BOOK REVIEWS


In this latest addition to the NICOT, Thompson has contributed an outstanding commentary that is bound to become a standard classic for English-speaking students.

The book consists of two main sections: an introduction, and a text and commentary. The introduction, 131 pages long, is a gold mine of information that matches the excellent work of Bright. In it Thompson deals with such difficult topics as the nature of Josiah’s reforms, the differences between the MT and LXX, and Hebrew poetic forms. But perhaps the most interesting part of the introduction is “Some Important Issues for Exegesis,” in which the author does not hesitate to address practically every controversial issue in Jeremian studies. The wide range of issues treated here is reflected in such intriguing titles as “The Debt of Jeremiah to Hosea,” “The ‘Seditious’ Utterances of Jeremiah,” “The Use and Significance of the Root šūb in Jeremiah” and “The Foe from the North.”

Thompson has done his homework well. He explains clearly the point being discussed, stating what is at stake. Then he proceeds to weigh the evidence for and against the various options, and finally he arrives at a conclusion without being unnecessarily dogmatic. He does not hesitate to interact with Bright, Holladay, Hyatt, Nicholson and others while being fair to them. His mood is irenic and his style is easy to read—even enjoyable. He clearly has an eye for the message and theology of the prophet. The introduction alone is worth the price of the book.

The outstanding introduction is followed by a very good text and commentary. This section has the edge on Bright for three main reasons. First, Bright has been allotted a space of 370 pages while Thompson has 645 pages. Second, while Bright’s notes and comments tend to be brief and sketchy, Thompson’s notes are fuller and more substantial. Third, Bright has rearranged the Biblical text in order to fit it into a chronological order, while Thompson has dealt with it in the order it appears in the Scriptures. The result is to solve the problem one encounters in trying to find a specific oracle in Bright’s work where, for instance, Jer 19:1-2 is treated after 26:1-24.

Thompson’s exegetical remarks vary from good to excellent. To observe him at his best, one may sample his exciting treatment of such passages as the denunciations in chap. 3, the passionate grief in chap. 8, the temple sermon in chap. 7 and “Yahweh Is Our Righteousness” in chap. 23. He sets a standard for himself that even he cannot maintain.

Other passages are less dynamic and do not receive a full treatment. For example, when the purifying process is described in 6:27-30, might not the imagery be dependent on Isa 4:2 and could not the fire be the Babylonian capture of the towns and land of Israel? In 32:36-44 Thompson notes the relationship between the everlasting covenant there and in Isa 55:3 and Ezek 16:60 and 37:26. However, he does not develop it in a satisfactory manner, nor does he give a detailed discussion of its relationship to the new covenant in 31:31. In 31:31-34 the reader is left desiring more discussion of the relationship between the old and new covenants and Jesus’ use of the words at the Last Supper.

Such occasional shortcomings mar an otherwise excellent work. In a future revision, the author might consider adding a few pages dealing with Jeremiah’s debt to Isaiah, his influence on Ezekiel, and the differences between the old and new covenants. In any case, Thompson has set a very high standard for the rest of NICOT. It is hoped that it can be met and upheld.

Samir Massouh
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

In this thoughtful and creative book, Pregeant proposes to go beyond Bultmann’s de-mythologizing and its heir (the new hermeneutic), develop a “process hermeneutic” out of Whitehead’s process metaphysics, and then apply that hermeneutic to some of the more difficult questions in Matthew’s gospel. The results he weighs by assessing their “depth” (their ability to demonstrate layers of meaning in the text not visible from other angles) and “appropriateness” (that the results are confirmed by at least some evidence in the text itself). Within its self-imposed limitations—e.g., the adoption of explicit antisupernatural presuppositions, labelled “scientific,” and the uncritical acceptance of Whitehead’s metaphysics—the work is a reasonably thorough and clear exposition.

Anyone who is venturing to pioneer in a new field is likely to tumble into pitfalls, and Pregeant is no exception. His book deserves more detailed interaction than the confines of this review allow, but a few of its problems may be briefly noted.

1) Although Pregeant pits his process hermeneutic against Bultmann and his heirs, he nevertheless adopts in too strong a form the disjunction between text and reader. Of course he could not have been expected to read the later book by A. C. Thiselton (The Two Horizons: New Testament Hermeneutics and Philosophical Description [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980]), which demonstrates the possibility of coming to a valid if partial understanding of an objective text by “fusing” the two horizons (the horizon of the text and the horizon of the reader). But there are other studies that antedate Thiselton’s magisterial work and offer telling criticism of the new hermeneutic in its most extreme forms—criticisms with important ramifications for Pregeant’s proposals. These he does not consider.

2) Pregeant generally discusses scholarly contributions that stand in reasonably close proximity to his own approach, but he studiously avoids interaction with studies that call in question something fundamental to his approach. For instance, the explicit antisupernaturalism of the first page has been repeatedly shown to be a function of modern cultural blinders, and it is astonishing that he nowhere interacts with (for instance) the rigorous critique offered by Wolfhart Pannenberg. When talking about the Biblical text Pregeant fares no better. For example, in discussing Matt 5:17-20 he allows room for dialogue with interpretations of πληρωτ that feed into his process approach, but he does not so much as mention the interpretation of “to fulfill” in that passage offered by Robert Banks, whose proposal, if adopted, vitiates Pregeant’s entire chapter. Again, although Pregeant in this book is building on process metaphysics, it is worrisome that process theologians, including Pregeant, continue on the whole to attack alternative systems without thoughtfully responding to threats on their own flanks. For a recent example of one such threat see Bruce Demarest, “Process Theology and the Pauline Doctrine of the Incarnation,” Pauline Studies (Festschrift F. F. Bruce; ed. D. A. Hagner and M. J. Harris; Exeter: Paternoster, 1980) 122-142.

3) An essential part of Pregeant’s application of process hermeneutic to passages he selects from Matthew (5:17-20; 11:25-30; 13:36-43; 25:31-46) is the need to demonstrate that the language of the text has, in each case, “a metaphysical thrust which may function in a way that is quite at odds with a univocal rendering of its terms” (p. 75). Methodologically this seems to depend on two steps: first, finding the desired thrust as a deduction of some textual point; and second, pitting this deduction against some explicit statement to the contrary. A statement pointing to grace, for instance, in reality affirms God’s universal love, and that love is in contradiction with particularism. To pull this old chestnut out of the fire is well-nigh irresponsible, at least without thorough interaction with the countless responses that have demonstrated that there is no incompatibility whatever. Worse, Pregeant’s hermeneutic is self-confessedly based on a method that must find (or manufacture) historical and theological disjunctions—a classic fallacy in all historical research (cf. David Fischer, Historians’ Fallacies: Toward a Logic of Historical Thought [New York: Harper, 1970]).

4) Although Pregeant wants to distance himself from hermeneutical approaches in
which the interpreter finds in the Scriptures the Christ already presupposed, he has fallen into the same trap. Toward the conclusion of his study Pregeant summarizes his findings by saying that the "real nature of the New Testament's witness to Jesus as the Christ... is, from the perspective of a process hermeneutic as I conceive it, a proximate lure which serves finally to point beyond itself bifocally: toward a particular human self-understanding on the one hand and toward an apprehension of God as the ultimate ground of this possibility on the other" (p. 157). Stripped of the technical language, Pregeant is saying (as his next lines go on to affirm) that the Whiteheadian metaphysics he has adopted, applied to language to develop Whiteheadian process hermeneutic that is then applied to NT Christology, interprets that Christology in such a way as to show that its real nature is nothing less than the substantiation of Whiteheadian metaphysics. Methodologically this approach is not easily distinguishable from the way Harnack (for instance) found a liberal Jesus in the NT.

(5) A never-failing source of astonishment in a book like this is the elevated, "religious" tone it seeks to preserve. We are told: "For if the Christ figure of the New Testament no longer appears as the exclusive irruption of grace into history, he nevertheless appears to those who are grasped by his words and deeds as the full and definitive disclosure of a grace always and forever being given in the universe. In this image they are surprised with a radical love which accepts them into an unbreakable fellowship with the ground of reality; in this image they are confronted with a radical call that bids them lay aside their selfish motives and find fulfillment in living for the sake of the total reality and broadest community in which they stand" (p. 168). God is not a personal, transcendent and loving Person, but (a more-or-less Tillichian) "ground of reality" or "total reality"; radical love cannot be measured, as in the NT, by the unique self-sacrifice of the incarnate Son in time-space history; the "call" is nothing personal, but a challenge effected by the speech-event of the existential encounter with the text; the "disclosure of grace" has nothing to do with the gracious self-disclosure, self-revelation and saving mercy of a personal God. Yet all the religiously emotive force of these and other terms—e.g., fellowship, image, irruption of grace—gives the sentences a religious hue that seems rather too generous for what is actually being said. For ground of reality's sake, let us avoid the evocative language of Christianity when its distinctive core has been removed.

