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Publication of this new version of the Bible culminates thirty years' work by the Joint Committee on the New Translation of the Bible initiated by the Church of Scotland. Sponsors came to include a wide variety of Protestant, and now Roman Catholic, churches of the United Kingdom and to employ the skills of scholars from the United States and Canada as well.

The version combines features that are valuable to a person in studying the Bible with features helpful to a person in simply reading it. The version is a new translation from critical editions rather than a revision of an older translation from the Textus Receptus. Book introductions, footnotes and annotations give the student a fuller picture of a passage in light of other textual possibilities, historical and literary background, and related Biblical material. The person wishing simply to read his Bible will probably appreciate the contemporary English in which the translation is made. In fact, the translation is so idiomatic as to border on paraphrase and is hence likely to frustrate the student wishing to use it in place of his KJV or NASB as a pony for his Hebrew or Greek text. Also present here, and lacking in the popular NASB, is parapraphing of the text and relegating chapter and verse numbers to the margin.

Most readers are aware of the reputation of the translation itself. Both the NT (1961) and the OT and Apocrypha (1970) are as interpretive as a truly idiomatic translation must be. Indeed C. H. Dodd, vice-chairman and director, admits as much, and without apology. In general the result is less paraphrase than is Phillips' version and contains less simplistic interpretation than in the Living Bible. On the other hand one finds less ambiguity than in the NASB and, as is the inevitable possibility in such endeavors, perhaps even less than in the Hebrew and Greek texts.

Perhaps most significant to this journal's readership is the liberal theology in this version's Study Edition. Since Wellhausen and Bultmann really are not dead in Christendom, this edition provides a real service to the student or pastor not seriously exposed to Biblical criticism and puzzled by critical discussions in some of the books, including evangelical books, that he uses in careful Bible study. Though some may object to the comparison, the NEB Study Edition could be considered the liberal counterpart to the Scofield Reference Bible. In the annotations of both versions, comments are made as established fact on texts on which evidence remains indecisive. The comments are nevertheless a handy compendium of critical problems in the Bible and liberal thought on them.

Inclusion of the Apocrypha with annotations is one of the most valuable, not to mention unique, features in the book. The usefulness of this section cannot but increase in light of the dearth of translations of the Apocrypha, the increasing interest in intertestamental studies and the commitment to volumes on the apocryphal books in the AB series.
Following the translation of the Bible is the section of "Special Articles." The first article touches on inspiration—quite unsatisfactorily, one may add—and on the uniqueness and antiquity of the Biblical notion of God's acting in history. Next, attention is profitably given to the fact that the Bible is literature and not just a history or theology book. Progressing from the whole to the parts, L. Keck and G. Tucker consider the Bible as a single book, the various kinds of books in it and the genres within individual books. At least reasonable comments, and sometimes very incisive comments, are given on such items as the order of books, the nature of a gospel, wisdom literature such as the parable, and hymns in the Bible. Finally a discussion of Biblical history and geography provides often neglected emphasis on the historical and situational, and not just theological or philosophical, element in the Bible. One can profit from this section without thinking so existentially as to say that Jesus' disciples "had experiences which convinced them that Jesus had been raised from the dead."

This version, now complete in its Study Edition, is worthy of attention for its idiomatic translation from critical editions, its inclusion of an annotated Apocrypha, its record of critical problems and its valuable attention to literary and historical information no longer optional for serious study. If the reader challenges some or most of the critical conclusions as too liberal, one reason for such conclusions may be a lack of cogently reasoned alternatives in print. We may use this volume extensively for many years to come, both for serious study and for easy reading.

Robert Lee Williams

Asbury College, Wilmore, KY 40390


This is a very important piece of work. It is made up of four essays. G. Wenham writes on "History and the Old Testament" (pp. 13-75); F. F. Bruce on the theme "Myth and History" (pp. 79-100), primarily with respect to the NT; R. T. France on "The Authenticity of the Sayings of Jesus" (101-143); and the editor concludes the volume with "History and the Believer" (147-224). Subject and name indexes are included.

Wenham's article surveys some of the contemporary approaches to OT history and, while still insisting on the necessity of criticism, argues that many theological propositions in the OT depend for their significance on the historicity of the event(s) to which they refer. Wenham provides helpful descriptions and criticisms of OT textual criticism, source criticism, form criticism, tradition criticism, redaction criticism and historical criticism. His treatment of current theories of Pentateuchal criticism is, for its length (10 pp.), the finest I have read. The brief section on "Archaeology and the Conquest of Canaan" is a model of fairness as it seeks to explain the wildly disparate conclusions that have been drawn by various archaeologists.

F. F. Bruce is helpful in nailing down that slippery word "myth." Beginning with a description and criticism of the "myth-and-ritual" school, he moves on to treat the questions that are fundamental to a vast spectrum of current NT studies: Bultmannian and post-Bultmannian conceptions of "myth," the related demythologizing programs and the constant pitting of the historical against the theological. "We would not gather from Bultmann's writings that he has ever heard of the principle of complementarity; probably indeed he has heard of it, but clearly he has no use for it" (p. 88). Bruce's observations on the danger
of moving from form criticism to historical judgment, and his notes on the Gnostic myth (especially with respect to Eph 2:14), though brief, are quite telling.

R. T. France's article on the authenticity of the sayings of Jesus is an amended version of a paper read at a Tyndale NT study group in 1971. This article alone is worth the price of the book. It should be compulsory reading for every student of the gospels. Although France begins by pointing out that rigid presuppositions may a priori rule out of court all kinds of evidence that should be admitted, he rightly focuses more of his attention on the criteria of authenticity adopted by many scholars and argues forcefully (but fairly) that they are not only too narrow—being at best capable of giving what is eccentric in Jesus' teaching, not what is central—but also that they are inconsistently handled by those redaction critics who most strenuously support them. France, however, does not stop at criticizing the critics: He goes on to outline and defend the "historicism's" reaction and to draw up some arguments, both literary and historical, that constitute sane guidelines to questions of authenticity. The object of the essay, in France's own words, "is to urge that the scholar is obliged to take the Gospels as he finds them. He must reconstruct their aims and methods from what the Gospels themselves indicate, and interpret them in accordance with their intention, rather than from a dogmatic presupposition that the evangelists were either freely creative or rigidly literalistic" (p. 133).

