which scholars in the past. It soon becomes clear that there is a large measure of subjectivity in what is considered to be both (a) a difference from Mark and (b) an agreement between Matthew and Luke. But herein lies the justification for a comprehensive listing of this nature: It provides all the possibly relevant information, from which the individual scholar can then select what he considers to be real and significant “agreements against Mark.” For this purpose, this book should prove a reliable and indeed essential tool for those wrestling with this particular aspect of the Synoptic problem.

Three further sections are added to make up the book. First comes a brief history of the study of the subject, heavily footnoted with bibliographical details and summaries of individual scholars’ conclusions. After the list comes a detailed classification of the different types of “agreement against” in terms of style and vocabulary (90 pages). This second listing provides much useful statistical information on the evangelists’ stylistic preferences, such as their respective uses of historic presents, periphrastic verbs, or genitive absolutes. But it should not be forgotten that the statistics given relate specifically to the “agreements against Mark,” not to the Synoptic material as a whole, and so are valuable only in the context of this special branch of Synoptic studies. Finally, an article by Frans Neirynck on “The Argument from Order and St. Luke’s Transpositions” from *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 49 (1973) is reprinted as an appendix. It consists largely of a critical assessment of the arguments of E. P. Sanders and R. Morgenthaler, and as such is a contribution to a continuing debate rather than having any definitive role. Its links with the rest of the volume are rather tenuous.

R. T. France
Tyndale House, 36 Selwyn Gardens, Cambridge, England

Since there are so few commentaries on the pastoral epistles available in English, I looked forward with eagerness to examine this one. Its avowed intention to make the text relevant to the situation of the preacher or teacher in the local church is certainly commendable. The commentary is based on the RSV, although Ward makes use of the underlying Greek text. He is particularly interested in the theology of the epistles and attempts to relate the teaching found in them to the whole teaching of the NT.

In spite of many commendable features, the book proved to be disappointing. I shall try to point out its strengths and weaknesses in these five areas: (1) its treatment of the critical problems; (2) its hermeneutical principles; (3) its use of Greek; (4) its theological approach; and (5) its authoritarianism.

(1) Only a very brief treatment is made of critical problems. In the introduction, reference is made to the four kinds of arguments that have been made against the Pauline authorship, but they are all dismissed with little more than a passing reference.

Ward disposes of the historical argument that these epistles cannot be fitted into the narrative of Acts, stating flatly that they were all written later.

With regard to the ecclesiastical argument, Ward rightly argues that the type of church organization reflected in the pastorals is earlier than that of the second century. With regard to the closely related doctrinal argument, he suggests that judgment be reserved until the theology of the epistles is considered more fully. He does not, however, allow his readers to do this, for he begins his comments on each book by a summary of its theology.

Ward states that the main attack against the authenticity of these epistles has been in the field of language and admits that "in point of language the Pastorals are a distinct, homogeneous group." But he insists that these need not imply that Paul did not write them. The distinctiveness of the language is explained as being due to the new situation and circumstances in which the epistles were written. The reasons Ward gives for this change in the apostle's circumstances—his advancing years, the possible impact of Latin, and his use of an amanuensis—are not very convincing. In a commentary this failure to come to grips with such critical issues is a serious omission.

(2) The commentary frequently follows unsound hermeneutical principles in determining the meaning of words and expressions. The presence of a word in a given passage is used as a pretext to discuss the meaning of the word in all the other New Testament passages in which it is found. One is left with the distinct impression that the meaning of a word has been determined from its usage elsewhere and then that meaning is imported into the particular passage in the pastorals. For example, in his discussion of 1 Timothy 1:9 Ward declares: "In speaking of the just, Paul clearly had justified men in mind." On the contrary, there is no indication the specialized meaning of "justified" is intended. Ward's desire to find a consistent "Pauline" meaning in words having the same root leads him into some difficulty in explaining how it could be said in 1 Timothy 3:16 that Christ was "justified;"

In his comment on 1 Timothy 2:4, Ward falls prey to a common error of explaining the meaning of a Greek word from the meaning of the Hebrew word that it translates in the Septuagint. He points out that the Greek verb thēlō is used in the LXX to translate the Hebrew verb hāpēs, "to delight in," and concludes that this is the meaning of the Greek verb here.

There is one clear example of allegorizing in the commentary. In 2 Timothy 2:20 "the great house," we are told, "as opposed to a mean shack, stands for the
church." There are other interpretations that, while not allegory, are equally doubtful. The requirement stated in 1 Timothy 3:2 and 3:12 that bishops and deacons be "the husband of one wife" is taken to mean that they have a marriage that works, one where "there is a community with two members who in a deep and real sense are one." In 1 Timothy 6:10, Ward takes exception to the RSV rendering, "the love of money is the root of all evils," and concludes: "In actual fact, however, Paul wrote 'a root'; there is no definite article." It is true that there is no definite article in the Greek, but neither is there an indefinite article. On 2 Timothy 4:10 he expresses preference for the marginal reading, "Gaul," instead of "Galatia" (preferred by the editors of the Bible Societies’ Greek text and by almost all modern translators).

(3) The commentary frequently points out the significance of the Greek tense or case. Ward has an excellent appreciation of the significance of the perfect tense, stating that "the perfect tense expresses the abiding result of a past act." For example, on 1 Timothy 5:5 in connection with the widow, Ward says, "The two perfect tenses suggest a crisis in her life. 'She who has been made solitary' means that 'she is now alone.' This obviously refers to the death of her husband. 'She has set her hope on God' implies that 'her hope is now resting firmly on God.'"

Ward tends to limit the use of the aorist to a definitive, once-for-all action. He says, for example, that the aorist tense of "saved" in 2 Timothy 1:9 shows that the apostle views salvation "as God's decisive act, of which the swift 'plucking' from the fire of destruction is an apt and vivid picture." The use of the present tense in Titus 1:14 is pressed to mean that the false teachers mentioned there are those who had not finally turned away from the truth, but were only in the process of doing so, in contrast to the extremists mentioned in Titus 1:16, whose deeds belie their words. Whatever the significance of the tenses in those two passages, it is evident that the same persons are being described, not two different groups of persons.

Ward prefers to translate the Greek preposition en consistently in the local sense of "in," even when the instrumental use makes better sense. For example, he admits that in 1 Timothy 4:2 the RSV rendering, "through the pretensions of liars," is a natural one. Yet he suggests that either the phrase refers to "doctrines of demons present in the pretensions of liars" or to the giving heed to the doctrines of demons "in the atmosphere of the sham of liars.

(4) The distinctive feature of the commentary is its theological approach. There are some excellent summaries of NT teaching on particular theological topics. The material is drawn largely from other Books of the NT. For example, the comment on the verb "to purify" in Titus 2:14 consists almost entirely of an exposition of the teaching of the Book of Hebrews on the subject.

There are, unfortunately, instances where Ward's theological views seem to have dictated his interpretation. For example, in 1 Timothy 6:12, the command to Timothy to "take hold of eternal life" is interpreted to mean to "enter more deeply into the possession of the eternal life which became his when he first believed." Here Ward has substituted the Johannine concept of eternal life as the present possession of the Christian believer for the concept, consistently found in the pastorals, that eternal life will be received by the believer in the life to come. Even in such passages as Titus 1:2 and 3:7, where believers are said to live in the "hope of eternal life," Ward insists that such persons have already received eternal life. The statement made in 2 Timothy 2:10, "I endure everything for the sake of the elect, that they also may obtain the salvation which in Christ Jesus goes with eternal glory," is taken to refer to those who have not yet been converted but who are destined to obtain salvation when they hear the Word and believe. The statement in 2 Timothy 2:12, "If we deny him, he also will deny us,"
by an appeal to the "episode" of Peter's denial and restoration, is said to state a principle which does not apply to Christian believers but to those who refuse to believe in Jesus.

(5) There is a strong emphasis in the commentary on the authority of the pastor. It is assumed that what is said about elders and deacons in the pastoral epistles has to do with pastors in the modern sense. In his comment on the appointment of elders in Titus 1:5, for example, Ward proceeds to argue for the importance of every church having a minister. There is no sympathy for any opportunity for congregational "feedback" such as is being advocated by those currently active in church renewal and the expression of "body life" in the local church. In commenting on 2 Timothy 1:11, Ward replies to the charge made by some that the modern preacher has the congregation at his mercy with no opportunity for the members to answer back. He says: "Contradiction of the man in the pulpit would be in order if his subject were a subject of discussion. But it should never be this. If the preacher really preaches the Word of God (and he has no authority to preach anything else), contradiction, comment and discussion are out of place." At this point Ward is erroneously equating the sermon with Scripture. The sermon includes interpretation, illustration and application of Scripture. If Ward's commentary is a fair example of the kinds of things he includes in his sermons, then I would venture to say that he might well profit from an open discussion by members of his congregation! Certainly all of us should be open to receive questions and comments from those who come to hear us preach and teach the Word of God.