D. A. C.


This brief introduction to Paul, written by the Lady Margaret's Professor of Divinity at the University of Cambridge, was originally published in Great Britain in 1979 as Pauline Pieces. The American edition's title is more descriptive of the book. This is a preface to the serious study of Paul's thought. There is no discussion, for example, of the chronology of his ministry or of the authorship and date of his letters. Though the book has no preface, the absence of a bibliography or index and the relative infrequency of footnotes suggest that the intended audience is educated lay people and perhaps beginning theological students.

The book is comprised of six relatively brief chapters. "Through a Glass, Darkly" (chap. 1) deals with some of the obstacles to understanding Paul, while "Christ Our Righteousness" (chap. 2) introduces Paul's gospel and its relation to the law. Subsequent chapters on "As in Adam, So in Christ," "God Was in Christ," "Have This Mind in You," and "Dying, and Behold We Live" cover other important aspects of Paul's theological system—e.g., anthropology, Christology, ethics, and eschatology, among others.

This well-written volume strives throughout to lay clear the "why" and the logic of the apostle's thinking to one to whom his language and terminology—"law," "righteousness," "in Christ," and so on—may be nothing more than a strange-sounding jargon (though the author's own comments are not always free of another jargon—e.g., "myth," "demythologizing"). By and large Hooker is successful in her effort. Chapter 1, with its discussion of
eight obstacles to understanding Paul that any interpreter must reckon with, is worthy of special notice.

Though not all chapters match the high level of the first—the treatment of the apocalyptic element in Paul’s thought is disappointing—this book deserves careful consideration by those engaged in the teaching of Pauline studies. In an introductory course on Paul, for example, it would complement quite nicely a book like R. N. Longenecker’s *The Ministry and Message of Paul* (Zondervan, 1971). Though not to be recommended to uncritical readers, this careful and easy-to-read study will prove stimulating to those seeking a sympathetic introduction to Paul’s thought and theology.

Michael W. Holmes

109 Farber 1A, Princeton, NJ


With this book Beker has redeemed the pledge given in his inaugural lecture in 1968 on the occasion of his installation as Professor of Biblical Theology at Princeton Theological Seminary (cf. *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin* 61 [1968] 13-19). This is an important major study of Paul’s thought, in which Beker demonstrates a rare ability to listen to Paul on his own terms. He has earned for himself a place in the very front rank of Pauline scholars, surpassing even the recent efforts of Ernst Käsemann and E. P. Sanders.

Two elements are central to Beker’s treatment of Paul. The first of these is a distinction between the one symbolic structure that lies at the center of Paul’s thought and the many symbols or metaphors that Paul uses to express that symbolic structure. Previous efforts to describe the “center” of Pauline thought in terms of “justification by faith” (Käsemann), a “pattern of religion” (Sanders), or “eschatological mysticism” (Schweitzer), for example, are rejected as a misguided concretion of Paul’s thought. All such efforts, says Beker, fail to distinguish between primary and secondary levels of language, and thus wrongly isolate any one of a number of themes as the theme or center to which all others must be subordinated.

Beker, on the other hand, locates the center of Paul’s thought in a “symbolic structure”: the imminent cosmic triumph of God, defined by and located in the death, resurrection and Lordship of Jesus Christ. This is the “primary level” of Paul’s language, which comes to expression on a “secondary level” by means of any of a number of themes: righteousness, justification, reconciliation, adoption, being in or with Christ, and so forth. In other words, Paul can and does use any and/or all of these various themes to give expression to the coherent core of his thought—the imminent cosmic triumph of God. Which one or more of these is chosen in a given instance depends entirely on the contingent factors of that particular situation. Thus for Beker there is in Paul’s thought no “primary crater” with a number of “secondary craters” encompassed within it. Rather, there is a coherent core that receives contingent expression by means of any of several equally valid and legitimate themes, metaphors or symbols.

The biggest part of Beker’s book, comprising his major contribution, is given over to an analysis of the dialectical movement in Paul’s thought between the coherent core and its contingent expression. Following a discussion in Part One of Paul as apostle to the Gentiles and the character of his thought, there is in Part Two an examination of the contingent aspects of Paul’s theological method. Focusing on Romans and Galatians, considered by many to be the most “doctrinal” of Paul’s letters, Beker (in much the same way as R. N. Longenecker in “The ‘Faith of Abraham’ Theme in Paul, James and Hebrews: A Study in the Circumstantial Nature of New Testament Teaching,” *JETS* 20 [1977] 203-212) compares Paul’s treatment of Abraham and the Torah in these two epistles. Criticizing a “unitary treatment” that ignores “incidental historical circumstances,” or the “topical-dogmatic” method characteristic of Bultmann and Ridderbos, for example, he argues for a “contextual” interpretation that takes seriously the differences in Paul’s treatment of the
same theme in the different letters. Only in this way, he contends, can one do justice not only to Paul’s message but also to his method. While this stress on understanding Romans and Galatians in their “particularity,” despite their “thematic similarity,” is not quite as innovative as the book at times seems to suggest, the effort to integrate contingent factors with the core of Paul’s thought and to analyze the dialectic relationship between them is. And it is the dialogical aspects of Paul’s theological method that Beker is particularly interested in and that he is very successful in illuminating.

The other element central to Beker’s treatment of Paul comes out in Part Three, where he turns to the question of the coherence of Paul’s gospel. This is located in Paul’s apocalyptic world view, as affirmed and modified by Christ’s resurrection. His view of apocalyptic, as involving (1) historical dualism, (2) universal cosmic expectation and (3) the imminent end of the world is nothing new, but the seriousness with which Beker takes the last two elements is, “It is interesting,” he writes, “that Christian hermeneutics has regularly adopted the dualistic component of apocalyptic—in whatever spiritualistic or existentialist terms—whereas it has neglected and/or obscured its other two components, imminence and cosmic universalism. And so it has failed to understand Paul properly, because the dimensions of imminence and cosmic expectation are central to Paul.” He argues that Paul’s apocalyptic framework is not a “husk” that can be discarded and thus refuses to allow eschatology to be swallowed up by Christology (Dodd’s “realized eschatology”) or reduced to individualistic-existentialistic terms (Bultmann).

While the way in which Beker describes the imminent aspect of Paul’s thought may remind one of other treatments of Paul (cf., e.g., G. E. Ladd, A Theology of the New Testament, or Michael Wolter, Rechtfertigung und zukünftiges Heil [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1978]), the consistency with which Beker interprets Paul in light of all three above-mentioned components of apocalyptic is without parallel among recent interpreters. This interpretative effort climaxes in Part Four in an exegesis of Romans 8 that highlights the place of apocalyptic and its constitutive elements in Paul’s life and thought.

The result is a tour de force that generates a fresh approach to familiar interpretative problems, such as the role of Torah in Christianity (“Paul steers a course midway between a Marcionite and a Jewish Christian interpretation”), the connection between sin and death (“sin is an anthropological reality, whereas death is as well a cosmological reality”), or the relationship between Israel and the Church (including a fine excursus on Jewish-Christian dialogue). Particularly interesting is Beker’s insistence on the cosmic-ontological reality of the resurrection, over against Bultmann (who wrongly fuses it with the cross into a single event) and Troeltsch (“the historicism of Ernst Troeltsch, with its criteria of probability, historical analogy, and causal dependency, cannot be superimposed on Paul”).

Given the scope of Beker’s enterprise, it is inevitable that careful readers will find points of disagreement. But these are mostly of a minor nature, and by and large his thesis is convincingly argued. A more substantial consideration, however, has to do with Beker’s rejection of Ephesians, Colossians, 2 Thessalonians, and the Pastoralas as Pauline. He correctly criticizes Marcion for destroying, in his expurgated edition of Paul, the variety of thought in Paul’s letters. One could ask, though—and this would be especially ironic in light of Beker’s stress on a contextual/contingent approach—whether he has not done the same. At a number of points where Beker plays off these “deutero-Paulines” against the other Pauline letters (cf., e.g., his treatment of the Pastoralas’ view of the Church, pp. 304-305), it appears that contingent factors, given such close attention elsewhere, may have been neglected. If this is the case, the differences between the “deutero-” and “genuine” Paulines may not be as great as Beker suggests (cf., e.g., p. 304, where he criticizes Ephesians 2 for giving the Church an “ontological status” as the “body,” with p. 308, where he notes that a shift from metaphor to ontological reality involving the “body” occurs in 1 Cor 12:27).

In sum, Beker has given us a magnificent treatment of Paul, original in its approach and magisterial in style. Well-acquainted with the secondary literature, he seldom gets bogged down in detailed discussions of other views or exegesis of texts, often being content to give his opinion on an issue and referring the reader to secondary sources for the arguments pro
and con. The bibliography lists only works cited in the book. Thus in the case of authors not mentioned, one cannot tell whether Beker knew certain works but found no opportunity to cite them (e.g., Cranfield), or whether they were overlooked completely (Longenecker, Ladd, Gundry?). The book reads well and has been well-edited (though some will regret the loss of his Dutch accent in the process), and it does not lack for nicely-turned phrases (Paul is not a "passionate fanatic who identifies his ego with the truth"). Of the references checked, only one error was found (p. 206; the reference to Josephus' _Jewish War_ should read 5.449). Finally, it is fitting to find both a deep appreciation and a profound critique of Bultmann's handling of Paul (in his _Theology of the New Testament_) in a book that a discerning reader may well choose to rank alongside that landmark work.