C. Brown's excellent paper treads a twilight zone among several disciplines, each of which contributes to our understanding (or misunderstanding) of the meaning of "history" and of the nature and function of historical inquiry: semantics, philosophy, historical theology, epistemology, and the interface between history and revelation. Beginning with Kierkegaard's paradox concerning the revelation of the utterly transcendent God, so that even in the incarnation this transcendent God remains, as it were, incognito, Brown moves on to show how this tension has been used by Kierkegaard's successors to question the validity not only of claims to direct experience of God but also to claims of any experience of God. Brown replies, leaning in part on F. Schaeffer and A. Richardson. His treatment of miracles is excellent. Brown goes on to discuss various methods of historical inquiry and what rules and principles apply. He argues inter alia that the use of analogy makes treatment of miracles possible. He is careful to show what the historian can and cannot achieve and to discuss the manner in which history affects belief.

The entire symposium is characterized by fairness coupled with forthright clarity. The bibliographies, though not exhaustive and largely restricted to English, are very helpful. Small criticisms could be offered: Wenham's article suffers a few minor organizational problems, while Brown's, for all its excellence, is weak on the interface between history and revelation, and elsewhere it succumbs to ambiguity when the word "history" is used in two or three different ways in the same paragraph. But these are minor problems, so minor it is picayune of me to mention them. This book deserves the widest circulation.

D. A. Carson
Northwest Baptist Theological Seminary, 3358 S. E. Marine Dr., Vancouver, B.C. V5S LH6
OLD TESTAMENT

A Time to Mourn, and a Time to Dance. By Derek Kidner. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1976, 110 pp., $2.50.

This volume is part of a series edited by J. A. Motyer and J. R. W. Stott entitled The Bible Speaks Today. In the general preface the editors state that these are not "commentaries" but rather "expositions, which are characterized by a threefold ideal: to expound the biblical text with accuracy, to relate it to contemporary life, and to be readable." Derek Kidner, warden of Tyndale House, Cambridge, has, in the opinion of this reader, achieved these goals in this little volume on Ecclesiastes.

Kidner believes the unity and integrity of the book is essential to making any sense out of it. Furthermore he sees throughout this ancient wisdom work a definite telos—viz., the last two verses of the book. For Kidner the author is Qoheleth, not Solomon, but a kind of "second Solomon" (p. 28), or "one in the mantle of Solomon" (p. 33), a sage who puts himself in the famous king's shoes (especially in chapter 2).

Again and again Kidner reminds us that in 3:11 we have a key to understanding Ecclesiastes. Because God has put eternity into the mind of man, man is never satisfied with anything that is only "under the sun." Here are a couple of quotations that illustrate this. On 5:10 we read: "If anything is worse than the addiction money brings, it is the emptiness it leaves. Man, with eternity in his heart, needs better nourishment than this" (p. 56). On 8:17 Kidner says: "Although as time-dwellers we see God's work in tantalizing flashes, the very fact that we can ask about the whole design and long to see it, is evidence that we are not entirely prisoners of our world" (p. 79). Or again, relative to 11:7, 8: "The author has not gone back on his insistence that, by themselves, time and all things temporal will disappoint us, who have eternity in our hearts" (p. 98).

One of Qoheleth's goals was to find "pleasing words" and "words of truth" (12:10). I found this a delightful book to read and must conclude that Kidner, too, had the same goals. For example, taste this from the comments on 4:4-8: "Our modern term, the rat-race, sums up the burden of these verses: a frantic rivalry at one extreme, a disastrous opting-out at the other; and for the successful few, a life devoted to acquiring prize after pointless prize" (p. 48).

Although this commentary is certainly not in the technical category, the author displays a mature grasp of what others have thought. But even more enviable is his acquaintance with and use of other literature to add further interest and worth to his study. So there are quotations from such widely divergent sources as "The Babylonian Theodicy" (p. 73), R. Baxter (p. 68), Gilgamesh (p. 83), Shakespeare (p. 85) and C. S. Lewis (p. 106 et al.).

To read this little volume on Ecclesiastes was a pleasure, and now to suggest that others do the same is my happy duty.

Robert L. Alden
Conservative Baptist Theological Seminary, Denver, CO 80210

"Two distinct patterns" and "two ways of viewing both God's immediate dealings with his people and his final provision for them...were to become classical in Old Testament prophecy," according to J. Bright's recent publication of a lectureship series first given in 1971 (p. 112). The "covenant" pattern was to be grounded in the Mosaic-Sinaitic vassal treaty and carried with it an absolute compliance if its blessings were to be enjoyed in the immediate and distant future. The "promise" pattern, however, was to be grounded in the Zionist theology offered to the patriarchs and David. It affirmed the sure and unconditional promises of God, which nothing could ever cancel. It was precisely this antithesis of obligation and promise, argues Bright, that explained the extreme hostility of Jeremiah's audiences to his fervent preaching just prior to the fall of the state of Israel in 587 B. C. Jeremiah rooted his message in the covenant pattern while his audience conveniently claimed promise theology. This antithesis Bright graphically portrays in the pre-exilic prophets of Amos, Hosea, Isaiah (i.e., only the first part of the book by the same name, according to the usual critical shibboleth), Micah, Zephaniah, Habakkuk and, especially, Jeremiah.

Yet the eschatology of these eighth- and seventh-century prophets was no doctrine of "last things" in the usual sense as used today. Rather, Bright found it to be an unshakeable confidence that the God who had given Israel his word about the future would secure for them the land under his protection and blessing (p. 47). Then, with a stroke of admitted "oversimplification" (p. 82), Bright discerned two patterns, corresponding to the two views of election and covenant traced above, as to how the prophets believed that God would fulfill his word to Israel (pp. 82-83): one rooted in the conditional terms of Sinai (e.g., Amos, Hosea), and the other traced to the unconditional traditions of Jerusalem, Zion and David (e.g., Isaiah I).