G. Henry Waterman
Wheaton College, Wheaton, Illinois 60187


This Louvain doctoral dissertation is an exhaustive study of the wording of Matthew's passion narrative and its relation to that of Mark. Every variation is catalogued in minute detail and the choice of wording carefully explained, though some of the explanations left me wondering why Matthew might not sometimes be allowed a stylistic preference without thereby revealing a profound theological Tendenz. Along the way several useful word-studies with full vocabulary statistics come in. Three overall theological emphases of Matthew are eventually isolated: his heightened Christology, his highlighting of Jewish responsibility for the death of Jesus, and his presentation of various individuals as ethical examples. There is nothing very new or surprising here, but these and other minor emphases are well documented in the verse-by-verse study.

The meticulous method of the author brings out clearly how carefully Matthew worked at the wording of his passion account and illustrates his skill in the dramatic presentation of the narrative. But it sometimes seems to fail to see the forest for the trees. Individual pericopes are not discussed as a whole but only in their component verses, phrases and words, so that one is left with a view of the gospel more as a dissected corpse than as a living work of literature, let alone of theology. Such detailed redactional study has much to contribute to our understanding of the theology of the evangelists, but here it seems to have gotten out of proportion, resulting in a study not of Matthew but of "what Matthew has done with Mark."
The one outstanding exception to this criticism is the long discussion of the Judas pericope (27:3-10), which was previously published in Ephe merides Theologicae Lovanienses 48 (1972) and is here reprinted as an appendix. Here, where there is no clear Markan background to consider, the author is bound to consider Matthew more in his own right, and the result is a most satisfying study. His conclusion, that the pericope was composed by Matthew to fill a gap in the structure of Mark's passion narrative, inspired by Zechariah 11:13 and Jeremiah 19:1 ff., but using an existing tradition of the death of Judas and the field of blood (the same traditional elements that occur in Acts 1:18 f.), appears sound and well argued. The theological purpose of the pericope is sensitively spelled out.

Underlying the whole conception of this work is the question of sources, and it is here that the author's attention is principally concentrated. He takes as a working hypothesis Matthew's use of Mark, which is fair enough. But the hypothesis becomes in practice an iron rule. The discussion is always in terms of "how Matthew got to here from the text of Mark." The relation of Matthew to Luke is not considered, even in so crucial a pericope as the institution of the Lord's supper. And the possibility that Matthew was at any point independent of, let alone prior to, Mark is never allowed to intrude. Given this orientation, it is hardly surprising that Senior concludes that Mark was Matthew's only source in the passion narrative. Even the peculiarly Matthean passages are combed for traces of Markan language and explained by the influence of themes from the surrounding Markan context. What did not come from Mark came directly from Matthew's own creative writing, under the influence of Mark and of the Old Testament. (Readers of Gaulter's Midrash and Lection in Matthew will recognize the same source-theory. Senior worked independently of Gaulter but mentions his agreement with him in an additional note.) The possibility that such striking sayings as Matthew 26:52 f. might be derived from an independently preserved tradition is consistently disallowed, so that when the conclusion is reached, as it is in every case except the elements of the death of Judas and the field of blood mentioned above, that Matthew had no source other than Mark and his own creative ability, there is more than a suspicion of petitio principii. Even where it is possible that Matthew composed a verse or two from unrelated elements in the surrounding Markan context, is this always the most likely explanation? Such a question is not decided by compiling vocabulary statistics but by literary judgment, and an unbending source-critical theory allows little scope for this.

This is not a book to read. Its exhaustive examination of detail soon becomes tedious, particularly where it seems to amount to a labored demonstration of the obvious. The presentation is that of a thesis with massive documentation and bibliography, and the path is not made smoother for an English reader by words like "explicitate," "explainable," and "cataclyptic," or the use of "thematic" and "stylistic" as nouns. But its verse-by-verse presentation makes it a convenient work for reference in a library, and few significant exegetical studies seem to escape mention in the footnotes.

R. T. France
Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Nigeria
BOOK REVIEWS


This important book from the prolific pen of Martin Hengel is an expansion of his inaugural address at Tübingen University delivered May 16, 1973. The subtitle and the first chapter reveal the problem to which he addresses himself. In the spring of A.D. 30, a Jew was crucified in Jerusalem on what was basically a political charge. Yet within 27 years (the chronology is Kümmel's), a Christian church in Philippi was being taught to sing a hymn that confessed this Jew's messianic identity and pre-existence and affirmed that he was en morphē theou. And the hymn itself was undoubtedly earlier.

In his second and fourth chapters, Hengel sketches in critical opinion from Harnack to Schoeps. Hengel rejects all reconstructions that postulate that Paul was so influenced by Hellenistic thought of one variety or another that he transformed the simple Jewish preaching of Jesus into what we now recognize as Christianity. Those of the religionsgeschichtliche Schule specify that the dominant influence on emerging Christianity was a new Kultusfrömmigkeit which received its impress from the mystery religions and especially from Gnosticism. They thus dissociate themselves from Harnack's theories about the speculative-philosophical interests of Greek (pagan) Christians. Nevertheless they concur that Christianity as expounded in Paul is "im Grunde eine ganz neue Religion gegenüber dem palästinensischen Urchristentum" (Bultmann). If their analysis is correct, we must choose between Jesus and Paul. And nowhere do such reconstructions have more influence than in the study of the early development of Christology.

In the third chapter, Hengel examines the use of "Son of God" in the epistles he takes to be genuinely Pauline. He agrees with Bousset that the fifteen occurrences appear at high points in Paul's presentation. But against Bousset and with Kramer, Hengel insists the title is not a Pauline creation. This pushes it back to earlier times. The title "Son of God" is connected with the mission of the pre-existent Son into the world, his surrender to death, and his role as the mediator of creation. Either these things sprang up within a Jewish setting, or else Christianity was paganized unbelievably early.

So far Hengel has traversed well-worn ground. His fifth chapter, however, contains much that is new and thought-provoking. Here he examines both Hellenistic and Jewish literature to discover how ho huios tou theou (or huios theou) is used. Classical Greek usage is closely bounded by ideas of physical descent; a more extended meaning occurs only at the periphery of the expression's semantic range. Its meaning is further limited, both in the classical and Hellenistic periods, by the fact that the more extended significance is usually taken over by pais. The paedes Dios of Hellenistic nature-religions form no bridge to the primitive Christian consciousness of one son of one God. In the mysteries there are no rising and dying "sons of God"; and as for the dying gods Attis, Osiris, and Adonis, they began their existence when born on the earth and thus lack the essential pre-existence and Sendungsmotiv. Because full-fledged mystery religions cannot be traced to sources earlier than the second century, Bultmann is guilty of "eine phantastische Konstruktion, die den religionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund der frühen syrischen Gemeinden nicht erhielt, sondern verdunkelt." In a similar way, Hengel dismisses alleged parallels among the "divine men" in the Gnostic redeemer myth and in the Hermetica.

By contrast, the idea of "son" in the OT is regularly used to express all kinds of relationships—including one's relation to the state, to God, to a people or calling, of angels, of God's people collectively, and of the Davidic king (Hengel
notes that the "today" of Psalm 2:7 precludes a merely physical relationship and, far from being a foreign concept, probably relates to enthronement. Intertestamental Judaism expanded yet further the multifaceted possibilities of *huios theou*. Hengel provides multiplied scores of references to the apocryphal and pseudepigraphic literature, the Talmuds, Philo, and the Dead Sea scrolls. The expression is made to refer to—*inter alia*—wisdom, charismatic miracle-workers, the kingly Messiah, angels, the king's son, and Metatron.

The sixth chapter provides us with Hengel's reconstruction of the development of early Christology. Beginning with the confession in Romans 1:3 f., Hengel allows for an alleged *Urform* that omits any nuance of pre-existence, although he concedes that Paul saw that pre-existence was involved. The two points of the confession are grounded in the earthly Jesus, born of the seed of David, and in the resurrection event, in which God raised Jesus (*horistheis* is a typical *passivum divinum*). The question is, Why does this confession call Jesus "Son of God" instead of "Lord," "Messiah," or "Son of man"? Hengel replies, "Der Titel Sohn Gottes schliesst—wie kein anderer im Neuen Testament—die Gestalt Jesu mit Gott zusammen." Hengel offers several *historical* arguments to justify this conclusion. The next step, which sees Jesus as pre-existent, sent, and the mediatorial Creator, developed within Palestine/Syria among Greek-speaking *Jewish* believers driven from Jerusalem by early persecution. That such themes developed from heathen influence is, according to Hengel, "hoehst unwahrscheinlich." Rather, the further development of Christology depended on inner necessity. To preach Jesus as the fulfillment of God's eschatological purposes necessarily raised the question of his relationship to other elements of the *Mutterreligion*—angels, wisdom, temple service, other mediators of revelation, and ultimately Torah. "Fulfillment" presupposes priority of purpose, and pre-existence is not far away. Pre-existence leads to the "descent" motifs, and hence to the "legends" of a miraculous birth. Absolute authority on the part of Jesus calls in question the permanence of Torah. In short, by appealing to inner necessity Hengel is attempting to explain the rise of early Christology in the same way Klaus Haacker tries to explain Johannine Christology (cf. his *Die Stiftung des Heils* [Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1972], although Hengel makes no mention of Haacker's work).