Michael W. Holmes

Princeton, NJ


By the word "power" Holmberg means "an actor's ability to induce or influence another actor to carry out his directives or any other norms he supports" (following sociologist A. Etzioni's definition; p. 9). The book is about the distribution of power in the primitive Church. In the first half of the book Holmberg presents an historical and exegetical study of the relevant data in the NT focusing on Paul. In the second half Holmberg attempts to utilize sociological concepts to analyze the historical reality.

As the author himself points out, the particular contribution of his work lies rather in the second half. Nevertheless, Part One is essential. Here Holmberg paves the way for the sociological analysis by discussing under three chapters the distribution of power (a) between Paul and Jerusalem, (b) within the Pauline region of the Church, and (c) within the local Pauline churches.

Holmberg lays no claim to any major new insights in exegetical and historical study of the NT. His treatment of the NT data is nevertheless rich and informative. Arguments and conclusions are sound, balanced and judicious. The copious footnotes are a mine of scholarly information.

Holmberg accepts only seven epistles of Paul as authentic. He however finds some reliable historical information in Colossians, Ephesians and 2 Thessalonians despite their pseudo-Pauline character. Holmberg admits that if the Pastorals were indeed written by Paul, his picture of intrachurch authority would need revision. Holmberg uses Acts minimally because of its disputed historical reliability. This, however, is to the detriment of his arguments. For example, only by ignoring Acts 11:30 is Holmberg able to argue that Paul's collection for the poor in Jerusalem was less than purely voluntary but was imposed by the Jerusalem apostles on Paul (p. 43).

Holmberg's critical assumptions lead him to rely on 1 and 2 Corinthians heavily. He refers to these two epistles just about as often as the other eleven. This is so despite the author's own warning that the picture gleaned from 1 and 2 Corinthians may not be characteristic of other Pauline churches. As a result of this lopsided use of 1 and 2 Corinthians, Holmberg does not credit Paul much with the rise of leadership in the local churches (p. 188).

The major contribution, as intended by the author, lies in the sociological analysis of the historical data in the second half of the book. For the nonexpert in sociology the author provides a chapter discussing some basic sociological concepts utilized in the analysis. On the whole, a Biblical scholar with little training in sociology would be able to follow Holmberg's discussion.

Holmberg's analysis centers on the renowned sociologist Max Weber's concept of charismatic authority, which Weber himself defines as authority resting "on devotion to the exceptional sanctity, heroism, or exemplary character of an individual person, and of norma-
tive patterns or order revealed or ordained by him” (see p. 137). Holmberg modifies Weber’s understanding in several ways, following a number of sociologists. Particularly significant is Holmberg’s insistence that Weber’s emphasis on the destructive and revolutionary impact of charisma needs to be supplemented by attention to the strong, constructive impulse of charisma to establish a charismatic legitimate society. Charisma actively seeks institutional manifestation. “A charismatic movement should not be interpreted as a kind of rapture or as enthusiastic flight from society. . . . It is an attempt to build the society (church, party) anew, from the ‘root’ ” (p. 146). Thus for Holmberg the institutionalization of charismatic authority, which is different from uninspired routinization, is not a suffocation of charisma. Holmberg consequently imposes no false dichotomy between charisma and institutionalization on the early Church.

A few examples will give the readers a flavor of Holmberg’s sociological analysis. He explains Paul’s insecurity of his own standing in Jerusalem (Rom 15:31) by the fact that Paul’s apostleship had not been clearly and fully institutionalized (p. 197). The charismatic authority of the twelve was higher than Paul’s because they were perceived to be closer to the source of all authority, the Lord himself (p. 202). “The apostle’s letters are thus both an exercise of apostolic authority and at the same time a diffusion of this authority into the local churches. And they can therefore be characterized as a re-institutionalization of the primary institutionalization which took place during the founding period” (p. 186).

Holmberg has made a significant methodological contribution: In constructing a historical picture of the authority in the primitive Church, one must take into consideration sociological dynamics that are often not evident in Paul’s writings, for Paul tended to theologize historical events. Holmberg successfully makes us aware of the trap of idealism that interprets historical phenomena as directly formed by underlying theological structures.

The book sets forth a model of integrative scholarship. On this count it is to be recommended.

David S. Tam

Gordon College, Wenham, MA 01984


The manifest cruciality of Romans for any reconstruction of Paul’s “gospel,” along with its enormous importance for historical and dogmatic theology, has always served to attract numerous and frequently outstanding commentators. The last few years provide a remarkable illustration of this attraction. Four commentaries, each of which can arguably be regarded as among the best available on Romans, have appeared or come out in new editions: Cranfield’s in the new ICC series (1975, 1978); the latest edition of O. Michel’s standard work (1977); H. Schlier’s Römerbrief (1977, 1979); and E. Käsemann’s An die Römer in its fourth and undoubtedly final edition (1979). We in the English-speaking world are particularly indebted to Eerdmans for so quickly providing us with an English translation of Käsemann’s magisterial work.

Käsemann perceives in Romans a clear and careful structure, built upon the theme of justification, which is, he argues, to be regarded as at the same time the gift and the power of God (1:16-17). In 1:18-3:20 the need for justification as a cosmic and not simply an anthropologically-oriented phenomenon is spelled out. The universal dimensions of justification are reasserted in 5:12-21, which forms part of the eschatological freedom theme of chaps. 5-8. Far from being a digression, Käsemann views chaps. 9-11 as an integral part of the letter in which the paradoxical fact of the justification of the ungodly is exposed in its corporate dimensions. In a similar manner the hortatory section (12:1-15:13) is to be seen not as an adjunct to the central theme but as an essential aspect of justification, according to which it “is manifested as the grasping of our lives by Christ’s Lordship” (p. 323). Käsemann discerns in 15:14-33 the conclusion to the epistle, chap. 16 being regarded as (prob-
ably a separate "letter of recommendation" originally addressed to the Ephesian Church.

While Käsemann views Romans as an intensely theological epistle, he is careful to stress that the formulation of this theology did not occur in a vacuum. The questioning of Paul's apostolic credentials in Rome, a situation that Käsemann finds implied in Paul's hesitant pronouncements on this subject in 1:1-15, is an especially important contributory factor to the stance that Paul assumes. The fruitfulness of this insight can be discerned in a number of places where Käsemann attributes seeming contradictions in Paul's discussion to the need of polemics. A better perspective on Käsemann's Romans can be attained through a brief resume of his exposition of chaps. 5-8.

In keeping with most modern commentators, Käsemann views chap. 5 as the beginning of a section that continues through chap. 8. The topic of this section Käsemann perceives to be the eschatological freedom entailed by the life of justification: freedom from death (5), from sin (6) and from the law, with its correlate, life in the Spirit (7-8). The freedom from death proclaimed in 5:1-11 is grounded in the universal situation summed up in the respective characters of Adam and Christ. As "the bearers of destiny for the world determined by them" (p. 146), these two figures take on representative significance.

Since justification is not a temporal event but involves the continual projection of resurrection power into the world, "sanctification" cannot be sundered from justification—the former is simply an aspect of the latter. Thus Paul exhorts the Romans to a constant appropriation of this eschatological saving act, in which freedom from the power of sin is made available. Baptism, "a projection of the change of aeons into our personal existence" (p. 163), inaugurates this pilgrimage of freedom, which is also, however, a situation of slavish obedience to the Kyrios who has made us his (6:12-23). Käsemann insightfully appeals to the demand of the first commandment to explain this paradoxical situation: As total, the commandment means bondage; as exclusive, it brings freedom.

In 7:1, Käsemann argues, Paul makes a fresh start. The theme of chaps. 7-8, which are to be regarded as a unity, is to be found in 7:6: The eschatological gift of the Spirit means freedom from the law. This "release" from the law is not to be watered down: It is total, and any slipping back to a consideration of the law jeopardizes the free gift of justification. As a development of this fundamental dictum, 7:7-24 portrays the situation of man in relation to the law. Käsemann assumes virtually without argument the position, almost universal in Germany since Kümmel's work, that these verses, under the guise of a rhetorical "I," depict the pre-Christian life from a Christian perspective. In vv 7-13 Paul utilizes the history of Adam as a paradigm of the inevitable perversion of the law that accompanies any and every attempt to live by it. The basic situation of man without Christ, summed up in the heading "carnal, sold under sin" in v 14b, is developed in vv 15-24. In the first section (vv 15-20), the destiny of the pious Jew who seeks to "help himself" is portrayed, again with allusions to the Adamic history. The resultant despair of all who follow Adam's way is poignantly described in vv 21-24. So convinced of this interpretation is Käsemann that three critical exegetical issues are not satisfactorily resolved. First, Käsemann admits that the language of vv 22-23 can be properly used only of the redeemed, but he fails to give a convincing explanation for its application to the unredeemed here. Second, v 25 (along with 8:1), despite the acknowledgment that historical and textual evidence is lacking, is considered to be a gloss. Third, while Käsemann denies any significance to the shift in tense at v 14, he never provides any reason for it. Those not persuaded of the "unregenerate" view of these verses will probably remain unpersuaded by this exposition. On the other hand, Käsemann does a fine job in discussing the theological perspective that results from the view he upholds.