Of course, none of these prophets can be stereotyped so rigidly as to be spokesman for only one of these emphases, as even Bright himself acknowledged in the case of Isaiah (p. 103), Micah (pp. 117-118) and Habakkuk (pp. 121-122). But a misplaced national confidence in the promise of God with no corresponding sense of obligation to his instruction may just be the real source of most of the adamant opposition Jeremiah faced (p. 165). Bright, however, is wrong in saying that Jeremiah did "flatly contradict the popular belief in Yahweh's eternal and unconditional choice of Mt. Zion...in the so-called 'Temple sermon' (7:1-15; 26)" (p. 163). In our view, Jeremiah no more contradicted the Zion-Davidic promise theology (which even Bright allowed Jeremiah, but only in one place—23:5 f.l.) than he could be said to have totally rejected (which Bright does not say here) the sacrificial ritual in favor of mere verbal obedience in that same message (7:21-26) (p. 162).

More is at stake here than a correct understanding of a theological collision between Jeremiah and his contemporaries. It is part of the law/grace question. And Bright concludes that both patterns of binding obligation and unconditional promise are part and parcel of the new covenant (p. 197). Yet we would urge that interpreters must also fairly observe that Sinai theology cannot be cut off from the promise theology of the Abraham-Davidic covenant in interpreting Old Testament Biblical theology. The unconditional promises made to Abraham included commands and prohibitions along with the blessings and promises. Such commands to the patriarchs were: "Walk before me and be perfect" (Gen 17:1); "take your son...and go" (Gen 22:2); "do not go down to Egypt, but stay in this country" (Gen 26:2); "go back to the land of your fathers" (Gen
31:3); etc. His duty of obedience was particularly stressed in Gen 22:18; 26:5: "because you have obeyed my voice... and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes and my laws." Thus the connection is undeniable: Man’s duty to obedience was intimately bound up with the promise as its natural sequel. Likewise, the Sinaitic conditions were not obligations for an alternative method of entering into the life of grace and promise, but rather they were guidelines for continuing to enjoy the effects of that life here and now. The conditional "if" of Sinai no more muted the Abrahamic promise than the conditional "if" attached to the Davidic covenant muted God’s everlasting plan. Individual participation in the benefits of the promise could be stifled when the “obedience of faith” was not in evidence, but the transmission of the blessings to that generation and its successors nevertheless continued.

Bright is to be thanked for having raised this central issue at the heart of any evangelical theology—viz., the connection between law and grace. In our judgment he has described the situation well from the point of view of the prophets’ audiences. But if his conflict is projected on to the truth-intention of the prophets it will miss the prophets’ own claims, the unity of OT revelation and one of the most important clarifications needed in Biblical theology today, i.e., the connection between the Abrahamic-David-(re)new(ed) covenant and the Mosaic-wisdom theology in the historical development of the OT.

Walter C. Kaiser, Jr.
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL 60015


On pp. 221-222, Fields gives his own overview of his book: "There does not seem to be one shred of evidence in favor of the Gap Theory left remaining. Its fanciful cosmogony, Satanology, and allowance for billions of years, all, indeed, appeal to the imagination; but the facts of grammar have consigned the Gap Theory to the graveyard of exegetical misconceptions. We must forever rid ourselves of harmonizations with science which are based on its intimidating power. We must embrace a presuppositional method of apologetics which will deliver us from such an ever-present and powerful danger."

A fuller, more exhaustive refutation of the gap theory does not exist. After meticulous analysis of the arguments for the gap theory, Fields marshals an impressive array of evidence in refutation: the history of interpretation, an exhaustive linguistic-exegetical study of Gen 1:1-2, and theological and apologetic concerns. His conclusion is that since the gap theory rose not from the Biblical text but from an attempt (misguided) to integrate the views of evolutionary science with the Biblical record, it is a misguided and misleading approach to theology.

As impressive as Fields’ refutation is, his approach in places leaves one feeling less than enthusiastic. For one thing, Fields claims for himself principles of logic he denies to antagonists: Though he cites "exceptions (that) prove the rule" (p. 92), he castigates Custance for the same; he supports various theses by citing parallel passages (pp. 116-120) but criticizes others for doing the same (pp. 60, 94-95); "uniformitarian" presuppositions deplored in evolutionists underlie his appeal to magnetic-field dating. Unfortunately also, the force of his refutation is at times cheapened by unfair caricature (pp. 172-174, 183). Further, his discussion of creation is impoverished by excluding the Psalms, Proverbs and Job creation sections. This in turn prevents development of a
positive theology of creation. Finally, Fields' otherwise impressive bibliography does not indicate any acquaintance with Westermann's epochal work on Gen 1-11.

All criticisms aside, Fields' effort will remain a classic, at least within the limits he has set for himself. Compliments to the publishers for an attractive job of publishing are tempered only by a rather high price asked.

Henry Rowold
Concordia Seminary, Chia Yi, Taiwan, Republic of China

NEW TESTAMENT


The NT monograph series WUNT was initiated over twenty-five years ago. Since the first volume of Series One appeared in 1950, seventeen successive volumes have followed. Now, with the publication of The Oneness Motif in the Fourth Gospel, we have the first volume of Series Two, edited by M. Hengel, J. Jeremias and O. Michel. The new series is intended to differ from the first, not in the richness of the research represented, as this first volume attests, but in the less elegant form of the book itself, which is an attempt by the editors to offset rising publication costs.

Appold's investigation, a reworked copy of his Tübingen dissertation completed under E. Käsemann, undertakes to demonstrate that the fourth gospel is conceived and developed from the perspective of Jesus' oneness with the Father. The oneness motif constitutes the indispensable key to the Johannine Christology. This dissertation is well written and coherent. The author has covered the literature admirably. He understands Johannine criticism and uses it well. The book is worth reading carefully.

Part one traces the morphology of the motif to determine its role in the theological plan of the gospel. After examining the shape and form of the motif in the gospel's reciprocity statements, Christological titles, semeia and passion account, he concludes that the motif is primarily Christological in orientation but that the evangelist's soteriology and ecclesiology are also developed and explicated on the basis of his oneness Christology. Jesus' oneness with the Father is the center of the Johannine proclamation, the content of faith.

Part two is an analysis of the oneness passages themselves (10:16, 30; 11:52; 17:11, 21-23). On the basis of form-critical, stylistic, religio-historical and contextual considerations, Appold's exegetical probe seeks to determine the Christological, soteriological and ecclesiological significance of each passage. He argues that the passages are integral to the major orientation of the entire gospel; they are not secondary editions, corrective interpretations or representative theological shifts away from the evangelist's intent. Also, the oneness language of each passage has its religio-historical roots in the language of Gnostic phenomenology, not the OT or Judaism.