Hengel's final two chapters discuss the "Son" in Hebrews, especially with respect to angels, and a few theological consequences of the study, including the fact that, for Christians, the entire revelation of God is at stake.

I welcome this penetrating study as an excellent antidote to much (especially German) contemporary scholarship. Its main point is surely correct: Pauline Christology finds its most believable *Mutterboden* within a Jewish setting, not a pagan one. Besides minor points of disagreement, my reservations are twofold. (1) I do not share Hengel's historical skepticism about several events that the New Testament writers are content to think of as historical. (2) At one point (p. 67), Hengel argues that intertestamental Judaism expanded the semantic range of *huios theou* precisely during the period when Judaism was clashing with, and being influenced by, paganism. This, he thinks, provides the crucial background. Unfortunately he does not explain what difference this confrontation makes, and it is difficult to see it intuitively when he has done such a thorough job of discrediting alleged pagan parallels. It sounds like a tipping of the hat to the main theme of his *magnum opus*, *Judaism and Hellenism*, namely the interpenetration of the two during the period 300 B. C. to A. D. 100. I sense a fairly major inconsistency. Perhaps Hengel will put us further in his debt by clarifying this point for us in future publications.

The production is marred by a lack of indices.

D. A. Carson
Northwest Baptist Theological College, Vancouver, B. C., Canada
THEOLOGY


Both scholars and ordinary Christians find the continued re-examination of the theology and practice of the Lord’s supper fruitful. But this volume does more than cover old ground or summarize the results of recent Biblical scholarship. As the subtitle—“An Ethical and Biblical Inquiry”—indicates, the purpose of the study is to set the Lord’s supper in the context of both Scripture and its ethical implications. By “ethical,” Cochrane does not mean simply the practical consequences of communion for restoration of broken fellowship among Christians or for more consistent demonstrations of unity in the ecumenical movement. “Ethical” here means the wider implications of the eucharist for the Church’s diakonia in the world.

The text contains three chapters: “Why Men May Eat and Drink with Jesus,” “What Men May Eat and Drink with Jesus,” and “How Men May Eat and Drink with Jesus.” Cochrane sets the Lord’s supper within the context of man’s existential act of eating and drinking—that is, human existence at the basic level demands eating and drinking for survival. But more than this, eating and drinking are pleasurable and enjoyable acts that provide escape from life’s tragedies. Yet eating and drinking even on the merely survival level cannot be separated from the grace of God in Jesus Christ. “We have heard,” says our author, “the answer that God permits and commands men to eat and drink. And we have heard that the commandment is fulfilled in Jesus. In him the commandment or word has become flesh. He is at once the commanding God and the obedient man who eats and drinks in gratitude. Through him all men are made free for a joyful eating and drinking. He—he alone—is the answer to the question why men may and must eat and drink” (pp. 23 f.). In the broadest sense, eating and drinking belong to the essence of culture and man’s purpose, but the Church is the goal of culture:

The purpose of all work, of all eating and drinking, is for the sake of the church of Jesus Christ. All is to the end that men may be caught for faith, love, and hope—caught for God, to whom they belong. Human life is preserved by work that is commanded and blessed by God in order that the gospel may be preached and men may be called to faith and repentance. Whether men know it or not, there is no other justification for agriculture, manufacturing, commerce and finance, for education, science, and culture. We have not been put here merely to catch fish, but in order that men may be caught for Christ. Or put the other way round: were it not for the church, for the preaching of the good news, and for the call to faith, love, and hope, there would be no political and economic order. The world exists and mankind is preserved for the sake of the covenant that God has made with man in Jesus Christ; that is, in order that men may live with and for Jesus (pp. 26 f.).

“What men may eat and drink with Jesus” is found in the Johannine picture of Jesus as the “bread of life” to which the Lord’s supper points. Cochrane calls for more “church suppers,” not simply as fund-raising opportunities but rather as occasions for genuine celebration. The practice of celebrating the Lord’s supper as an isolated part of the worship service at which no real eating and drinking occur is condemned. Cochrane would move the celebration of the Lord’s supper from the sanctuary to the fellowship hall of the church, and he
would invite not only believers but even unbelievers to join in the celebration. This systematic theologian is not, however, a mere restorationist; bread and wine are not essential elements of the ordinance or sacrament. Indeed for Cochrane even a cocktail party may be a legitimate occasion for celebrating the Lord's supper. "How men may eat and drink with Jesus" demands that we understand the Lord's supper as a ground for faith, love and hope. In this context, Cochrane broadens the celebration of the Lord's supper into a mandate for social involvement. Man's ultimate hope, however, rests in the marriage supper of the Lamb at the return of Jesus Christ.

Probably the price more than anything else will keep this volume out of the hands of many readers! Its weaknesses are rather minor. Few cocktail parties would provide a good setting for the celebration of the Lord's supper, but more importantly Jesus' practice of eating and drinking with sinners seems hardly a justification for inviting unbelievers to join Christians in the celebration of the Lord's supper. Cochrane fails to take note of a practice in the early Church of celebrating the Lord's supper at morning services with only believers present while an evening service was held at which Christians invited their non-Christian friends to hear the gospel. Cochrane never mentions 2 Corinthians 6:14—7:1!

Positively, this book has much to commend it. It will provide the minister with some very helpful insights for making the celebration of the Lord's supper a more meaningful affair in the life of his congregation. Although not a long book, its treatment of Biblical texts is impressive. The volume has two appendices: one dealing with the question of sacramentalism, and a second dealing with the problem of bridging the gap of history or what Lessing called "the ugly, broad ditch." It is interesting that in the first appendix Zwingli, not Calvin or Luther, receives the credit for correcting the sacramentalism of Roman Catholicism. Cochrane has no sympathies with those who seek to justify the real presence in the eucharist other than a presence of Christ through the Holy Spirit. For this reason the preposition with must even stand before the word Jesus. In the Lord's supper we never "eat Jesus." The Church and the world are invited to "eat with Jesus." Cochrane's volume belongs with the other important recent studies on the Lord's supper, but its contribution to ecumenical theology will be divisive rather than unifying.

Donald M. Lake
Wheaton College, Wheaton, Illinois 60187


A sense of appreciation was my first reaction to seeing a title so greatly needed by the growing movement that calls itself Hebrew Christianity or Messianic Judaism. The author has done us a service in giving us this volume. The book contains many fine features. There is a clear outline and presentation of the issues, along with the author's conclusions. The general recounting of the history is lively and not bogged down with details. This will appeal to a wide audience.

Fruchtenbaum properly explains the need for Jewish cultural identification among Hebrew Christians along with clear applications of the meaning of the practices that instill this identification for a Christian. His discussion of the feasts shows how these can be practiced in a non-legalistic manner in a way that extols the fulfillment in Jesus the Messiah. There is even information on a Jewish
Christian wedding service. All of this is Biblically defended with the understanding that, although all believers are one in the Messiah, oneness does not remove the richness of cultural distinctives within the body of Christ.

There are features of the book, however, that are disappointing. For example, the author seeks to speak to the vexing question, Who is a Jew? in a cavalier way he announces that the problem is simply resolved by going to the Bible, which clearly teaches that no one can become a Jew by conversion but that Jewishness is by physical and national descent through the father (rather than through the mother, as in the case of modern Jewish definition)! Fruchtenbaum does not seem to recognize that the distinctiveness of the nation was not only through physical descent but was to be maintained mostly through religious and moral practice. This is why Jewish people were allowed to marry those of different physical descent when the latter accepted circumcision as the sign of entering into the covenant and its practices. Can even the author be sure that he does not come from a stock of converted Jews where the blood is not predominantly from Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob? In proving his point, he quotes passages from Acts to show that Gentiles attached to the synagogue were not considered Jews but proselytes. However, no less an authority than F. F. Bruce says that proselytes were Gentiles attached to the synagogue who were not willing to undergo the full requirements of Jewish conversion. Would it not be better to recognize that definition in this area is especially complex, since in the case of the Jewish people there are religious, cultural, and ethnic considerations mixed together as there are not in the case of other peoples?