Inasmuch as Käsemann is inclined to regard 8:1 as a later addition, he is able to find a close and clear transition from the despair of man under the law in chap. 7 to the freedom of the one set free by "the law of the spirit of life" in chap. 8. Again, it is emphatically asserted that there can be no compromise or via media between these two "laws." With respect to the remainder of the chapter, little needs to be said other than that Käsemann continues to maintain the (in my opinion untenable) hypothesis that glossolalia is in view in vv 26-27.

One of the most noteworthy aspects of this commentary is Käsemann's unabashedly
"theological" approach to Romans. Without neglecting syntax and criticism, Käsemann consistently sets Paul’s words in the larger context of the apostle’s theology. Worth quoting is the assertion made in the course of exegeting 8:18 ff.: “Paul has more to say to us than the theological guild is largely prepared to accept even when he makes use of ancient mythol- ogy” (p. 235). Whence demythologizing? That Käsemann’s Romans is a gold mine for the serious student of Paul’s greatest epistle is unquestionable. But, in what could be the book’s major drawback, one needs all one’s mining equipment to unearth the gold. So concise is Käsemann that important grammatical points can be easily missed. Even the careful reader will at times be left wondering: “Just what did he mean by that?” In addition to this is the difficulty of understanding Käsemann’s theological discussion without some exposure to Bultmannian and post-Bultmannian language and theology. Therefore the commentary will be of most value to the technical scholar—but its value at that level is immense.

Douglas J. Moo

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL


The rector of St. Helen’s Church, Bishopsgate in London, writes in The Bible Speaks Today series edited by J. A. Motyer and John R. W. Stott. His aim is not a “commentary” but an accurate, readable exposition keyed to practical life. He achieves this in a fresh style akin to Stott’s in the series (Only One Way, on Galatians; God’s New Society, on Ephesians; Guard the Gospel, on 2 Timothy; and Christian Counter-Culture, The Message of the Sermon on the Mount). For Lucas, Colossians was a beacon to “a new loyalty to evangelical Christianity” (p. 25).

Lucas reflects awareness of some problems and draws from Lightfoot, E. Lohse and others. He doubts M. D. Hooker’s thesis that Colossians lacks evidence of false teachers opposing the faith, particularly Christology (cf. “Were There False Teachers in Colossae?”, Christ and Spirit in the New Testament: Studies in Honour of C. F. D. Moule, ed. B. Lindars and S. S. Smalley [Cambridge University Press, 1973]). Hooker argues that converts were tempted to succumb to the beliefs and conduct of their pagan and Jewish neighbors. Lucas sees evidence as firm enough that the converts heard erroneous preaching (2:4), a “philosophy” not after Christ (2:8). An incipient gnosticicism inside the churches was luring some leaders away from Christ rightly understood.

We may sample other concepts of the author. In 1:27, he defends well the idea “Christ in you,” not “among you.” In 2:6-7, foundations do not exist only for their own sake but to be built upon, as all growth in Christian life “must be entirely consistent with its beginnings.” “Received Christ” means not only that they received the account of Christ’s death for sins and resurrection (1 Cor 15:1-3) but Christ into their hearts to submit to him and experience his presence (p. 88). It “turns the gospel upside down” when we are “half hiding the authoritative demands of the Lord in our eagerness to commend the attractive offers of the Saviour. Jesus can be our Saviour only because He is Lord” (p. 89). That needs practical clarification, given the problems young Christians—indeed, all Christians—have sometimes not acting as if he is Lord. Lucas can be lucid on background (cf. the Roman triumphal procession, 2:15) and on the motives of those who lead others to OT shadows rather than the substance in Christ (2:16, 17). At 3:18 he argues that wives’ submission to their husbands harmonizes with Gal 3:28. Equality can co-exist with submission as Son and Father are equal yet the Son is submissive to the Father.

Brevity on some problems is disappointing, as on a crucial text: 1:15. Lucas might explain Biblical usage of words for “firstborn” to some degree. Also, since in v 18 Christ as “firstborn from the dead” had been one among the dead, Lucas might have shown why “firstborn of all creation” does not similarly mean he was one among the created. Lucas rightly argues that vv 16-17 run diametrically against Christ being “first among created be-
ings” (p. 50). He might nail down how the traditional Christian view of v 15 is consistent also with v 18 (contra so-called “Jehovah’s Witnesses”). The Greek in v 15 differs from that in v 18.

The introduction to Philemon is good on slavery, yet one is astonished to find less than a page verse by verse. Little is said about Paul’s release or his tactful arguments to encourage Philemon's forgiveness of Onesimus.

Positive aspects far outweigh negative ones. The main message of fullness and freedom beams brightly in this exposition.

James E. Rosscup
Talbot Theological Seminary, La Mirada, CA


The writings of F. F. Bruce are consistently characterized by breadth of learning, freshness of approach and clarity of expression. This slim volume is no exception. Here evangelicalism’s foremost NT scholar offers us a series of studies of the major leaders of early non-Pauline Christianity that exhibit the blend of erudition, originality and lucidity that we have come to expect in his work.

Each of the four chapters in the book consists of an historical study of one of the important figures in the primitive Church, his associates, and his influence. The primary sources drawn upon are the writings of Paul and the Acts of the Apostles (in that order). The remaining NT books and other early Christian literature are also utilized, but to a lesser extent.

Appearing so soon after Bruce’s magnum opus, Paul: Apostle of the Heart Set Free (Eerdmans, 1977), this volume invites comparison with it. It should be recognized, however, that the two works are very different in character. In contrast with the earlier study of Paul, this book does not attempt to discuss the contents of the canonical epistles attributed to the men under study. The interest is more specifically historical, as Bruce sets out to explore what may be known about Peter, Stephen, James and John, and their impact on emerging Christianity.

In “Charting New Directions for New Testament Studies” (Christianity Today, October 10, 1980, p. 20), Bruce wrote: “If a synthesis of ‘New Testament theology’ is to be attained, it can only come after proper justice has been done to the manifold diversity.” Certainly he himself cannot be criticized for failing to do justice to the diversity within the NT. At his hands the early Christian leaders emerge as men with significantly different perceptions and emphases. Peter is represented as a vigorous exponent of Christian liberty who was also deeply sensitive to the problems faced by Jewish Christians and who was therefore able to make a significant contribution to the unity of the Church. Stephen is described as a Hellenist who went beyond the apostles in his total repudiation of the temple cult, and whose influence may be detected in early Alexandrian Christianity (e.g., the Letter of Barnabas). James, the brother of Jesus, is portrayed as occupying an increasingly dominant role in the Jerusalem Church, while it became progressively more conservative in the first three decades of its existence. The discussion of John differs from the rest in being limited to a study of his relationship with Ephesus. The existence of a Johannine circle or school is affirmed, and favorable consideration is given to the view that there were two Johns (John the apostle and John the elder) at Ephesus.

All who are interested in the development of primitive Christianity, and the forces that shaped it, will find this book to be valuable. Bruce’s historical judgment is generally sound, and his exegetical insights are invariably stimulating. One caveat should be registered, however, and that concerns the scope of the studies. Because they are primarily historical, they are highly selective and leave many questions unanswered. Since it clearly was not the author’s intention to provide a comprehensive exposition of the theologies of the men he
discusses, he can hardly be faulted for not doing so. Nevertheless the reader should recognize that he will not find a thorough treatment of Peter, Stephen, James, and John’s understanding of the gospel here. It is to be hoped that Bruce’s retirement will continue to be fruitful and that we will receive further studies of non-Pauline Christianity from his pen.

Sydney H. T. Page
North American Baptist College, Edmonton, Alberta


Anyone familiar with the writings of Meredith G. Kline has probably come to expect clarity and precision in expression, penetrating analysis of pertinent viewpoints, meticulous documentation, complete familiarity with ancient Near Eastern religious laws and customs, and a careful use of the Biblical languages, all brought to focus in elucidating some scriptural text or idea. Images of the Spirit adequately maintains this tradition. Three of the four chapters of this volume originally appeared in WTJ in 1977-78.

Images of the Spirit draws largely on the disciplines in which Kline specializes. He challenges the noncorporeal views of the imago Dei as inadequate and presents some rich typology and scriptural analysis in an effort to portray a threefold “glory image” that corresponds functionally, ethically and formally with the “archetypal Glory” (p. 31). Man’s functional glory-likeness is that of exercising dominion and official authority. The ethical glory reflects the holiness, truth and righteousness of God, while the formal-physical glory-likeness is man’s eschatological bodily reflection of the theophanic and incarnate Glory (p. 61).