Christological oneness: Jesus' oneness with the Father is understood neither morally nor metaphysically nor philosophically; it is described in both relational and revelational terms. It is a oneness of equivalent relationality, of togetherness and mutual correspondence. The projection of this oneness in
the person of Jesus into the sphere of the world is its revelational aspect.

Soteriological oneness: The saving event is man’s integration into the projection of the heavenly oneness in Jesus. The essence of salvation is to be found in a relation of oneness to Jesus. Such oneness is effected through a response to the word that Jesus is one with the Father. This response in turn reveals the believer’s predestined character as God’s elect.

Ecclesiological oneness: Appold believes that oneness is the unique feature of the Johannine Church; it is a relational quality, a togetherness, the decisive bond being integration into the heavenly reality. The community is conscious that it is sent with the revelational task of being instrumentally manifest for the gathering into one of those given to Jesus.

Appold describes the total picture as an emanative sequence or chain of action. The point of departure is the relational/revelational character of Father and Son, then Revealer and believer, and believer and believer successively. The line moves from Christology to soteriology to ecclesiology, and oneness is the theological abbreviation for all three.

I agree heartily with Appold’s insistence that Johannine faith has a dogmatic content, but he has too sharply delineated its content by insisting that the evangelist’s sole concern is to give witness to Jesus’ oneness with the Father. Also it is difficult to argue with his emphasis on the uniqueness of the Johannine witness, but it is equally difficult to accept Appold’s oft-reiterated contention that the salvation-history perspective is missing in John. To be sure, the evangelist does not portray Jesus primarily in the context of salvation-history; but does not the demand to believe in Jesus as the Messiah indicate that one aspect of Johannine thought and faith points in the direction of Jesus’ relation to salvation-history? Furthermore, he has not persuaded me that the Johannine motif of oneness is merely the product of the evangelist’s assimilation and adoption of the Gnostic motif of oneness. Finally Appold has not, in my opinion, obviated the view that the oneness motif is primarily ethical in character—in particular, a oneness that can be described as a unity of love and will between the Father and the Son that finds pre-eminent expression in Jesus’ obedience unto death and his sacrifice on the cross.

Raymond Bystrom
Regent College, Vancouver, B. C. V6T 1W6


Robert Culver’s purpose (in adding yet another volume to the vast body of life-of-Christ literature) is to furnish a basic handbook for the average Christian reader and a textbook for students in Bible colleges and the first year of seminary. I think the author has accomplished his purpose, and I recommend the book with supplementary material for such use.

The book is organized in a way suggested by John 16:28 into four divisions: “I Came Forth from the Father” (pp. 17-60); “I Have Come into the World” (pp. 63-192); “I Am Leaving the World” (pp. 195-262); “I Am Going to the Father” (pp. 265-284). Extensive general and textual indices (pp. 285-304) add to the book’s usefulness. While the importance of John 16:28 as a “summary” of Jesus’ life is obvious it is not so apparent why this text should suggest the outline of a textbook, for the result is a rather uneven division of the material that detracts from its usefulness as a textbook. The organization is further cluttered with eleven excurses, added mostly in section two. Why excursus four,
“Jewish National Responsibility for Jesus’ Crucifixion,” should appear at all in a textbook on his life, and why it should be placed with the Galilean ministry instead of the crucifixion, is not clear. In short, the organization of the book leaves something to be desired.

The reader will have to grapple with a frustrating set of abbreviations—e. g., ALOL, ANT, FANT, VIG, etc.—which the author uses for more conventional footnoting. The book includes six maps (five of detail areas), three diagrams (Jewish and Roman days), the temple (floor plan), table positions at the last supper, and about twenty-five black-and-white photographs. Many photographs are quite helpful—e. g., the “house of Caiaphas” (pp. 239 ff.) and the Arab family scenes (pp. 53 ff.). Others are less valuable for this book—e. g., why the Bethany church instead of the “tomb of Lazarus” (p. 183), and how would a student recognize the road to Jericho (p. 201)?

Although the author does not intend to treat every incident and journey in detail he attempts to give a comprehensive structure and discussion of the life of Jesus. Hence his method is selection of key aspects for extended discussion “in a manner suggesting how the others might be handled” (p. 11). Consequently Jesus’ interview with the Samaritan woman is “a kind of supreme example of the Savior as evangelist and soul winner” (p. 92). Similarly, the healing of the blind man (Bartimaeus) at Jericho is a sample of how students should handle problems of harmony (pp. 212-213). Here the apparent “double discrepancy” in the synoptic accounts receives seven of a dozen possible explanations with this conclusion: “These and other explanations, each with some degree of plausibility, serve to show only that there is no need to accept the stories as discrepant if all the relevant facts should be known. This and many similar apparent discrepancies are no serious obstacle to believing the facticity of the Gospels” (p. 213). The student is not given the (best) solution to this “Jericho” problem, nor can this be a “model” for working through similar harmonistic questions. Accepting the full authority of Scripture, students still will ask, “What is the answer? What is your answer?” We may not avoid such questions. The reliability of the gospels require our one best answer, not a repetition of reliability.

In spite of these and other criticisms, the book remains a solid, evangelical tool for studying Jesus’ life. The reader will appreciate the traditional structure and conservative approach, as well as many fresh insights derived from the author’s first-hand knowledge of geography, local customs and the archaeology of Israel.

James C. DeYoung
Tyndale House, 36 Selwyn Gardens, Cambridge, England CB3 9BA


In 1966 J. T. Sanders wrote an article on 1 Cor 13 and its interpretation since World War I and pointed out that since the war no commentary had been written in the series ICC, Kritisch-Exegetischer Kommentar (KEK) or HNT (Int 20 [April, 1966] 160). This statement is partly outdated since the appearance of H. Conzelmann’s commentary on 1 Corinthians in KEK (and in English in the Hermeneia series) and the promise of a new ICC work by E. E. Ellis. Now another German series is developing and promises to be equally as useful as the old stand-bys of ICC, KEK and HNT. It is the series THKNT
under the new editorship of E. Fascher. Volumes have already appeared on Matthew, Mark, Luke, Romans, Galatians, the pastoral epistles and 2 Peter-Jude and have proven to be helpful works.