The other source of disappointment is Fruchtenbaum’s evaluation of Hebrew Christian congregations. He rejects the idea of identification through the formation of congregations that are Jewish or Hebraic in flavor or composition (pp. 94-98). His reasons are: (1) Such a separation of Jews and Gentiles in the Church is unbiblical; (2) such an arrangement deprives the local church of the presence of Hebrew Christian believers; (3) such attempts have been largely unsuccessful. In my view, this evaluation is judgmental toward those of us involved in such congregations, betrays a lack of understanding of the Hebrew Christian congregations, and betrays a lack of understanding of church-growth principles (such as are now being taught by the Fuller School of Missions). There is no Biblical warrant for saying that churches of distinctive cultural flavor are not justified. A few miles from us we have Korean churches, Chinese churches, and Spanish churches, to name only a few. The reason for this is that people need a strong identification with their culture as a way to remove the barriers to belief arising from separation. (This is the basis of much of the theory in McGavran’s Understanding Church Growth.) If we spread out these Jewish believers into scores of churches, we will lose an influence on the Church through lack of visibility. Indeed, a monthly fellowship where we remember what the feasts are, or a get-together because we are physically Jewish, will not instill this identification in the second generation. The identification needs to be more intensive and part of our religious expression congregationally. Thus Jean Daniérou looks for a Judaeo-Christian branch of the Church that will be Hebraic in its liturgical expression on a regular basis (Cross Currents: Spring, 1968).

Specifically, Hebrew Christian congregations do not separate Jews and Gentiles. In every Hebrew Christian congregation I know of, Gentiles are full members of these congregations in goodly numbers. They are not cut off from other Christians but have opportunities that would never be possible were they dissolved into other churches with Gentile forms of worship. For example, we often have opportunities to testify to other churches, to demonstrate practices to them, and to explain the roots of the New Testament faith. As far as success goes, these congregations are having a new birth of vitality since they have
understood the propriety of their Jewish identity in Hebraic liturgical practice. Although numbers have not been huge, some congregations have carried on steady, successful ministries for many years. However, the necessity to adopt Gentile worship orders and Latin terminology rather than Hebraic ways has been a hindrance that is now being removed.

In conclusion, read Fruchtenbaum. However, watch out for sections that are simplistic, and do not take his conclusions to be necessarily Biblical, or his solutions to be the only solutions to the particular issues that are raised. Above all, be supportive of the various ways of being Jewish Christians, both in traditional local churches and denominations and in new types of Messianic congregations within Israel.

Daniel C. Juster
3839 West Lawrence Ave., Chicago, Illinois 60625


The present study by a leading British Methodist NT scholar is a revision of an Aberdeen dissertation first published in 1969 by Epworth Press. The thesis of Marshall's work is that the predominant Augustinian-Calvinist orientation of evangelicism, which postulates the unqualified final triumph of the elect believer, is a deduction not from Scripture but from a fallible a priori philosophical and dogmatic schema. The truth as to whether a Christian believer can fall away from salvation to perdition is found to lie between the extremes affirmed by traditional Calvinist and Arminian theology. In order to transcend the present impasse, Marshall undertakes a painstaking exegesis of the Biblical texts that bear any relevance to the issue. His affirmative conclusion, in brief, is that the security of the believer is contingent on his fidelity to Jesus Christ. Apostasy—that is, complete abandonment of faith in Jesus Christ—poses an ever-present threat to the professing Christian against which he must be vigilant.

Marshall's rather brief treatment of the data from Jewish literature (20 pp.) emphasizes the theological significance of the relentless backsliding and apostasy of OT Israel. But it may be questioned whether an argument that reasons from the faithlessness of national Israel to the defection of a Christian believer who is indwelt by the Spirit and grafted into the Body of Christ is theologically valid. The fact that a Jew was cut off from the congregation of Israel as a result of deliberate sin does not necessarily demand the conclusion that a Christian believer who succumbs to sin is in danger of being eternally forsaken by God. We recall that "not all who are descended from Israel belong to Israel, and not all are children of Abraham because they are his descendants" (Rom. 9:6 f.).

But Marshall's argument is exposed to a still more fundamental criticism. Appeal is made to frequent citations in Jeremiah's prophecy ("Jeremiah may be a key figure in the Old Testament doctrine of apostasy," p. 30) which speak of the abandonment of Israel by Yahweh because of spiritual infidelity. The clear and repeated failures of Israel to maintain an acceptable spiritual relationship with Yahweh under the Old Covenant underscore the fact that in the plan of God the program of co-operating grace under the Old Covenant, which proved ineffectual vis-à-vis the spiritual welfare of Israel, had to give way to the program of effectual grace under the New Covenant (Jer. 31:31-37) by means of which the divine purposes would be brought to realization. Thus human inability under the Old Covenant merely highlighted the absolute need for a truly
efficacious work of God which would be brought to fruition in the New Covenant (Rom. 11:25-32).

As for Marshall’s extensive discussion of the NT side of the apostasy question, several issues may be raised. The first relates to the author’s development of the concept of the kingdom. By overly futurizing the kingdom through such statements as “entry to the kingdom of God is something which takes place in the future” and “men cannot now enter into the future bliss to which there is no end” (p. 53), the author appears to relegate the believer to the status of spiritual limbo in which the onus rests on the individual to qualify for future admission to the kingdom. The significant Pauline teaching that the Father in the present “has qualified us to share in the inheritance of the saints,” and that “he has ... transferred us to the kingdom of his beloved Son” (Col. 1:12 f.), has been overlooked in the discussion.

Examination of the numerous NT texts addressed in support of the author’s thesis leads us to the conviction that many do not ostensibly affirm the probability of spiritual defection as alleged. Not all exegetes, e. g., would agree that Jesus' interpretation of the parable of the sower (Mt. 13:18 ff.) identifies the seed cast on the first three soils with Christian disciples who fail to persevere in their faith. Similarly, it is doubted whether the final petition in the Lord’s prayer (“lead us not into temptation,” Mt. 6:13) ought to be regarded “as a prayer for protection from apostasy” (p. 69). On the contrary, the disciples were encouraged by Jesus to recognize their inability to cope with divine resources with many situations to which they would be exposed. Furthermore, Marshall’s attempt to counterbalance the clear teaching of the security of the believer in the fourth gospel (Jn. 6:39 f.; 10:29; 17:12; etc.) with apostasy motifs proves unconvincing. For example, we judge that the vine narrative (Jn. 15:1 ff.) affirms the importance of vital contact with Christ for spiritual effectiveness, rather than the need for the believer to persevere unto salvation. One further illustration underscores the conviction that the author’s argument may be faulted at the level of exegesis. Marshall argues that in 1 Cor. 9:24-27 Paul raises the possibility of a believer’s final disqualification and rejection by God on the day of judgment. But surely under the imagery of the athletic contest the apostle teaches only that a believer might lose his heavenly reward because of second-rate discipleship.

Marshall’s essay is also to be commended, however. First, it insists that the evangelical Christian ultimately commits himself to Scripture rather than to the teaching of a particular dogmatic schema, whether Calvinist or Arminian—both of which bear the marks of imperfect humanity. Second, Marshall rightly underscores the radical demand in discipleship incumbent on every true believer. Authentic self-judgment requires that we recognize that often evangelicals have been guilty of obscuring the doctrine of grace by permitting faith to degenerate into an expression of mere mental assent.

Nevertheless, if we read Scripture aright, Christians will achieve the goal of eternity with Christ not as co-operating sinners who finally make it on the basis of self-effort but as sons who accept the sufficiency of divine grace. It is doubtful, therefore, whether Kept by the Power of God will constitute the final word on the subject, notwithstanding the painstaking detail of its exegesis and argumentation.

Bruce A. Demarest
Conservative Baptist Theological Seminary, Denver, Colorado 80210
CHURCH HISTORY


This work is number 16 in Studies in Anabaptist and Mennonite History, an excellent series on many facets of Anabaptist history. In addition to Roman Catholics and the Lutheran and Reformed Protestants, a third group in the Reformation has been variously called by recent historians “the Radical Reformation” or “the Left Wing of the Reformation.” Within it three sub-groups have been identified: the Anabaptists, the Spiritualists, and the Socinians or the Evangelical Rationalists. As the title indicates, Davis’ book is concerned with the Anabaptists and their theological antecedents. He opens his work with an excellent survey of the three current historical views of Anabaptist origins: the medieval heretical groups, the Reformation (particularly the Zwinglian), and the medieval ascetic tradition.

Davis rejects any connection between the medieval heretical groups and the early Anabaptists because of the lack of solid historical evidence. He also discounts the more popular theory of the origin of the movement in Zwingli’s Reformation in Zurich, due to certain theological differences he regards as basic. He develops the thesis (first advanced by Albrecht Ritschl and continued in this country by Albert Hyma) that Anabaptism owes its origins to the medieval Catholic ascetic reform, especially as seen in the Franciscan Tertiary’s and the Devotio Moderna mediated through Erasmus. Instead of the separation of Church and state, or believers’ baptism and the gathered Church being distinctive, he finds the major emphasis in Anabaptism to be asceticism. This he defines as having three emphases: (1) negatively, the struggle against the flesh and the evils of this world; (2) positively, the development of virtues leading to spiritual perfection; and (3) an otherworldly ethical thrust distinguishing it from mysticism.