Key to understanding these aspects of the image of God imparted to man is Kline’s concept that the physical theophanic Glory of the Holy Spirit, who hovered over the original earth creation in Gen 1:2, served as the “divine model” for man’s creation. In expounding these themes, Kline develops a system of typology where tabernacle, temple, priest and prophet are all modeled after the archetypal form of the Glory-Spirit, which is often coupled with the divine presence therein of the Son of God as well. Trains of thought are followed which are at once interesting, stimulating and quite original. With all this, however, there may be cause for concern in some areas. Any form of typology must exercise care to avoid (1) forcing types based on possibly coincidental identifications, (2) drawing unwarranted conclusions, (3) reading one’s own deductions into certain texts, (4) reasoning in a circle, and (5) flight into the sometimes nebulous realm of symbolism.

In seeking to establish his crucial argument on the aspects of the image of God found in the prophet model, Kline takes the visions that Isaiah and Ezekiel had of being in heaven in the presence of God and a divine council as completely normative and as required of all prophets. The same is true of the rather unique experience of Moses, the paradigm prophet. Their experience is said to be a “prophecy” of the “eschatological destiny of mankind recreated in God’s image” (p. 63). If this is true, many of us have been missing a lot of the Scriptures’ intended meaning.

Another novel idea is that Gen 1:2 is a pre-incarnation theophany of the Son who “proceeded forth from the Spirit of God” (pp. 16-17), in contrast to the post-ascension procession of the Spirit from the Father and the Son as per John 14:26 and 15:26. Much that follows page 19 is based on seeing Gen 1:2 as depicting the Spirit overarching the creation “as divine witness to the Covenant of Creation” (pp. 55-56). This is apparently read back into the text after a contemplation of Gen 9:12 ff. and Rev 10:1 ff. and then used as a paradigm for the crux of the book’s interpretation regarding replication of the visible Glory-Spirit in tabernacle, priestly investiture, and so on (p. 21).

It may be stretching the typological point to make Paul’s list of the Christian’s armor (Ephesians 6) picture the putting on of priestly garments. One can only surmise what the
source of information was for the claim that the Glory-cloud was positioned on a mountain in Eden from which sprang the river of Paradise (p. 42). The words “Let us make man in our image” are said, surprisingly, to identify angels “as sharing in the image-likeness to God” (p. 27). Again, “the sons of God” are said to be earthly “tyrant kings” (Genesis 6, p. 28), while the only other time the identical phrase is used with the article in the OT they are said to be members of the heavenly council (Job 1 and 2, p. 27). Attention is drawn to the symbol of stars used for the “angels” of the churches in Rev 1:20, but their identity is not disclosed.

Dispensational pretribulationists will dispute Kline’s identification of the lampstands in Revelation 11 with the Church. This involves a substitution of symbolical, typological interpretation for normal, literal, hermeneutical principles and selectively ignores details not in accord with the symbolic understanding, such as the forty-two months (v 2), also called 1260 days (v 3), and the death of the two witnesses (is the Church eventually to be decimated?).

One is left to wonder what view Kline holds on the days of creation. He states: “This identity in functional accomplishment of days one and four continues to be an unanswered demonstration of the nonsequential topical arrangement of the data in the creation account” (p. 111). Perhaps there is a studied ambiguity in Kline’s references to the creative week as “the age of creation” (p. 112) and “the seven panelled day of Creation” (p. 113).

Very excellent is Kline’s section on the Messenger of Jehovah, whom he correctly identifies as Christ. The theophany of Exod 33:18 (“show me thy glory”) on through 34:9 is convincingly said to be a pre-incarnate appearance of Christ connected with the Glory-cloud. Another great section on Gen 3:8 interprets Jehovah God coming as Spirit (the Glory-cloud) in the day (speaking of the Day of the Lord), accompanied by the loud and terrifying sounds connected with the eschatological event. This view is at once both unique and satisfying, well exegeted and carefully presented. The volume concludes by demonstrating the Glory-ensign of Isaiah 59, 66 and elsewhere to be Christ in the Glory-cloud, the parousia-Glory of Matt 24:30.

Thus there is much in Images of the Spirit that will heartily commend itself to the diligent reader. Every theologian, pastor, and Bible teacher who is wrestling with the concept of the image of God should read this book. The fresh insights Kline gives and the typological connections he stresses will add to one’s understanding and grasp of a large part of the symbolism found in the tabernacle, priest and prophet aspects centered in the imago Dei.

James A. Borland

Liberty Baptist Seminary, Lynchburg, VA


“All biblical faith finds its source in the divine word of promise and ends in a prayer for the coming of the Lord and his kingdom” (p. 1). So begins Isaac Rottenberg’s engaging and stimulating, popular but profound, treatment of kingdom theology. The kingdom of God, he argues, is the central theme of the Bible. It is the theme that God the sovereign Creator is with us in the power of the Spirit through Christ, the concrete personal expression of his love, recreating the world. The Bible is eschatological from start to finish, and its characters were transformed in their present by their vision of God’s future, as the example of Abraham illustrates. Indeed, true Biblical faith is cosmically eschatological in focus and perspective. It is trust in the God of promise to bring all things in the universe into subjection to himself through the Lord Christ by the power of the Spirit. It is not merely the belief in and assurance that he is Lord of our lives. Rather, true faith is the assurance that God himself will establish his kingdom universally. Jesus’ belief in the promise and presence of the kingdom formed the redemptive context of his ministry and defined the gospel he preached.
Kingdom language draws attention to the reign of the sovereign Creator over his earthly realm. "In a very tentative and fragmentary way" God's kingdom "takes shape in human structures" (p. 14), though it does not arise from this world. But it is related to this world, for this is the world that is the object of God's saving recreative work. Here he will establish his kingdom through our proclamation of the gospel and the accompanying power of his Spirit to transform lives so that righteousness, peace and joy result (cf. Rom 14:17). Yet such participation in the life of God's kingdom costs us the loss of self-centered lives for kingdom-centered ones. Conversion without a subsequent life of obedience, Christ as Savior without Christ as Lord, is unknown in the NT but too well known in modern evangelicalism, Rottenberg rightly laments. Those who truly enter the kingdom now by faith alone must live the righteous lives of disciples in order to inherit it in the future. The grace of life in the kingdom entails the obligation of obedience to its king. This is the Biblical dynamic governing the Christian life. Because the kingdom is the power of the new age, kingdom members are transformed ethically, just as the whole world will be transformed in the future when God makes all things new. This kingdom work of recreation is performed by God the Spirit, for the kingdom of God is "righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit" (Rom 14:17).

Because he is Immanuel, the God who acts in history to fulfill his sovereign plans and covenant promises, his coming in action is correlative with the coming of the kingdom and vice versa. Because he controls the future and because his plans and promises are not yet completely fulfilled, his kingdom is not yet complete. Therefore his coming is a call to participate in and to strive for the future manifestation of that kingdom. Hence Biblical faith has a futuristic quality to it. By faith we now experience the reality of the coming kingdom and hence participate in God's actions in history. We are "pilgrims of the future." When faith loses its future orientation to God's kingdom-building activity, the Church loses its vision of and grasp on history and the activity of God in the world. It loses its identity and birthright.

God's decisive acts that inaugurated the kingdom were the atonement and resurrection of Christ. For on the cross God in Christ confronted Satan, death and sin—his and mankind's enemies—and became a perfect sin-offering that brings forgiveness and new life, thereby defeating the enemies. Thus the cross is the perfect and supreme manifestation of God's love and righteousness, "The new order of the kingdom finds its ground and being in the love and justice of God" (p. 34). But the cross without the resurrection is powerless to save. For by virtue of his resurrection, Christ was designated Son of God in power by the Holy Spirit (Rom 1:4) and became the firstfruits of the new humanity (1 Cor 15:20) which will be the new world of God's kingdom. The personal dimension of the crucifixion and the resurrection have a cosmic context: God's universal kingdom-building activity. Through the resurrected and ascended Christ, God by the power of the Spirit is reconciling the world to himself, overcoming the principalities and powers, establishing his kingdom. At his parousia the present "hidden phase" of the kingdom will give way to its universal revelation as the exalted glorified Lord rules over all.

The present hidden form of the kingdom will give way to its full revelation at the coming of Christ. The work begun at the D-Day of the cross and resurrection will be completed at the V-Day of Christ's parousia. Hence the believer, living between the resurrection and parousia, experiences the tension of the "already/not-yetness" of God's kingdom-building activity. Our experience of salvation and hope is a function of the form of the kingdom. "Through the manifestation of the power of the new age in our midst we experience the future. Thus a foundation is given to our hope, while the foretaste of the future in turn intensifies our longing for the full manifestation of the new heavens and new earth" (pp. 43-44). The transcendent Creator is immanent in the world to recreate it. Though the kingdom is present we still live in hope on the basis of God's promise to manifest it fully on earth. Maintaining the balance of the already/not-yetness of the kingdom in our theology is the key to preventing triumphalism on the one hand and escapism on the other, an "uncritical world acceptance" or a "spiritualizing world flight" (p. 48).
The NT categories of "signs," "guarantee" and "firstfruits" can help us define the form the kingdom takes in the world in the present. Each of these terms refers to the eschatological work of the Holy Spirit who works righteousness, peace, joy, assurance and hope in the heart of the believer. And all godly changes the gospel brings about in the world can be seen as signs of the kingdom, though not the kingdom itself. Though the present form of the kingdom does not slowly evolve into its future form, the fruit born by members of the present form of the kingdom will be brought into its future phase.