The newest addition to THKNT is Fascher’s commentary on 1 Cor 1-7, including an introduction for both 1 and 2 Corinthians. Fascher explains in the foreword that his intent is to follow the principles of the series by offering a presentation of general problems dealing with textual matters and questions of authenticity and unity as well as a running commentary on the text. He does, however, point out that he intends to avoid a cold, critical approach of just listing different opinions. His purpose is to present the meaning in a form that will be useful for both preacher and religious-education teachers.

Has Fascher accomplished his stated purpose? If one is looking for homiletic helps such as sermon outlines, illustrations and devotional thoughts, he will surely answer, “No.” If, however, one is looking for a discussion of the Greek text with explanations of grammar and the meaning of concepts placed in a historical setting of NT times, he is more likely to answer positively.

Fascher has done an admirable job of dealing with the text in a concise but scholarly manner. Following his translation of units of the text, he offers comments on word meanings, grammatical constructions, historical background and textual matters.

In his introduction Fascher discusses general problems dealing with textual criticism, exegesis and lexicography, as well as problems related to the Pauline corpus and to the Corinthian epistles in particular. He attempts to find a happy medium between an extreme Gnostic view of the Corinthian problems and a totally Jewish approach.

It is obvious that all will not agree with every interpretation offered by Fascher, but apart from this there seem to be some weaknesses that should be noted. In spite of its being a recent commentary (1975), it was somewhat disappointing to note that the latest date listed in the bibliography is 1969. Of course, this is not to say that just because something is new it is automatically good and should be included in a commentary. However, such works as the excellent (both in content and method) article by G. Theissen, “Soziale Schichtung in der korinthischen Gemeinde,” ZAW 65 (1974) 232-272, and the writings of C. Colpe, R. McL. Wilson and E. Yamauchi concerning Gnosticism would certainly have enhanced Fascher’s commentary.

The more glaring omission, which is even more far-reaching, is Fascher’s failure to seriously consider or use the contributions of English- and French-speaking scholars. The commentaries of Barrett, Bruce, Grosheide, and Robertson and Plummer in English and of Allo and Héring in French were evidently not consulted. But despite such weaknesses, Fascher has written a good commentary that will contribute to the understanding of 1 Corinthians. All who use this volume will eagerly await Fascher’s future work.

Beside noting the very reasonable price, a brief quote will round out this review: “Die Verkündigung beruht also auf dem Respekt vor einer heiligen Schrift welche der kirchlich bestellte Verkündiger zu überliefern und zu deuten hat” (p. 2).

Cleon Rogers
Freie Theologische Akademie, 6104 Seeheim, Germany


For those who are acquainted with Hiebert’s two previous volumes on NT
introduction—An Introduction to the Pauline Epistles (Chicago: Moody, 1954) and An Introduction to the Non-Pauline Epistles (Chicago: Moody, 1962)—this third study on the gospels and Acts will be a welcomed and long-awaited addition. For those who may not have consulted his previous works this volume will certainly be an incentive to do so. From his long experience as an educator in the NT field Hiebert, who is now serving as professor of Greek and NT at the Mennonite Brethren Biblical Seminary in Fresno, California, has produced a practical but solid introduction to the gospels and Acts. In his preface Hiebert sets forth his purpose and procedure. His primary aim is to provide "a guide to the systematic study of the Gospels and Acts" by giving background material along with "fairly detailed outlines" of the books (p. 7). The individual books are approached by providing a discussion of usual introductory matters, then an outline, and finally a book list for detailed study.

Hiebert has done an admirable job of condensing and summarizing vast amounts of material in a clear, concise and understandable fashion. For this reason his work will be of special value for students, pastors and laymen who are actively involved in the study of the NT. Another helpful feature is the inclusion of outlines of the books. These are well done and provide the reader with a structure of each book that is helpful for study and teaching.

One valuable contribution is the annotated book list that appears at the end of each chapter and the general bibliography at the end of the book. Most of the major commentaries in English are mentioned along with helpful remarks regarding the work. Of course it is not to be expected that every book and article dealing with the NT would be included, but one wonders about the omission of such works as A. H. McNeile, The Gospel According to Matthew; D. Hill, The Gospel of Matthew; B. Lindars, The Gospel of John; A. Edersheim, The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah; W. Gasque, A History of the Criticism of the Acts of the Apostles; J. A. Bengel, Gnomon of the New Testament; and others. Perhaps it would have been helpful had he included some of the more well-known and important works in other languages, such as Str-B. The discussion of the Johannine authorship of the fourth gospel would have been further strengthened by a summary of the evidence provided by the unsurpassed study of A. Schlatter, "Die Sprache und Heimat des Vierten Evangelisten" ("The Language and Home of the Fourth Evangelist"), as reprinted in Johannes und Sein Evangelium, K. H. Rengstorff, ed. (Darmstadt, 1973).

Perhaps the weakest chapter is chapter one, "Survey of the New Testament." In seven short pages subjects normally considered as "general introduction" are briefly treated. This is understandable, on the one hand, when it is realized that the main purpose of the book lies in the area of "special introduction." It would have been most welcomed, however, if Hiebert had appended an annotated bibliography to this section. One other comment here: In the light of J. N. Sevener's Do You Know Greek? How Much Greek Could the First Jewish Christians Have Known? (Leiden, 1968) and K. Beyer's Semitische Syntax im Neuen Testament (Göttingen, 1968), is it really necessary to concede that "it is possible that the New Testament writers . . . recorded the good news about Christ Jesus in Aramaic" (p. 12)?

Hiebert is to be commended for his fine work, which truly honors the Bible as God's Word and provides a good study guide to it.

Cleon Rogers

Freie Theologische Akademie, 6104 Seeheim, Germany

This short monograph brings a fresh mind to the study of a Pauline cuix interpretum and indicates that the many problems of exegesis and background having to do with Phil 2:6-11 are by no means finally settled. Further light on such a crucial passage is bound to be welcome, and this incisive study merits attention.