After tracing the development of the ascetic tradition in Church history before the Reformation, he devotes his longest chapter to the primary place of asceticism in structuring the theology of the Anabaptists, which he finds best delineated in the writings of Balthasar Hubmaier. He develops the contacts of a number of early Anabaptist leaders with monastic ascetic traditions. Although admitting the lack of definite evidence for direct contact of the Anabaptists and the Devotio Moderna, he still believes the many parallels between the two indicate strong influence. He concludes that “Anabaptism emerges as a unique, independent Reformation movement, a Protestant adaptation of a Christian ascetic tradition, more akin to Erasmus than to Luther, more right-wing than left, more conservative than radical, unless the last term is used in reference to a radical Erasmianism” (p. 297).

Originally presented as a doctoral dissertation at the University of Michigan, the book impressed this reviewer with its careful research, its extensive notes and the many sources consulted by the author. Davis cogently argues the case for medieval ascetic influence as the background of Anabaptism and makes a real contribution to the study of Anabaptist origins. However, one feels in reading this work that he almost overpleads his case through defining asceticism too broadly and thus including too much under this rubric. He also discounts too much the influences of the Zwinglian Reformation on the early leaders of the
Swiss Brethren. This reviewer felt that he did not recognize as sufficiently important the powerful influences of the Scriptures that Zwingli had first emphasized. In his search for one prime antecedent he also did not include the social and economic forces working in the milieu of the early Swiss Reformation. However, in any study of Anabaptism, Davis' book must be considered for its extensive contributions that fill in an important gap in Reformation Church history.

Frank Pack
Pepperdine University, 24255 Pacific Coast Highway, Malibu, CA 90265


The original edition of *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* established itself as the standard one-volume reference work on the history of the Church. Those who have used the first edition will be further encouraged by the bringing of that work up to date. Livingstone states in the preface that "the very success of the first edition of the Dictionary is among the reasons why it has been completely revised." Even the original work underwent improvements with each successive reprinting, but the 1974 edition is a complete revision. (This statement alone may be somewhat misleading, since the new edition does not substantially alter the content of most articles.) There is a much deserved tribute to Frank Leslie Cross at the beginning of the new edition. Cross died in December of 1968; fortunately E. A. Livingstone was able to complete his work.

The list of contributors has been greatly increased in the new edition: original 94, second edition 247! The number of standard reference works cited in the texts and bibliographies has also been greatly increased. The beginning student of Church history or historical theology would do well to study this list of reference works. No other one-volume dictionary can compare with the *Oxford Dictionary* when it comes to bibliographies. The new edition does not simply bring these bibliographies up to date, but rather points the student and scholar back to original sources and to even older works that were overlooked in the earlier edition.

A number of new articles has been added. Most of these are small and pertain to personalities whose scholarly and theological contributions have become apparent since the original work in 1957. In this category belong such obvious names as Karl Rahner, Karl Adam, Pope John XXIII and Teilhard de Chardin as well as Dietrich Bonhoeffer, Oscar Cullmann, Martin Kähler, Michael Ramsey and many others. The Roman Catholic Church receives a large share of the new entries. A revised list of the popes is found at the end of the dictionary. Not only are outstanding Roman Catholic theologians and churchmen noted but such terms as "The Westward Position" and "Solemnitas" are defined. Entries on "Aggiornamento," "Collegiality," and the more important encyclical works such as "Humanae Vitae" are also included. One of the deficiencies of the original work may have been the slighting of the Eastern Church, but the new revision seems to overcompensate for this earlier omission. Many Greek terms of little interest to those outside this tradition are included. On the other hand, the new rather lengthy article on "The Orthodox Church" is a welcome addition. Among the new articles are those that deal with more contemporary concerns, although many of these will be with us until the time for
a third edition. "Death of God" and even J. A. T. Robinson's "Honest to God" are noted along with the issue of "Euthanasia." Ecumenical concerns are noted in the articles dealing with ecclesiastical groups such as the "Anglical-Methodist Conversations" and "The United Church of Christ." There is a listing for "Conservative Evangelicalism" but unfortunately no separate article; one is referred instead to the article on "Fundamentalism"! This item may lead us to some critical observations about this standard reference work.

When one examines the larger list of contributors, one cannot but wonder about scholarly objectivity when such British evangelicals as Bruce, Guthrie, Stibbs, Douglas, Stott and Wiseman are not mentioned. Not a single American evangelical scholar contributes to this volume. One wonders when ecumenicity will reach a scholarly level that recognizes the abilities of others. When the term "O Sapientia" can be cited, but not a single line is devoted to James Orr, one must raise questions about balance. This leads to the observation that The Oxford Dictionary possesses an undeserved preoccupation with the liturgical. This weakness was notable in the original, but it has been multiplied in this new edition. Certainly larger, multi-volume works on Church history should give a full listing of liturgical terminology, but one-volume works can probably do without this emphasis. It has already been noted that one of the strengths of this dictionary is its bibliographies, though the reader will not want to take these as being exhaustive or complete. And occasionally important sources are overlooked, such as the omission of reference to Carl Bang's work on Arminius from the Arminius article. The critical reader will also notice a High Church Anglicanism in many ecclesiastical articles. Generally the theological balance is good and objective.

The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church remains a basic research tool for any serious student of Church history and historical theology. No library ought to be without it, price notwithstanding. This reviewer would recommend, however, that the student and scholar supplement this dictionary with The New International Dictionary of the Christian Church, edited by J. D. Douglas (Zondervan, 1974). For those who possess the original edition, it will be a matter of interest whether the revision is worth replacing one's old copy. Since the second edition is a scholarly revised edition, the answer should probably be affirmative.

Donald M. Lake

Wheaton College, Wheaton, Illinois 60187


One of my classics professors once reacted to certain murmurs in a seminar by roundly pronouncing: "Nothing is boring." Certainly he was never boring, for he sparked interest in the most detached student by the force of his genial personality and his passion for rigorous analysis. The same could be said of the brilliant Charles Earle Raven (1885-1964), regius professor of divinity, master of Christ's College, and vice-chancellor of Cambridge University.

At first I was surprised that the shelves of my study contained not one book, essay or article by the man whose biography I had been asked to review. I soon realized why. Canon Raven was undoubtedly a classic example of the English liberal. His opinions could be guaranteed to inspire a negative desire to buy on the part of a student raised on large doses of Karl Barth. For his part Raven had a peculiar dislike of German theology, particularly Barth. Not even Tillich
appealed to him. What did move Raven was the intricacy of nature, and few if any could rival his powers of observation and awesome grasp of detail. He was at heart a natural historian, writing four captivating books on birds and two on naturalists of the past. At a lavish banquet hosted by Russian Orthodox churchmen in Moscow, Raven was served a course consisting of a whole bird. He fiddled about with the creature for a minute or two in an abstracted kind of way, as though it were distasteful to him. Then he looked up and announced, "There is only one bird in Europe which has a breastbone of this shape." He went on to identify the bird and when a dictionary was consulted, it was established that the Russian word for the bird in question was translated by the very English name that Raven had given it. The Russians were duly impressed. Such was Raven's detailed scientific knowledge and the accuracy of his formidable memory that he was accepted by the British scientific community as one of themselves. Indeed, a leading academic biologist who knew Raven's biography of naturalist John Ray was amazed to learn that Raven was a professor not of biology but of theology.

One might well have preferred that Raven had concentrated on biology rather than the queen of the sciences, for his position is compared to that of Teilhard de Chardin. In fact Raven himself prepared a biography on de Chardin, which was published in 1962. Dillistone remarks that Raven's "was not the deductive mind which begins with propositions or premises and proceeds to weave patterns of logical argument or to build up structures of mathematical proof. He needed to begin with objects or events in the external world and to mirror them in and through patterns of wholeness corresponding to shapes which he saw with his eyes" (p. 425). Raven was a characteristic representative of the tradition described in Glover as "the predominant feature in Cambridge training and Cambridge thought—that steady interest in the fact, which in its higher flights becomes a burning passion for truth." Dillistone sees Raven as akin in approach and general outlook to Paul of Samosata, whom Raven described in his *Apollinarianism* (1923) as a man who found his chief interest "in the concrete and particular not in the abstract and general, in the scientific analysis of human nature rather than in the metaphysical principles of which it is or may be the embodiment, in the study of the facts of history and experience more than of the eternal relationships by which those facts are to be interpreted" (p. 103). Whereas a man like Archbishop Temple was primarily concerned with the philosophical climate within which the Christian message must be proclaimed Canon Raven was constantly seeking to relate the gospel to the world of the scientist, to the particular method of seeking truth which he came to regard as alone valid (p. 113). Yet, as Dillistone points out, Raven's scientific method emphasized the life-sciences rather than the "hard" sciences of physics, chemistry and engineering. And as far as the new movement in linguistic analysis was concerned, Raven passed it by on the other side.