In the history of the Church, three false equations involving the kingdom should be examined in order to prevent us from making the same mistakes. First, the kingdom has been ecclesiasticized. Since the medieval period, the kingdom and the Church have often been identified, especially in the Roman Catholic tradition. But the Church must be interpreted in terms of the kingdom, since the Church as an eschatological community exists for its sake. The signs of the new age are particularly but not exclusively manifest in the Church. The Spirit is also at work in the world through the proclamation of the gospel. Second, the kingdom has been secularized. It has been identified with this world. But though the kingdom, the sphere of God's sovereign redemptive grace, is in this world and for this world, it is not of this world. The "new world of God's tomorrow" operates in this world through the transforming power of the Holy Spirit but is not identical with it. Because of this, we can enjoy a "qualified this-worldliness" (p. 71), for it is in faith, hope and love that we affirm the good earth and the destiny of all things in the kingdom of God (p. 71). But we must guard against turning a qualified this-worldliness into an uncritical world acceptance. Third, the kingdom has been humanized. It has been identified with man's self or quest for self-realization, self-identity and authentic existence. This is the existentialization of the kingdom. But kingdom theology does call for an inward journey, the development of the inner life. Spirituality includes but should not be reduced to the inner life. Mysticism and eschatology are complementary, not contrary Biblical concepts. "A fascination with selfhood that is combined with an indifference to neighborhood is clearly a sign of disobedience to the mandate of the gospel" (p. 83).

It is in the context of the kingdom that Christian mission takes place. Both the Church and the world must be understood from the perspective of the future of the Lord. "The kingdom sets the agenda; the vision and the values that inspire the church's ministry find their source in the promise of the new heaven and the new earth" (p. 87). Rottenberg then goes on to discuss eschatological and mission, proclaiming the kingdom, serving the kingdom, suffering for the kingdom and praying for the kingdom.

This is an important book. It offers a remarkably well-balanced treatment of one of the most profound Biblical themes: the kingdom of God. And it does so in a very practical way. Rottenberg is no armchair theologian. Throughout the book he applies kingdom theology to various tendencies, topics and episodes in the history of the Church. This is the kind of book that offers a helpful and stimulating oversight of a crucial doctrine, shows its relation to the practical life of the Church and to the individual, and is clear, succinct, and simple without being simplistic.

John J. Hughes


A continuing concern for many Calvinists has been to integrate the universal call of the gospel with the idea of particular atonement: Is it permissible to tell a particular individual that Christ died for him without some prior evidence of faith? This book, written by a pastor in the Christian Reformed Church, reflects the continuing discussion of these issues in Reformed circles.

Author Punt stands firmly in the Calvinist tradition. He endorses the doctrine of particular redemption. He feels, however, that Reformed theology has failed to do justice to the universalistic texts of Scripture. Too often Calvinists have adopted "the protectionist atti-
tude which never permits Scripture to declare ‘all persons are saved’” (p. 33). But the Calvinists are not alone to be faulted: Lutherans and Arminians, while affirming the universal extension of the “all,” “every” and “world” texts, fail to see that these “speak of an actual salvation and not merely of a potential or provisional salvation” (p. 33). Having structured the problem in this fashion, will the author then opt for absolute universalism? Punt makes it clear that he does not, and thus he attempts to formulate a fresh approach that he calls “biblical universalism.”

Biblical universalism argues that historic, mainstream Christianity has approached Scripture with a faulty assumption—namely, that “all persons are outside of Christ except those who the Bible declares will be saved” (p. 4). Punt holds that it would be more appropriate to say that “all persons are elect in Christ except those who the Bible declares will be lost” (p. 4). Those alone will be lost who refuse to submit to God’s will as it has been revealed in the gospel. By stating the case more positively we are in a better position, the author believes, to appreciate the universalist accents of the Word of God. Thus texts like Rom 5:18—“through the obedience of the One there resulted justification of life to all men”—are to be understood as generalized statements indicating the comprehensive scope of Christ’s work. The immediate context of these verses places no limitation on the extent of the atonement. Such texts, however, do not teach absolute universalism because the larger context of Scripture shows that there are exceptions to the “all” who benefit from the atonement. By this approach Punt hopes to avoid the artificiality in exegesis that he thinks has attended particularly the Reformed treatment of the universalist passages.

A question that arises for the reader of this book is whether Punt is really saying anything very different from what earlier Reformed exeges have said regarding the extent of the atonement and related issues. By admitting that the universalist texts do not teach an absolute universalism he does little to distinguish himself from others in his own theological tradition. Since he accepts the doctrine of particular redemption, he still faces the problems of reconciling the universal call of the gospel with the notion that Christ’s work is intended only for the elect. The traditional Calvinist wrestles with the question of whether it is appropriate to tell (possibly) nonelect individuals that Christ died for them. Punt’s restatement of the issues, it appears to me, contributes no new answer to that question, since he must admit that not all are included in the scope of Christ’s work. While the formula “all are elect in Christ except...” may be helpful psychologically in enabling the author to proclaim the gospel with greater freedom and conviction—his intense evangelistic concern on this point is apparent and commendable—it seems to provide no help from a theological perspective.

Beyond this question there is much that is stimulating and useful, especially as the author traces the implications of his thesis. In arguing that only those are ultimately lost who persistently and willfully refuse the gospel, Punt finds a doctrinal basis for affirming the salvation of the mentally deficient and all those who die in infancy. From the same “all are elect...” perspective he suggests that the first task of the evangelist is to “proclaim release to the captives.” “To say that our first purpose in bringing the Word is to make the hearers tremble before the wrath of God is sub-Christian” (p. 134). This is to work again from the faulty assumption that “all are lost...” Punt further argues that the premise of Biblical universalism can lead us to a more positive view of our fellow man. Rather than view the masses of humanity as “strangers” or “outsiders,” we may regard them as elect in Christ. “What a difference it makes to view others in connection with Jesus Christ!... Biblical universalism puts lenses on our eyes so that we treat our fellow human beings as those for whom Christ died” (p. 143).

My fundamental problem with this book is whether the assumption that “all are elect in Christ,” as Punt wishes to understand the phrase, is really a Biblical assumption, or whether the traditional Christian understanding that “all are lost except those who trust in Christ” does not more accurately reflect Biblical teaching. I am inclined to think that the weight rests with the latter case. For example, when Paul designates Christians as those who were “by nature children of wrath” (Eph 2:3), and when he speaks of the Gentiles as
“excluded from the life of God” (4:18), is he not implying that sinners are to be regarded as lost prior to repentance and faith? Admittedly the same epistle gives witness to a divine perspective in which believers are seen to have been eternally elect in Christ (1:4). This, however, does not seem to be the general approach of the Biblical writers to the unconverted.

The practical implication of the author’s position is that the weight of the discussion shifts toward the objective aspects of the atonement in such a way that the doctrines of subjective appropriation (faith, repentance, and so on) can easily be underplayed. Thus it is interesting that Punt devotes an entire chapter to “What Faith Cannot Do.” In it he states that “faith is not a factor in our being established in a state of grace” (p. 89). Admittedly this could be simply the outgrowth of his particular brand of Calvinism. On the other hand, it could be a direct corollary to his basic presupposition.

This book constitutes a fresh challenge to evangelical Christians to reflect on the meaning of the central facts of Christianity. If Punt’s formulation does not entirely satisfy us, we may at least appreciate his fresh and stimulating treatment.

David G. Dunbar
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL


The title is unfortunate. I would guess that some who buy this book will do so in the hope of learning how to find God’s will for life. The subtitle is much more helpful. The key word is “perspectives.” The book is not intended to be a complete study of the early third-century African theologian. It is rather an argument for a particular perspective on Tertullian.

Bray believes that Tertullian has been misunderstood by the Church since about A.D. 400. In order to make his case, Bray devotes the first chapter to summarizing the Church’s understanding of Tertullian and in the process to setting his own study into context. Jerome asserted that Tertullian joined the Montanist sect about ten or fifteen years after he converted to the Christian faith. Augustine, who shared this perspective on Tertullian, approved of much of Tertullian’s theology but noted with disapproval the likeness of certain aspects of his thought to that of the Donatists. Subsequently, the assumption that Tertullian converted in mid-career to Montanism has stood as the unquestioned foundation for the academic study of Tertullian. Modern studies of Tertullian have taken various tack but have presupposed the truth of Jerome’s allegations. What is needed, Bray suggests, is a new and careful reading of the extant writings of Tertullian.