Written by a student of J. Jeremias (but forsaking his mentor’s conclusions at several points), the book states its position in the preface, which may be rendered thus: "Phil 2:6-11 is a traditional early Christian hymn that celebrates the saving action of God in Jesus Christ, in which the pathway and story of God’s Son are described. The extant form of the hymnic report has its prototype in those OT Psalms which relate in confessional praise the historical saving acts of Yahweh.

"It can be seen from explicit reference to the divine oath in Isa 45:23 (made in Phil 2:10, 11) that the Christ-hymn has literary connection with the Gattung of the historical psalms of the OT, to which it is related in terms of its content.

"The following study is based on the OT background by which the hymn is to be understood, and it seeks to comprehend its message particularly in this setting."

The author’s declared object is faithfully pursued throughout his treatment. He is a doughty opponent of any and all attempts to see the hymn against a Hellenistic background, and he denies all connection between the passage’s story and the gnostic redeemer myth (pp. 32, 36-37). In fact, Hofius’ sketch of the Biblical setting of Phil 2:5-11 is the exact antithesis of that given in Käsemann’s influential essay, with which he is in running debate. He sides with Jeremias in seeing the OT servant motif as dominant and takes issue with those who find the hymn’s center of gravity in either dogmatics (p. 58) or the incarnation (p. 64). Rather, the locus of interest is the cross of Jesus, which clamps together the pre-existent and exalted states of Christ—a theme that is traced, in a final section, through the Christology of the epistle to the Hebrews (p. 95).

Hofius is at pains to oppose two positions that are commonly held in modern study. One is that the phrase "even the death on the cross" (v 8c) is an addition by Paul to a pre-Pauline composition; the other interprets the character of those beings referred to in vv 10, 11 as demonic powers existing in the heavens, on the earth and in the underworld. Hofius endeavors, by a fresh structural analysis—already anticipated by J.-F. Collange’s French commentary (1973)—to divide the passage into two main stanzas, in which v 8c and v 11c match each other. His literary analysis fails to convince, and I may refer to the New Century Bible commentary (1976) for details of a counter-argument.

Even less persuasive is his argument to apportion the triadic phrase in v 10 to the three areas of angels in heaven, inhabitants on earth, and the dead in Sheol (p. 53). Proof that v 10 has the underworld dead in view is found in Ps 22:30, but this is very unlikely; and the confession of faith in Christ’s Lordship that Hofius regards as "macabre" (p. 40) when attributed to demonic agencies is even more problematic in view of Pss 6:5; 30:9; 88:4 ff.; 115:17; and Isa 38:18!

The vital concerns of this monograph are to demonstrate the OT rootage of the Christ-hymn, especially regarding the use of Isa 45:23 and the Jewish synagogue prayers based on this text. He may well be correct in this single
point. But the case has been overpressed, and attempts to see a blend of enthronement teaching and a future parousia hope in both the Philippian hymn and the epistle to the Hebrews falter on the double ground that the thrust of Paul's citation of vv 6-11 is to assert the present Lordship of Jesus Christ and that while Hebrews does contain some obvious parousia teaching (1:13; 9:28; 10:13, 37) this hope is singularly absent from Phil 2:6-11. Hofius as good as concedes these differences in his final paragraphs. Also, in understanding both documents he has strangely overlooked the one exegetical key that could have accounted for both the present enthronement of the Lord and his future universal acclamation. This, as O. Cullmann and C. F. D. Moule have shown, is the liturgical origin of the teaching whereby it is the language of the Church at worship that reaches out to grasp and express the future acknowledgment of all creatures as though it were a present reality. The present writer's Carmen Christi (1967; pp. 266-270) sought to utilize this hermeneutical key that Hofius has passed over.

This treatment, however, claims attention as a full exploration of the OT-Judaic backgrounds to the pre-Pauline hymn. Its central thesis may stand, even if the application of that thesis is to be questioned. Hofius writes (p. 51): "Basic to Phil 2:9-11 is the OT and old Jewish theologoumenon that at the consummation of the age all creatures will fall down and worship Yahweh, the King of the world. . . . [It is to] Jesus Christ that universal, eschatological homage will be rendered."

Ralph P. Martin
Fuller Theological Seminary, 135 N. Oakland Ave., Pasadena, CA 91101

BIBLICAL THEOLOGY


Here is the first in-depth Biblical theology on the doctrine of the Holy Spirit by a Pentecostal. Taking the progressive unfolding of revelation seriously, Horton canvasses the data in a panoramic sweep from the Pentateuch through to the Pauline epistles. He serves his readers a mixed plate of exegetical, devotional and practical comments. What the Bible Says is theologically Pentecostal and methodologically conservative, for the author not only finds the Pentecostal doctrine in all the expected places but also takes a conservative stand on questions of dating and authorship. He also writes with a mild apologetic against liberals, Biblical critics and anti-supernaturalists.

Several shortcomings limit the value of the book. Too often Horton sacrifices theological comment to running exposition. It is also a dated book in many ways, for he relies heavily on older authors at the expense of sufficient interaction with contemporary authors. Most serious is Horton's failure to interact with the development of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit within Judaism. His readers remain blissfully ignorant of any points of contact, either similarities or contrasts, with beliefs about the Spirit in the intertestamental period, rabbinic theology, apocalyptic or the sectarian Judaism of Qumran.

Though it contains few surprises, the book is an important study. Reflecting as it does Horton's Pentecostal heritage, it will undoubtedly take its place as a standard restatement of Pentecostal interpretation. More important than the particular exegetical and theological insights it contains, its appearance suggests
that Pentecostalism is finally shedding its characteristic isolationism and is ready to expose its distinctive doctrine to the challenge of serious Biblical scholarship.

Roger Stronstad

1848 Vine St., Vancouver, B. C. V6K 3J7


The truism that one's strength inevitably bears the seed of one's weakness applies to this book. On the one hand, Hughes draws from his rich experience as pastor (Episcopalian) and visiting professor (Westminster Theological Seminary) to provide a collection of rich, significant and at times even devotional insights into the nature of Biblical prophecy. Surveying much of the Scriptures, Hughes demonstrates the strong continuity of the OT and NT and finds the fulfillment of all prophecies in Jesus Christ, the center of all Scripture as well as of all history. Though his antithesis seems to be a premillennial view of prophecy, his approach is a sympathetic and positive one.