For Raven the all-important thing was to maintain the vision of wholeness by celebrating the unity, continuity and interrelatedness of the entire cosmic process and by bearing witness to the organic design that conditions every stage of the evolutionary movement (p. 400). In his *Science and the Christian Man* (1952), Raven confesses, "For my own part, I am not prepared to argue that the 'image' is identical with that which it expresses. In confessing that Jesus is God I mean that He is God for us, God in every sense in which I can conceive God—a true picture but (perhaps) not the whole picture. For me as man He satisfies and surpasses all that I can imagine of the divine; He calls out my adoration; He empties me of my pride; He inspires me as no other can do. Beyond that I cannot go. If I were an angel or an animal, the universe and God might look quite different. As a man I cannot know or conceive God as He is in Himself; but all that I can know of Him I find in the universe and in Jesus, and these two, so
far as all my experience goes, belong together. For me ‘God is in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself’” (p. 342).

Neither Barthian nor evangelical can sympathize much with this kind of theology. Yet Raven can seize the imagination at least to the extent that his piercing intellect and Christian profession made a profound impression on those who heard him preach or speak. Many regarded him as the best preacher in England; ordinands testified to the influence of his speaking at a school assembly in moving them to study for the ministry. Raven was not, however, in good odor with the Church establishment. Someone wrote:

“Charles Raven
He has no haven
But he has a perch
In the Anglican Church” (p. 291).

More at home in the world, perhaps, Raven was deeply involved in the issues of the time, acting as a padre in World War I, appointed a royal chaplain, advocating socialism, pacifism and feminism, playing an outstanding role as broadcaster and popular lecturer, not to mention his varied career as educator and researcher. His twenty-five books on theology represent a remarkable achievement in academic excellence. A Yale professor is reported as having written that Raven’s life and story seemed like a transcript of twentieth-century English intellectual life.

This is the appeal of Raven’s biography. It reviews the trends of modern theology in an engaging way and from the English point of view. While Dillistone seems wooden in his treatment of Raven’s personal and family life, he does trace the man’s intellectual development and career with considerable sympathy and skill. The evangelical should feel free to go into all the world. Reading this biography takes one into the world of English liberalism. The excursion need do no harm; it may well prove a timely challenge both to think more rigorously and to witness more sensitively.

Graham A. D. Scott
C. P. 215, Noranda, Quebec J9X 5A6, Canada


On starting to read this book, one needs to remind oneself that God loves the Church and is utterly committed to it. God loves the Church above and below, behind us and before, to our right and to our left. God loves that part of the Church called Presbyterian; in fact, he loves it far more than the most loyal of us. God even loves the segment of Presbyterianism Fry is discussing—the UPCUSA. Without such assurance this book would drive anyone who cares for the whole Church of Jesus Christ to the verge of despair. The story the book recounts, and the principles it advocates, leave one with a feeling of utter helplessness.

Fry sees the major problem of the UPCUSA as organizational, with theology playing an important and fascinating minor role. Reorganization of the denomination during the last decade by idealistic and unrealistic ecclesiastical politicians, with a newly-oriented theology as justification, have, in the author’s opinion, ruined the excellent and productive institution which prior to that time exerted a salutary national influence of love and justice. A mildly traditional theology and expert administration, he implies, kept the socially-conservative,
white, and upper-middle-class body in a state of genuine religious efficiency. The intellectually more liberal leaders who emerged in the sixties drew up the Confession of 1967, ordering it around an activistic theology of reconciliation which they applied to the gamut of major social issues. They unadroitly bludgeoned opposition with their self-righteous slogan and went on their merry way, insisting that any who dissented were free to leave. Meaningful priorities were lost, and foolish decisions of leader-driven General Assemblies became the laws of the Medes and Persians. The $10,000.00 donation to the Angela Davis fund in 1971 was the crowning asininity. In return local leadership got its back up, contributions to the central budget dropped $10,000,000.00 or one-third from 1965-1973, and the Church became increasingly a pale shadow of its former robust self.

The story is a sad one, and Fry's critique is equally dispiriting. He claims the leaders of the Church made organization paramount in the sixties, which would seem to be undoubtedly true; and as they sought to save their organization, the Church was increasingly in danger of losing its soul. But he also seems an organizational man. His concern for theology appears moderate, and he does not bother to evaluate the effect of the moratorium on theological discussion in the denomination for some years after the Machen controversy nor the influence of American-style Neo-orthodoxy in the fifties. His putdown of spiritual experience fits into the same general model. The denomination's leaders and their critic seem to suffer from the same malady. This is a sad juncture indeed.

As one contemplates the heirs of American Calvinism—liberal, Neo-orthodox, and conservative evangelical—particularly in the UPCUSA, one is impressed with the fact that, in spite of many dissimilarities, they all seem to share one common family likeness. Each is haughty, intransigent, and censorious. They seem to share a common attitudinal fundamentalism. Biblical, spiritual, and personal bigness seems to be lacking all down the line. They are so busy chewing each other out that they seem to have lost sight of the sweep and transcendence of the Church—that ultimately it lives by the grace of God and not the pugnaciousness of man. Fry displays this unfortunate characteristic admirably when, in his closing pages, he turns his guns from the denominational leadership to the conservative and evangelical Presbyterian lay committee. Perhaps he only intended to remove any possibility of identifying his criticism with that of the lay committee. If so, however, in seeking to avoid being tarred with their brush he has actually performed a significantly symbolic act of Christian fratricide.

American Presbyterianism, once a vital force in the land and admired and respected throughout world Protestantism, seems, in most areas, to have fallen on sorry days. While some sections of the Church of Jesus Christ seem to be evincing signs of renewed health in our day, this seems to be withheld from a Church preoccupied with infighting. What can those of us do who care for the UPCUSA? Surely at this point we must pray that God will raise up, as he so readily can, a host of Presbyterians, at every level of the Church, who have deeply experienced his grace and thus love him, his Word, his Church, and his world.

Ian S. Rennie
Regent College, Vancouver, B. C., Canada V6T 1W6
MISSION


One of the significant developments in world Christianity in the last century has been the ecumenical movement. This movement had its origins in the evangelical emphasis of the nineteenth century, designated the “Great Century” of Christian missions by Kenneth Scott Latourette, which witnessed the propagation and establishment of the Church in most segments of the great colonial empires of the powerful European nations. The missionary explosion was based in the evangelical traditions emanating from the pietist and revivalist movements of the preceding centuries. Along with para-ecclesiastical movements such as the Evangelical Alliance and various youth movements (YMCA,YWCA, SVM, SCM, WSCF, etc.), the Church epitomized its activity in the watchword of the Student Volunteer Movement, “The Evangelization of the World in This Generation!” At the beginning of the twentieth century there seemed to be every reason to believe that this task was capable of fulfilment.

The World Missionary Conference, held in Edinburgh in 1910, was regarded as the springboard to achieve the task of world evangelization. With its somewhat utopian vision, Edinburgh attempted to correlate and integrate the evangelical resources of nineteenth-century activities and harness them for this great task. Other forces, however, made their presence felt at Edinburgh as well. German Biblical criticism, with its attacks on orthodoxy, social gospel theology, and the new approaches to other religions proposed by a syncretistic theology—these too were present. And thus the history of missions from Edinburgh forward becomes the history of the varying definitions given to theology as each of these emphases gained prominence.

Johnston’s *World Evangelism and the Word of God*, originally written as a doctoral dissertation at Strasbourg under the title, “A Study of the Theology of Evangelism in the International Missionary Council, 1921-61,” is particularly concerned with the “theological aspects of the IMC in terms of its origins in the Reformation and in Pietism.” “Few,” he says, “have considered the relationship in history between the authority and inerrancy of Scripture and its influence upon the theology and practice of evangelism” (p. 15). “A cause and effect relationship,” he suggests, “may help to give direction to the work of both missions and evangelism in our day.”

Johnston argues that the evangelical missionary emphasis of the last century had its origins in a “pietistic evangelism,” which was based on the doctrine of an infallible Bible as defined by the Reformation. This evangelical basis was eroded, and, the author suggests, missions at that point started to wane. When the “intellectual leadership of the missionary movement, influenced by liberal theology, abandoned the Reformation authority of the Scriptures for a progressive theology,” a quest for a new authoritative basis for a “new” evangelism was begun. Johnston points to the authority structures proposed by natural theology, the Church, creeds, traditions, Church history, preaching, secular history, personal experience, and a Bible which contained a word from God. Each of these new sources of revelation and authority had a profound effect in doctrinal issues pertinent to evangelism. Thus it was that the IMC, which fell heir to the grand design of Edinburgh, saw its missionary motivation
and strength sapped by the insidious influence of progressivist theology that departed from traditional orthodoxy, especially in the area of Biblical authority.