Chapter two is devoted for the most part to “the man and his times.” It includes helpful information on the pagan backgrounds, the second-century Church, and the role of martyrs in that Church. The chapter ends, however, with an evaluation of the traditional interpretation of Tertullian. Bray concludes that the tradition is in error. The core of Tertullian’s thought is not a defense of Montanism. The core value in his thought is the doctrine of sanctification. Thus, according to Bray, Tertullian may have found much in the Montanist movement that he liked, but there is no clear evidence in the literature that Tertullian did in fact convert to Montanism.

Chapters three to five are devoted to defending this novel interpretation of Tertullian. Chapter three examines Tertullian’s understanding of holiness, chap. four studies how an individual acquires holiness, and chap. five looks at matrimony as a test case for understanding Tertullian. Bray concludes that Tertullian’s deeply ascetic personality colored his whole theology. The theologian understood—intellectually—that the Christian doctrine of creation implies that the created order is good and is to be affirmed. But his asceticism was in the end rooted more deeply in his soul. And this fact provides a better explanation of his
writings and his strongly-held opinions on chastity than does a supposed conversion to
Montanism.

The book is certainly well researched and shows a thorough understanding of Tertullian
scholarship, and future study of Tertullian will have to take this study into consideration.
Bray's work should be added to theological libraries and will be of interest to those who

teach history of doctrine.

William W. Wells
Wheaton College Graduate School, Wheaton, IL


This is not a book on the doctrine of God (his attributes, the Trinity, and so on) but
about God as Creator, the nature of his creation, and how we should live if we really believe
in God the Creator. Houston's basic thesis is that faith in the Creator is needed if man is to
have a proper understanding of himself and his place in this world. Man's broken "cove-

nant relationship with the Creator" results in the "dissolution of natural bonds within fam-
ily, society and environment" (p. 29).

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

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

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

Houston's emphasis on the Word is prominent in much of the book. Not just God's crea-
tion but God's providence is also by the Word (p. 110), and through the incarnation of that
Word "the divine meaning and purpose behind creation is now revealed"; Christ is "the
centre, the rationale, and the clue of all reality" (pp. 128, 135). The emphasis of course is
Biblically sound, but Houston sometimes appears to lead it on to a semi-Barthian stance
whereby the doctrine of creation becomes dependent on Christology. Not only does he deny
any valid arguments for God's existence (p. 57), but he seems to underrate the intelligibility
and witness value of creation as general revelation apart from the saving grace of Christ
(see, e.g., pp. 55, 98-99, 155). Some of Houston's comments in the area of historical theology
are unfortunate, such as his assertion that Augustine "excluded philosophy, that is, Greek
thought, from Christian theology," and ignored the fall "to dwell almost entirely upon re-
demption" (p. 168). Also Houston shows a traditional Protestant reaction to Thomas Aquinas’ nature-and-grace scheme, seeing it as paving the way for the secularization of science (pp. 168-169). Houston’s indictment of modern man’s exaltation of technology, resulting in “technocracy,” is timely (pp. 40, 43, 161-162, 179), though sometimes it is overdone (e.g., “the evolution of the machine results in the devolution of man,” p. 97). Just once I would like to see an evangelical theologian extol some of the benefits of modern technology.

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

David W. Diehl

The King’s College, Briarcliff Manor, NY


This book is a translation from the German original, a volume in the Biblical Encounter Series. Gerstenberger is an OT scholar currently teaching in the Church Seminary in Sao Leopoldo, Brazil, while Schrage is professor of NT in Bonn, Germany. The translator is professor of historical theology at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary in Wake Forest, North Carolina. There is much here that is profound and deeply analytical. It is not a collection of easy answers to deep and significant questions. The entire realm of suffering is dealt with, including that of outcasts (from the viewpoint of society), animals and other levels of life. The key to the authors’ interpretation of OT teaching is that God “is not far removed from the arena of suffering, but is very close at hand, and that he is not there as a spectator, but as one who is affected, as one who suffers” (p. 135). The conclusions of the writers must be carefully evaluated in the light of a full-orbed Biblical orthodoxy that also does not and cannot opt for easy answers about suffering.

Particularly open to question is the total framework of interpretation or presupposition-al stance of both authors. In dealing with the OT they view the documents as the product of theologians who were functioning, so to speak, as “shapers” of the data, and not as those individuals who spoke and wrote the Word of God. Thus we read that the authors of the various books, as theologians, control the evidence and “make Yahweh unapproachable and unreachable” yet “still let him be present in the theater of human history” (p. 99). Assuredly there is allowance in orthodoxy for the full balance of human authorship in the production of the canonical documents, but this allowance functions within the balance of God’s revelatory activity. The authors of this work give too much place to the shaping of the data by the human author, and there is little or no emphasis on the revelation of God, truth from God, or the fact that God has revealed himself in sacred Scripture.

The NT data also is viewed as almost completely subject to the theological perspective of the individual authors and not to a balancing and pervading concept of revelation from God. The authors apparently reject the historicity of NT accounts of healing, for example, as they state: “It is obvious that we cannot adopt the demonological or ‘medicinal’ views of the New Testament accounts of healing. But this does not at all mean the devaluation of the real message of these narratives, that is, the battle against suffering” (p. 138). The authors of the various gospel narratives are viewed as ones who veritably structure the evidence, reading into the suffering of Jesus the theological framework of the particular writer.
This hermeneutic allows the authors to suggest that each gospel writer controls the information and changes the body of data to suit the purpose for writing. They conclude, for example, that the writer of the gospel of John, dominated by a Christology of glory, can simply put into the mouth of Jesus the last word, "It is finished," rather than the citation as given from Luke. Instead of grounding their work on the assumption that there can be a meaningful harmonization of the gospel data, the authors conclude that each gospel writer manipulates information to suit his purpose. Thus in their search for answers to the dilemma of suffering they stop short of granting full integrity to the very Biblical documents which themselves supply the ground of response to this question.

The suffering of Jesus receives detailed treatment. The conviction of the authors at this point is that a "suffering and dying messiah was not prefigured in the Old Testament and Judaism in any way" (p. 171). This position is open to question. R. T. France notes that "in Palestinian Judaism, on the other hand, a persistent messianic exegesis exists side by side with an embarrassment at the idea of a suffering Messiah. . . . The Rabbis generally preferred rather to ignore the Servant-idea than to interpret it as other than messianic. The evidence, therefore, suggests that in Palestinian Judaism of the time of Christ and afterward a messianic exegesis of the Servant was so firmly established that even the demands of the anti-Christian polemic could not unseat it" (France, "Servant of the Lord," Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible, 5. 361).

This review is not intended as a glib "put-down," for the reviewer is keenly aware of the serious task faced by these authors. Some of the conclusions found in the book are very helpful, if they are placed on a solid foundation of confidence in Scripture and open acceptance of its authority. Thus, for example, readers are urged to draw sustaining strength from God in suffering. It is stated that "when those who suffer know that they are suffering in fellowship with Christ (2 Cor. 1:5; 1 Pet. 4:13), that nothing is able to separate them from the love that has been made manifest in Jesus Christ (Rom. 8:35 ff.), and that 'the very hairs of their heads are numbered' (Matt. 10:30), the suffering has taken on a new visage" (p. 242).

Frederic R. Howe

Dallas Theological Seminary


While this book stands as a splendid specimen of modern critical research, it is unfortunately doomed to survive as a museum piece representing a nearly extinct species of scholarly endeavors.

The author, a professor of NT at Luther-Northwestern Seminaries in St. Paul, surveys the synoptic materials that consist of pericopes recounting verbal exchanges between Jesus and his adversaries on critical issues. Those issues arise because of some action by Jesus or his disciples that is unacceptable to his adversaries, or because someone asks a question that provokes conflict. The author identifies eighteen conflict stories in the synoptic tradition.

The author notes that there is only one significant work devoted to conflict stories, that of Martin Albertz, which appeared in German over fifty years ago. Other scholars, however, have also dealt with such stories: Bultmann under the heading "apopthegms," Dibelius as "paradigms," and V. Taylor as "pronouncement stories." With the latter the author agrees that their origin is not to be found in Jewish or Hellenistic analogs but in the life-situation of the Church at various stages of their formation. "They are presented in a form composed by early Christian storytellers specifically for the needs of the newly developing Christian movement" (p. 39).

The more primitive stories, designated as "unitary," were composed in a Palestinian milieu for apologetic purposes. They offered a justification for beliefs and practices to the primitive congregations in response to Jewish criticism. "They are the result of the church
working out its own patterns of beliefs and practices by drawing upon reminiscences of Jesus, and formulating stories upon them in which the Master is set in bold and victorious relief against his adversaries" (p. 88).

Conflict stories classified as "non-unitary" were artificially constructed of independent sayings, questions and narrative material. Although they did not arise out of a common life-situation, they generally served a catechetical function as teaching devices for churches of the Diaspora.