The book's weakness, however, lies in its nature as simply a collection. There is no apparent structure or outline. Even the table of contents is simply a listing of widely ranging topics. This leads, for one thing, to a blurring of insights; some, in not being developed or reinforced, are robbed of their full potential. More problematic, however, this anthologic format leads to some statements so bald as to need considerable substantiation before one can accept them: "The apostles and evangelists of the New Testament (are) unaware (of) a difference between the 'kingdom' and the 'church'" (p. 107). Should the temple vision of Ezekiel be consigned to Judaism, as Hughes implies (p. 129)? Hughes' equating the tòrà with the NT nomos is typical of a tendency to so flatten out the difference between the Testaments that the distinctiveness of the OT is lost completely. This leads to an overly facile condemnation of Jewish rejection of Christ, as though they then could see things as clearly as do we who live under the light of the Spirit.

The comments above are not to judge Hughes' book as without value, but merely to lament the fact that much of its value is lost in a labyrinth of unstructured and sometimes unsubstantiated thoughts.

Henry Rowold
Concordia Seminary, Chia Yi, Taiwan, Republic of China

JUDAISM


In this book the author studies attitudes toward women reflected in Jewish sources in the period from about 200 B. C. to A. D. 400 in Palestine and Babylonia. After an opening chapter discussing the rationale for the study and the status of women in the Egyptian, Mesopotamian and Graeco-Roman background, Swidler devotes chapters to women in wisdom and pseudepigraphical literature, women in major Jewish groups, women in relation to cult and Torah, women in society and, finally, women and sex. A conclusion relates modern
feminist efforts in Judaism and encourages a more "liberated" role for women in Jewish religious life.

On the positive side, one can say the following major things about the book: (1) It is good to have this material surveyed and drawn together in one place, including the references both to ancient and to modern works; (2) there is some credible and helpful historical interpretation, such as the suggestion that attitudes toward women hardened as the Jews attempted to cope with the urbanization of Palestine and the infiltration of Hellenistic culture in the period under study; (3) the book provides valuable background material for reading the NT and the attitudes toward women reflected there (Swidler promises another book on women in "formative Christianity" too); and (4) it is interesting to be able to compare the women's movements in Judaism with similar movements in Christian circles (pp. 167-173).

A few observations are proper of a critical nature also, however. (1) Swidler is anxious to prove his case that women had a low position in early Judaism. He tends, therefore, to be somewhat insensitive to the Jewish desire to preserve Jewry from worldly influences in the pagan culture of ancient times. He points to the freer role of women in Graeco-Roman culture but ignores the immoralities of the culture, which the rabbis feared. However we judge actions today, we must try to discern motives and fears of ancient peoples to do them justice. (2) Much of his material and views is borrowed heavily from writings of R. Loewe (with whom he often disagrees) and C. G. Montefiore (with whom he generally agrees). At best, Swidler has done only trace amounts of original research and thinking. (3) He seems unable to recognize that the generally patriarchal nature of ancient Semitic culture would demand as proper many practices now deemed unfair. That is, the restrictions on women were not always out of misogynous intent but were simply logical extensions of the basic economic system.

There are, however, many passages Swidler collects to show some blame-worthy attitudes in rabbinic Judaism of the ancient period, such as the damning references discouraging conversation with any women including one's wife (except to procure intercourse from the latter; pp. 123-125).

I noticed missprints on p. 39 (the footnote number should be "17," not "12"), and on p. 184, n. 7 ("catches," not "cathces").

Overall the book is a helpful "primer" in the subject for one not familiar with ancient Judaism, providing one keeps aware of the author's limitations and his desire to portray the inexcusable nature of misogyny in early Judaism.

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

CHURCH HISTORY


Doctoral dissertations in historical studies have the reputation of concentrating more and more on less and less. The Patristic Roots of Reformed Worship has all the marks of its dissertation origin, but the judgment that it magnifies the minuscule would say as much about the interests and priorities of the reviewer as of the reviewed. So, without indulging in such a judgment ourselves, it can be stated as a matter of fact that Old has produced a definitive study of the patristic roots of Reformed worship that leaves few stones unturned.
Old primarily concerns himself with the explanation of the patristic roots of the Genevan Psalter of 1542. This self-imposed limitation "is justified by the fact that it can be regarded as a good culmination of the Reformed liturgical revisions which preceded it and at the same time the archetype of Reformed worship which followed it." Even so, the mass of material that Old had to sift through is overwhelming. This includes the liturgical developments in Strasbourg, Zurich, Basel, Bern, Constance and Geneva; the references to liturgical form and meaning in Renaissance humanists and the sixteenth-century Reformed theologians Zwingli, Pellican, Oecolampadius, Bucer, Hedia, Capito, Le Fevre and Calvin; and the search for roots in the Church fathers, most notably Eusebius, Gregory of Nazianzus, Ambrose, Augustine, John Chrysostom, Gregory the Great and John of Damascus.

Three distinct lines of approach to this material are taken. Part one traces the history of Reformed worship beginning with pre-Reformation attempts to supplement the Roman mass and proceeding through the evolution of Reformed worship as it culminated in the Genevan Psalter. Part two cites the evidence for the knowledge and use of the Church fathers by the Reformed leaders as well as the impact that the Church fathers had upon them and the nature of their appeal to the fathers vis-à-vis their appeal to the authority of Scripture. Parts three, four and five treat the Reformers' understanding of the proclamation of the Word, prayers and the Lord's supper in the Reformed liturgy and their justification for this understanding from the Church fathers.

Old successfully demonstrates that it can no longer be assumed that early Reformed worship had neither interest nor precedent in the liturgical traditions of the patristic age. Sola scriptura did not rule out interest in the liturgical practices of the ancient Church. Indeed, the repeated claims of Calvin and other sixteenth-century Reformed theologians that their liturgies had patristic roots should be taken seriously. But why should the Reformers have been interested in such a patristic root? Was not the exegetical root for faith and practice of most and ultimate importance? Yes, and the patristic root was important to them to the extent that it confirmed a usage they felt had already been established by Scripture. In other words, in the Reformed tradition sola scriptura did not negate the significance of patristic testimony and practice, but even the fathers must be judged in the light of sola scriptura. The goal was to be faithful to God and his Word.