The thesis postulated by Johnston is most pertinent for evangelism today. On the one hand, it is dangerous to be dogmatic in areas of cause/effect relationships where simplistic relationships are difficult to isolate. It is axiomatic that the IMC and the subsequent DWME have waned in influence and that the so-called evangelically oriented mission societies have had rather prosperous times. The "why" of that fact is not always clear. Johnston feels that the "why" is inextricably bound to an inerrant Scripture. Most evangelicals would agree. But I feel we must guard against a much-too-common error of evangelicalism whereby the baby is thrown out with the bathwater. Much within the scope of the IMC's historical concern should commend itself to us. Wrong theology does not always result in wrong actions any more than right theology always results in right actions. Hopefully evangelicals after Edinburgh II (Lausanne 1974) will maintain a true commitment to Biblical authority. But I trust we will also speak meaningfully to some of the basic concerns evinced by ecumenical Christianity.

Other studies which provide additional framework for Johnston's work are W. R. Hogg, Ecumenical Foundations; Gerald Anderson, A Study of the Theology of the Christian Mission Since 1910; and Charles Sell, "A Critical Survey of the Theology of Missions of the International Missionary Council" (unpublished dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary). Johnston writes from the perspective of one initially concerned with the practical outworking of evangelistic theology. Thus his World Evangelism and the Word of God is a major contribution to the field and should be read by every serious student of missions theology.

Ben Harder
Department of Religious Studies, The University, Aberdeen, Scotland


What connection has Christian faith with "spaceship earth"? Why and how will Christian leadership participate in the creation of global consciousness? These are the questions addressed by the professor of world missions at the Lutheran School of Theology, Chicago, in this eminently readable study book, encouraged by the flow of ideas from the 1973 Bangkok World Conference on "Salvation Today" and the recent task force studies of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U. S. A.

Scherer insists that our contemporary awareness of "common, identifiable global experiences" (p. 9) is more than faddist and must be more than simply mass-media, tourist sameness. "Global living here and now concerns the quality and direction of our relationships with our global neighbors" (p. 17). It is an identity emerging "as the human race is confronted with the problem of its own survival" (p. 18). The global death images of nuclear annihilation, ecological extinction, and population explosion force it on us. The world view of Neil Armstrong, the space theologian, the United Nations as a global symbol of hope (pp. 28-31, 84) are strong arguments that "we are witnessing—still in hope, to be sure—the birth pangs of a new global society. This global society will be, with God's help, an earthly foretaste of the kingdom of God" (p. 109).

Chapters three and four sketch the theological dimensions for those convictions. From what Scherer refers to in one place as the "primitive accounts in Genesis 1-11" (p. 47) and another as "a poetic account of the creation of the
world and the origins of life on earth” (p. 44), he finds “a profound commentary on the human condition” that gives “classic expression to the Judeo-Christian view of the place of human beings in nature and history” (p. 37). In something resembling the traditional Lutheran vein, he identifies “image of God” with human beings as “earth managers,” serving under God’s commission as his viceregents, “doers, pioneers and inventors endowed with freedom, creativity and initiative,” yet limited in their partnership by their creature nature. “The symbol of this limitation is the tree of the knowledge of good and evil” (p. 39), and the result of its testing “the cataclysmic ‘event’ now universally famous as the ‘fall of man’” (p. 39). Consistently in this section especially, Scherer softens Biblical Historie into Geschichte with words like “primitive,” “poetic,” “symbol,” and “biblical motifs,” and with quotation marks around the historical realities of “event” and “fall of man.” His defense against those who might “find fault with the Genesis interpretation of the human condition” is a question his own suspicions of the historicity of Genesis 1-11 would, to this reviewer, find difficulty answering, “Is there a more satisfactory basic explanation for human beings and their problems today?” (p. 45).

His analysis of God’s choosing Israel as a light to the nations (pp. 46 ff.) and the prophetic vision for the reconciliation of the nations in a reunified earth (pp. 48-50) is much less overtly tendentious. At the same time, in the light of an overall tendency in the book for redemptive categories to merge into international, secularized categories like freedom, human dignity, hope and opportunity for the dispossessed, one wonders whether a fuller analysis by Scherer of these Biblical materials would not also leave the evangelical with as many serious questions as he will undoubtedly have over his treatment of Genesis 1-11.

The treatment of the redemptive work of Jesus Christ is disappointingly brief (pp. 54-59) in view of the attention given to Old Testament perspectives (pp. 37-54). Attention is paid to “his victory over the powers of sin, evil and darkness” (p. 54), but it is scanty, to say the least. His work is defined as the Great Liberator, the cosmic reconciler and unifier, and is etched most strongly in terms of his protest against the parochialism of a “religion that had lost its liberating vision” (p. 58). “Would not his word to our generation be something like this: To cut the ‘frills’ and get on with the essential tasks of the kingdom today—proclaiming good news to the poor, effecting liberty from all kinds of captivity, and offering human dignity, hope and opportunity to the dispossessed?” (p. 58). The impact of Bangkok’s horizontalism is most strikingly felt here.

The latter half of the book asks what this kind of dimensionalism means for North America (chapter 5 ff.) and the global community. Scherer sees America’s romantic self-analysis as a global dream reinforced and underscored by these Christian commitments to global community but blemished by the harsh realities of its treatment of American Indians, racism, and expansionism. There is much truth here, and it is painful to admit.

Building on the global recommendations issued from the World Council of Churches conference held in Bangkok, Scherer sees education as “the key to any program of personal and social transformation for global living” (p. 91). But education not “idea-oriented” but “people-oriented,” “the transformation and renovation of human awareness at several different levels” (p. 94)—personal, structural, value, and societal. He sees examples of that “conscientization” in the WCC’s program to combat racism in Southern Africa, in ecclesiastical promotion of development aid, in two-way exchange of men and finances between North American and third-world churches. Scherer’s suggestion of manpower exchange, however, does not go far enough. The emphasis of his examples is on
short-term visits by third-world churchmen for purposes of North American self-analysis (pp. 103 f., 116-118). Where is his call for third-world pastors, teachers, evangelists, deacons, to serve here full-time? How else can we avoid a form of backlash colonial tourism?

At the heart of Scherer’s stimulating and challenging treatment are at least two fatal flaws, both shared by Bangkok. There is a new view of hermeneutics, in which Scripture no longer interprets reality but reality interprets Scripture. Not as explicitly drawn as Bangkok, it nevertheless functions repeatedly throughout the book. It calls for “a renewed understanding of the Bible from the viewpoint of the community of the oppressed” (p. 91). It recognizes that “Christian freedom is not identical with freedom guaranteed under the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights” (p. 51), and yet de facto so correlates the Biblical category of salvation with the secular category of freedom that Jesus becomes the Great Liberator from racism, poverty, discrimination, powerlessness—and little else. It flows from a Neo-orthodox view of Scripture, a substitution of existential meaningfulness for Biblical givenness, in this case global meaningfulness.

Accompanying it is a new definition of mission in which the kingdom of God as “God’s own sovereign act” (p. 34) shifts to something resembling global responsibility (p. 109), and “the missionary task of North American churches” becomes the liberation of “North American people from ignorance and indifference” and assistance “in searching for values and life-styles that are not oppressive but just” (p. 93). “The great deterrent of the mission of the local church” is not the lack of a self-conscious dependence on the Holy Spirit for world change but, in the language of Bangkok, “the ordinary Christian’s lack of conviction about the relevance of Jesus Christ to the life of the world. This calls for nothing less than a conversion from parochial self-absorption to an awareness of what God is doing for the salvation of men in the life of the world” (p. 97). With this new hermeneutic of history, “we need to consider the nature of the Christian world mission in the light of developments in China. What are the implications of the new China for persons in the west, and for Christian world mission?” (p. 107). “Mission in one world” takes on new dimensions for Scherer in this way, and his anxiety that “some North American Christians are fearful that ‘mission in one world’ spells a retreat for our historic missionary task” (p. 113) cannot help being reaffirmed.

Having said this, one must also say that Scherer leaves the evangelical with a challenge. If his essay does nothing else, it must shame the Christian community for its silence over problems of global dimensions. It demands a response from a Biblically-structured framework to hard questions that continue to go unanswered or answered inadequately in evangelical circles.

Why does evangelical awareness of global dimensionalism seem to restrict itself to a narrow focus bounded almost exclusively by the sending role in world evangelism? Is our definition of evangelism as largely a call for individual repentance and faith as imposed category on a Great-Commission demand for discipleship in every area of life? Should our concept of the kingdom of God have more of a theo-political ring to it? Do the roots of much evangelical mission thinking in the individualistically-oriented pietism of the past hinder us from a Biblically-framed appraisal of the structural and societal levels of “conscientization”? Does our functional definition of the Church as a voluntary society act as a deterrent to the evangelical Church’s response to questions of racism, poverty, and world power structures? How can Biblical ground rules govern us in developing Biblical guidelines for military, political, and economic policies? Can the evangelical Church and evangelical missionaries participate in the defense of human rights now questioned in right-wing power orientations of
South Korea and the Philippines, as well as the left-wing dictatorships we have spoken against for so long? Is the giving of cups of cold water in Jesus' name to be understood as a legitimate exercise in terms of food airlifts to Ethiopia and Bangladesh, but questionable in terms of development aid and the deeper basis for poverty?