An important contribution of the author is his claim that the conflict stories represent a new form of composition created by the early Church. Neither the unitary type nor the composite conflict stories conform to existing patterns of rabbinic disputations or of Greek antecedents. The author has also made a signal contribution to this area of NT research by arranging the conflict stories in terms of the redactional functions they served in the gospel-writing process.

The major flaw in Hultgren's work derives from his unquestioning acceptance of the discipline of form criticism as a dogmatic explanation of the origin of the gospel material by locating its origin solely in a Sitz im Leben Kirche and removing it almost totally from the Sitz im Leben Jesu. Form criticism gains credibility when it is used as a working hypothesis for classifying gospel material and for tracing the history of such material through the stages of its oral transmission. Hultgren's approach results in a refusal to recognize a continuous frame of reference between the location of the origin of the material in the ministry of Jesus and its ultimate written expression in the gospels. Consequently the author has recourse to the quasi-magical creativity of a movement powerfully motivated by little more than remote reminiscences about its unaccountably forgotten Founder. Placing the impetus for the miraculous creativity of the early Church in its life-situation rather than in the ministry of Jesus betrays a disregard for credibility matched only by the delusions imputed by modern scholars to the disciples of Jesus gone amnesic soon after the resurrection.

The plight of such an enterprise is aggravated by the author's onesided reliance on tradition criticism at the expense of more recent developments in NT scholarship. The emergence of genre criticism as a tool for gospel research has opened promising perspectives for this kind of pursuit, especially in view of the correspondence that seems to exist between the conflict stories of the gospels and the "forensic debates" that constitute a notable element of Greek and Latin tragedies. The Scandinavian approach exemplified in the work of B. Gerhardsson provides also a fruitful alternative to a dehistoricizing use of form criticism.

It is this uncritical acceptance of the assumptions of radical form criticism elevated to the status of dogma that will contribute to make of Hultgren's work an antiquarian curiosity. Although the question of the historical factuality of the gospel's subject matter comes to haunt the author at several points throughout the book, he resorts to the familiar Jesus-the-ghost approach in answering it. This book dramatizes the troubling dilemma that strikes at the very foundations of radical form-critical methodology: If the early Church created the gospels out of nothing more than elusive reminiscences about a ghostlike Jesus, who created the Church in the first place? 

Gilbert Bilezikian
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In the final chapter of his recent autobiography, F. F. Bruce tried to explain how he produces so much on so many themes. His solution: Publish lectures. That way, he contends, one can kill two birds with one stone. This reviewer feels, however, that the real question has not been answered. It has only been set back one stage: How does he find time to prepare so much lecture material? One glance at the bibliography during the last decade (pp. xxii-xxxvi) puts most of us to shame. His forthcoming tasks look no less demanding. Such is
the man under whom the following scholars studied—their work betrays the guidance of a master. There are sixteen articles divided into life, theology and exegesis of Paul.

Colin Hemer begins the volume with a chronological study of the “pillar” events. Although he may assume too much on the part of his readers, Hemer knows the issues. He examines Aretas, the famine, Gallio, and the voyage to Jerusalem. He makes a conjecture for a new reading on the Gallio inscription and offers a suggestion as to why Paul left Corinth. Hemer also suggests a theory for the impatience of the travellers on their return to Jerusalem.

Paul Garnet, known for work on Qumran, critiques E. P. Sanders’ view that Judaism did not know of a justification by works. Qumran literature reveals such a belief. The vehicles of salvation (knowledge, holy atmosphere, exclusiveness, discipline) are all present to aid the member to law obedience, a requirement for salvation. Paul fought this attitude in Galatians and taught an exile soteriology, a theme not as convincing as his criticism of Sanders.

The interpretation of Paul’s view of women in the Acts of Paul and Thecla is the concern of E. M. Howe. After summarizing this late-second-century document, Howe concludes the author was at variance with Paul in three matters. The author was out of order in Paul’s idea of sexual freedom for Christians, Thecla’s near-worship attitude toward Paul, and Paul’s view of women as teachers/preachers. Paul did not allow sexuality differentiation in public ministry (1 Cor 11:2:6) and taught that leadership is in virtue of one’s relationship to God, not man (11:10). This equality, Howe maintains, “is to be reflected in the organization and worship of the local church” (p. 46). Although one cannot expect too much in one article (her evaluation of Acts is superb), this reviewer would like to have seen further treatment of the Pauline view of women.

Peter O’Brien strikes a resounding note on the treatment of thanksgiving in Paul. A careful study of the words leads him to view thanksgiving in Paul as praise. Adamic theology is the topic for Swee-Hwa Quek. Whereas 1 Corinthians 15 emphasizes the humanity of Christ, Romans 5 stresses the work and result of each person. Also, the greatness of Christ-solidarity is seen in Romans 5. David Wenham continues the Romans 7 debate by contesting James Dunn. Romans 8 is the answer to Romans 7. There are clues, however, that Romans 7 is descriptive of the Christian. Thus victory is possible (Romans 8) but not inevitable (Romans 7). The solution is in Paul’s inaugurated eschatology. Stephen Smalley compares the relationship of Christ to the Christian in John and Paul. Ten parallels are given. John distinguishes the experience of Christ and the Spirit. He also has the love command. In spite of diversity the two authors are compatible.

Ronald Clements, a notable OT theologian, examines the development of remnant in Isaiah. He finds a trajectory beginning in 7:3 (influenced by 1:4-9) with the name Sharr-jashub, moving to 10:20-23 (640 B.C.) to 37:31-32 (598-550 B.C.) and ending in 2 Kgs 21:14. From a “hint” of disaster the theme progresses to primarily negative (northern kingdom) to being synonymous to Judah and a term of hope. Finally, “remnant” is not a doctrine but a “vital image” (p. 118). Paul is able to combine the juxtaposition of national and obedient Israel in the concept of remnant. As is obvious, some will want to take issue with Clements because of his critical breakdown of Isaiah.

Bruce Demarest is conversant with process theology and exegesis. Briefly summarizing process theology and incarnation, he then examines eight Pauline passages to show that the NT teaches an ontological incarnation of God in Christ. Process incarnation is a deduction of philosophy, not exegesis. This reviewer would like to have seen greater awareness of NT literature on the crucial points in the exegesis of Paul.

Donald Hagner, co-editor, provides a useful (for pastors, I might add) survey of Jewish literature on Paul. In Jewish scholarship Paul has moved from a Hellenistic gnostic heretic to a Palestinian Jew in line with Jesus. Paul, therefore, is being reclaimed by Jewish scholars. The irony of the matter is that, although they embrace Paul, they reject his message about the crucified Messiah experienced at Damascus.

From theology one moves to exegesis. Paul Beasley-Murray analyzes Col 1:15-20. He ar-
argues persuasively that the hymn is a hymn on the Lordship of Christ. This theme provides the clue to resolving several exegetical issues. He sees Adamic theology in v 20 yet fails, in my opinion, to provide a satisfactory alternative to universalism. Perhaps the most potent article is that of M. Silva on lexicography. He proposes a method for determining style. Lexical style must be determined by syntagmatic (combination of words) and paradigmatic (choice of semantic meaning) relationships. This will give greater scientific accuracy to authorial style, vocabulary, authorship questions and synonymy. Far-reaching implications for such questions as the authorship of the pastorals could arise from this approach.

John Drane proposes a theory on the purpose of Romans by analyzing the Roman Church sociologically. The purpose of Romans, however, is not found in Rome but in the life of Paul: He is making a "conscious effort to convince himself as well as his opponents that it is possible to articulate a theology which is at once antilegalistic without also being intrinsically antinomian" (p. 234). His basis for seeing a fragmented Roman Church is not wholly convincing.

Another study on Romans 7 (R. H. Gundry) concludes that this passage (7:7-25) is a real experience of Paul but occurred prior to his conversion. The experience was one of sexual lust and occurred at his bar mitzvah. Gundry then defends this view by harmonizing it with the problems and critiquing the opposition. The article does not always hang together.

Ronald Fung demonstrates admirably, but not always persuasively, that justification by faith is not reserved by Paul for polemical contexts but is at the heart of his theology. It appears in 1 Cor 1:18-31; 6:11; 2 Cor 3:4-11; 5:18-21. His treatment of 2 Cor 3:9 is enlightening. This reviewer would like to have seen a defense of justification as the pre-eminent theological concept in all of these passages. As it is, it is only one among equals.

Finally, in the last article one comes to exacting exegesis. Murray Harris attempts to prove the deity of Christ grammatically by an exegesis of Titus 2:13. The verse should be translated with "God and Savior" as dependent upon "glory." Jesus Christ is in apposition to the formulaic "God and Savior." His substantiation is as follows: The formulaic nature of "God and Savior" (borrowed from pagan titles), the use of the article to form a conceptual unity, the use of "great" polemically, and parallelism. This article is ready ammunition for the pastor in polemical defense and the teacher in need of an example of grammatical exegesis. One cannot read the article, however, without a finger on the Greek text and an awareness of Greek grammar. We await the promised monograph on the topic.

Scott McKnight
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