Old is to be commended for his exhaustive research. It will be of primary significance for those in the Reformed traditions in liturgical renewal. Old writes with pastoral as well as scholarly concern. But it is too bad that the published form of his research should so thoroughly disguise that pastoral concern in the practically unmodified garb of a dissertation.

Stanley N. Gundry
Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, IL 60610

PASTORAL CARE


Evangelicals came of age intellectually in two areas in 1975. George Eldon Ladd's New Testament Theology marked our coming of age in NT studies. Christian: Celebrate Your Sexuality marked our coming of age in the area of sexual ethics. This book is one the evangelical community can recommend with
pride, for it approaches a major area of concern with considerable theological acumen.

There are two parts to this book, the first being a history of Christian treatment of sexuality. Chapter one deals with the present scene, clearly laying out most major options. The remainder of the first part catalogues Christian approaches to human sexuality. This section is only necessary because Derrick Sherwin Bailey’s *Sexual Relations in Christian Thought* is out of print. But Small’s treatment is so delightful (by comparison with Bailey’s) that it may be that the loss is minor.

The second half of the book merits our greatest attention. Small attempts to take the best insights of Karl Barth, Emil Brunner and Derrick Bailey and expand them into an evangelical approach to sexuality. He does a masterful job.

One major revision is immediately introduced. Mankind—two sexes—reflects the image of God. The image of God is no longer considered as ontological; rather, it is mankind’s relational ability. God is three persons in one being. So mankind, in marriage, is two persons in relation to one another and in relation to God. Many of the categories of ontology are used to describe the image, but they are developed as relational rather than as ontological categories.

Sexuality is considered essential to a proper reflection of the image. Neither man-man nor woman-woman relationships would suffice. There is a need for sexual differentiation. A unisex society could not reflect the image of God because it would lack the necessary diversity and accompanying intensity of a sexual relationship.

Sexual differentiation is also necessary for a personal image. It is only possible fully to have a self-image in contrast to the images of others, particularly members of the opposite sex. I am only able to view myself as a man as I am able to view others as women; only as I recognize my lack of fulfilment as a man do I also recognize my need for a woman.

Viewed relationally, the image of God can only be reflected by a Christian marriage. One cannot truly be partner to another unless both are also partners with God and therefore united in their approach to life, an approach in harmony with God’s plan for the universe.

Speaking gently to Christian feminism, Small writes that the creation account, by showing woman created for man, reveals the essential hierarchy in God’s creation. He was not created for her but she for him, thus establishing God’s order for living.

How does the fall affect marriage? The primary effect, writes Small, was not so much on the relationship of mankind to God—although that was great—as it was on the relationship of man and woman, expressed by the statement they were naked and ashamed (Gen 3). His detailed analysis of the consequences of the fall is highly revealing. Adam no longer sees Eve as one taken from man but as the mother of all flesh. No longer is she primarily a partner for him but the bearer of his children. This effect is partially erased in Christ. The curse primarily affects his relationship to the world, but it affects her relation to him.

The one-flesh nature of marriage reveals that sexual experience is no mere biological experience. To be lastingly satisfying, it must be a total experience of personality. Thus fornication is wrong because it is a mockery of God’s image of the relationship of Christ to his church; transience replaces permanence. Thus also the quantity of sexual experience is not nearly so important as the quality because sex is more than physical.

Finally Small points to the mystery of sexuality, a mystery that defies
final analysis by the sexologists because they can explore little more than the physical. This brings out also the supreme pleasure found in sexual experience, something else that cannot be explained. It explains our difficulty in giving sex education even to our own children because biological facts cannot explain intercourse.

Part of the mystery is that love can legitimate sexual experience. Sex as a purely physical expression would be using another person to meet personal needs, but as love infuses the act it becomes a legitimate expression of something beyond the ability of words to communicate.

A number of new directions can be taken from this book. If human sexuality—that is, the bisexual nature of humanity—reflects the image of God, then an argument may be developed for prescribed sex roles in marriage. As the Son submits to the will of the Father without in any way being his inferior but always his equal, so also the wife can submit to the will of her husband without in any way being his inferior, while actually being his partner in life.

This work also suggests that there is a divine purpose behind the creation of two sexes. Unisex approaches calling for egalitarian marriage fail because they cannot explain this diversity. Men and women are not the same except for minor biological differences. Although in many ways the same, they are profoundly different because God chose their diversity to reflect the diversity within the Godhead.

But we might also ask Small for further words. His attacks on fornication, homosexuality and the Playboy philosophy are devastating in their thoroughness. How does this theology of sex, however, approach the problem of masturbation and premarital petting? These are two of the most pressing problems confronting Christian counselors. Possibly they can be discussed in a future revision.

C. E. Cerling, Jr.
Aquinas Institute of Theology, Dubuque, Iowa

BOOK NOTES


This commentary on the ASV (1901) of Mark’s gospel can be warmly recommended to reading laymen. Serious students and pastors will also profit from it, even if they will want to turn as well to such commentaries as those by W. Lane and C. E. B. Cranfield.

Written by Hiebert’s prolific pen, this book is at its best when it is unpacking the text phrase by phrase and word by word. It is weaker in the matter of discerning the theological significance of each pericope. The trees, and sometimes the knots in the trees, stand out with reasonable clarity; the forest, however, is harder to locate. The author in his brief preface advises his reader that the work “is not intended as a contribution to contemporary studies in Markan theology.” Therefore he should not be faulted for failing to interact with recent
redaction-critical studies, most (but certainly not all) of which are in any case far too speculative to stand the test of time as well as this commentary will.

D. A. Carson
Northwest Baptist Theological Seminary, 3358 S. E. Marine Dr.,
Vancouver, B. C. V5S LH6


This revision of the author's thesis (Yale, 1970) argues for the integrity of Rom 1:16 (minus the doxology, 16:25-27) by use of text-critical and style-critical data. Gamble also makes suggestions about the occasion and purpose of the letter, arguing that Romans was not a "summary" of the Pauline gospel but was directed specifically to the Roman Church and was written with the Church's situation in mind. This is the first monograph-length study of the ending of the Roman letter and is "must" reading for scholars studying or teaching the epistle.

Larry W. Hurtado
Regent College, Vancouver, B. C.
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