Scherer's book does not have these answers. But the evangelical cannot reject it without remembering he has not offered a Biblical, viable substitute. We have much homework to do.

Harvie M. Conn
Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19118


In five chapters Alan Walker seeks to update evangelism as he addresses five areas of the new evangelism: the motive, arena, message, method, and power for mission. Whether or not he has succeeded will be determined by the theological bias of the reader.

Walker is an ordained Australian Methodist minister. He is the founding president of Life Line International, a crisis-call ministry. He is also the minister of Sydney's Central Methodist Mission, "the largest Sunday night Christian congregation in Australia." Meeting his congregation at the Lyceum theater he has preached weekly for a verdict with the evident blessing of God.

Evangelical preaching means seeking to win men and women to a commitment to Christianity. Too often preachers are content to try to influence people. The task in evangelism is surely to bring people by the power of the Holy Spirit to a verdict (p. 73).

Walker speaks firmly out of great experience and apparent deep feeling for what appears to be historic Biblical evangelism.

The problem for the reader lies in reconciling Walker's positive attitude toward evangelism of the Michael Green variety (pp. 8 f.) with that of the ecumenical Bangkok variety. In the process Walker excoriates Jonathan Edwards' preaching on hell, gives Charles Finney a casual nod in favor of his "strong social conscience" (p. 10), and characterizes Whitefield as having failed, "offering only a pious evangelism" (p. 10).

In this context he asserts that the Bangkok Affirmation on Salvation Today ties together the evangelistic and social components of the "new evangelism" (p. 41).

On closer examination, however, it appears that Walker is really seeking to correlate the dynamics of evangelistic preaching with the development of Christian social concern.

True evangelical preaching must, in every utterance, reveal social overtones. To preach only on a social issue is to offer people a stone when they need bread. To offer religion only in personal terms is to create morally and spiritually undeveloped Christians (p. 42).

The concerned and Biblically-oriented reader will agree with Walker's statement. Such a reader will also ask a few relevant questions: Are the foundations of the Bangkok statement and "true evangelical preaching" one and
the same? Are the social aims, economic goals and political concerns of Bangkok essentially rooted in the historic Biblical message of salvation by personal faith in the living, risen Lord Jesus Christ? If the answers to these questions are "yes," then the question needs to be raised why those present at Bangkok representing the historic Biblical faith were not given "equal time."

Walker's desire to seek a proper Biblical balance in gospel proclamation and gospel application to social needs is to be commended. But it is deeply regretted by the reviewer that Walker has confused apples and oranges in seeking to equate the historic gospel with the Bangkok Affirmation. Its very title suggests that today's salvation is not yesterday's gospel message!

Walker's essential thesis is to be applauded. At the same time, it is to be regretted that he has chosen as his chief example of Christian social concern the Affirmation of Bangkok. Neither Harry Emerson Fosdick nor Colin Williams, among several liberals quoted by Walker, would support his preaching for conversion from sin and reliance on the Holy Spirit as "the agent of conversion" (p. 54) in the old-line Methodist sense of the word.

H. Wilbert Norton
Wheaton Graduate School, Wheaton, Illinois 60187
BOOK NOTES

*Das Evangelische Schrifttum.* Ein systematisches Verzeichnis für Wissenschaft und Praxis. Gestamtausgabe 1975. Published by the Vereinigung evangelischer Buchhändler e. V., Fichtestrasse 2, Stuttgart, West Germany. 820 pp., DM 22.—.  
*Das Katholische Schrifttum.* Ein systematisches Verzeichnis für Wissenschaft und Praxis. Gesamtausgabe 1975. Published by the Verband katholischer Verleger und Buchhändler e. V., Fichtestrasse 2, Stuttgart, West Germany. 479 pp., DM 17.—.

The first of these works will be already well known to most regular buyers of German books, but the second appeared for the first time in 1975, thus filling an important bibliographical gap. What we now have is a virtually complete index in very inexpensive and easily accessible form to the whole of German theological literature that is currently in print.

The first volume is, as its title indicates, a list of all books published by German Protestant publishers in which works are classified into fourteen major categories with numerous sub-categories. This is followed by full indexes by author, title, and series. Full titles and subtitles are given, along with other essential bibliographical information (i.e., number of pages, publisher, edition, date of publication, and cost) and sometimes a brief description of contents. The second volume provides exactly the same information for all works published by Roman Catholic publishing companies. A quarterly supplement to *Das Evangelische Schrifttum* is published under the title *Buchinformationen.*

With the combined information of these two volumes the theological student who reads German is in a position to check his personal library—or the theological library he regularly uses—to find the existing gaps in its holdings and to begin to fill them in. For those who are engaged in research, these two books enable him to note at a glance important German works he might otherwise overlook. The librarians of smaller libraries who do not have access to the most expensive German equivalent of *Books in Print* should find these two indexes more than adequate.

For the really keen bibliographer or larger library there is a “Dokumentations-Dienst theologischer Buchliteratur” (available from M. Weber, Grosse Bockenheimer Str. 17, 6 Frankfurt a. M., West Germany), which offers very full information concerning new and forthcoming German theological books in the form of Library-of-Congress-type cards. The cards could easily double as catalogue cards for institutional or larger personal libraries. This seems by far the best way to keep totally up to date with detailed data concerning new and forthcoming theological books in German. It would be very useful for theological libraries to keep the complete series of cards on file for ready reference by students and teachers, whether books have been ordered for the library or not.

The “Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft” (Postfach 1129, 6100 Darmstadt, West Germany) was founded in 1949 to reprint many of the books that were destroyed by the war or were otherwise long out of print. Since its beginnings it has spread out to include new books as well, not only in the area of theology, and also phonograph records and art prints. However, it is a source for reprints of many important but long unobtainable theological books that are not included in the two indexes mentioned above. Those who are working in the area of
nineteenth-century theology will find the listings of the WBG’s massive catalogue most useful, since many of the very influential German books are found in only a small number of North American libraries. The WBG sells books only to members. Membership costs DM 7.50 (about $3.50) and includes a copy of the catalogue.

But how does one go about buying German books? The answer to this question is to be found in a good bookstore. There may be bookstores in North America that are experienced in doing this, but I am not personally aware of any. So if you are in my position, you will find it useful to open up an account with a *major* German theological bookstore. You can do this by sending a deposit of (say) $25.00 to $50.00, along with references (your present position, church connection, membership in ETS, etc.), to the bookstore concerned. This can be applied toward future purchases. Perhaps someone near you—a colleague or a theological librarian—can recommend an appropriate bookstore with which to open an account. The agency I use, Stephans-Buchhandlung (Stephanstrasse 6, 87 Würzburg, West Germany), will have in stock one copy of almost anything you might wish and is therefore in a position to serve its customers quickly and efficiently. The proprietor also speaks English, so this is very useful as well.

W. W. G.


This is a paperback edition of an important set originally released as follows: Volume III, 1963; Volume II, 1969; Volume I, 1970. Other than the bindings, the apparent difference between this edition and the former hardback volumes is that Volume I contains a new preface and a list of corrections for that volume.

Volume I presents excellent discussions and surveys of Biblical languages (by M. Black and D. Diringer), books in the ancient world (D. J. Wiseman and C. H. Roberts), text and canon of the OT (P. R. Ackroyd, G. W. Anderson, J. Talmon, and G. Vermes) and NT (C. F. Evans, R. M. Grant, J. N. Birdsall, and C. K. Barrett), and the Bible in the early Church (R. P. C. Hanson, M. F. Wiles, H. F. D. Sparks, G. Bonner, and J. A. Lamb). The last section deals with Origen, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Jerome, and Augustine; it also contains other articles. As an example of the material in Volume I, J. N. Birdsall’s article on “The New Testament Text” (pp. 308-377) is a very competent and scholarly discussion of a large and complicated topic. These articles are helpful for the scholar desiring the best overviews of a subject, as well as for the more general-interest reader. Twenty-four plates (mainly of Biblical manuscripts), a bibliography, and indices complete this volume.

Volume III is a fascinating mine of information including “The Bible in the Reformation” (Roland Bainton), “The Bible in the Roman Catholic Church From Trent to the Present Day” (F. J. Crehan, S. J.), and “The Rise of Modern Biblical Scholarship and Recent Discussion of the Authority of the Bible” (Alan Richardson).

Since Volume II was reviewed in this journal already by Paul Leonard (*JETS* 13 [1970], pp. 191 f.), I shall mention here only that it contains rich treatments of the late patristic and medieval period (including an article on the study of the Bible in medieval Judaism).
No doubt the publisher hopes that the paperback edition will find its way into the collections of many more people. In view of the general quality of the contents and the importance of the scholars associated in the work, I too hope that this new edition will receive a wide reading.

Larry Hurtado
Regent College, Vancouver, B. C., Canada V6T 1W6
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