BOOK REVIEWS


Evangelicals today are divided over their view of the missionary task. Some evangelicals believe that the principal goal of missions is evangelism, while others would contend that social concerns and evangelism should be equally stressed. Dyrness attempts to solve this current impasse by re-examining what the Bible has to say about mission. Although the Bible is acknowledged by many to be authoritative for the Church’s view of mission, Dyrness remarks that few have adequately grounded their theology of mission in the Scriptures. Thus the author uses the Biblical theology method so that the Scriptures can speak for themselves in their historical-cultural setting.

The unifying theme of the Bible is identified as the kingdom of God, which is provisionally defined “as God’s dynamic rule leading to the salvation of his people and the restoration of the created order” (p. 14). The unfolding of the kingdom of God is conceived in terms of a drama. The five great acts in the drama are creation, exodus, exile, Christ and consummation. The heart of the book consists of an explanation and analysis of these five dramatic acts. Almost the entire Bible is compassed in this remarkably concise survey of Biblical theology.

The major conclusions of the book are implicit in the definition of the kingdom of God. God is concerned about the salvation of individuals, but his kingdom purposes also include the restoration of creation and human society. The redemptive activity of God is manifested in both the proclamation of the gospel and the transformation of social structures. The promise of the future consummation of the kingdom does not imply that social concerns for this creation are irrelevant, for there is continuity between the old and new creation.

It is hard to disagree with the central thesis of this work, for Dyrness convincingly shows that the Scriptures contain a holistic theology of mission. Clearly the initial creation of the world and the promised new creation reflect the comprehensive nature of God’s purposes. In addition the exodus, the message of the prophets, and the ministry of Jesus reveal that God is interested in the transformation of both individuals and social structures, in spiritual renewal and physical well-being. However, it is more difficult to see how the wisdom literature supports Dyrness’ thesis, and this literature receives little attention.

There is no doubt that this book is a valuable contribution to the current debate over mission, but it should also not be overlooked as a fine handbook for the student who wants to see the overriding unity of Scripture from a Biblical theology perspective. Some readers will quarrel with the idea that the kingdom of God is the center—they may even be skeptical of any single center—but such a disagreement should not blind one to the many benefits of the work. For example, the chapter on the monarchy was particularly effective in portraying the tensions and ambiguities of this institution in Israel.

One could quibble with some minor points in the book. Dyrness’ view of the implications of the exodus for the contemporary movement of liberation theology is disappointingly brief and a trifle vague. Perhaps such ambiguity is inescapable in light of the larger purposes of the book. There are also a few statements in the book that are dogmatically stated but not supported with any evidence. Dyrness affirms that in “the prophets the pagan gods are accounted as nothing (Isa. 44:9ff.), which surely means that they offer no threat to God’s purposes rather than that they have no reality” (p. 39, italics mine). Such a conclu-
sion is possible, but Dyrness’ certainty on this issue is rather mystifying since solid evidence is available to support the other viewpoint. This review should not end on a negative note, for the work is a helpful and Biblical contribution to the contemporary debate on mission and it ably supports the notion that the Biblical view of mission is holistic.

Tom Schreiner

Azusa Pacific University, Azusa, CA


Cities of the Biblical World is a series intended to place at the disposal of the layman the results of archaeological activities carried on at some of the major sites of Biblical interest. The successive volumes are published with this agenda: “Each title describes the excavation and finds of a particular site and shows how this evidence can help our understanding of the world of the Bible.” As such it will fill a real void for the student of both Bible and archaeology. A few extensive but costly specific treatments like Yadin’s Masada and Usishkin’s The Conquest of Lachish by Sennacherib ($72!) exist, but many of these are, for all intents and purposes, the special treasures of good libraries. No other series does precisely what this one has set out to do.

Roger Moorey’s volume provides an excellent introduction to modern scientific excavation in Palestine. It is designed as a simple introduction for all those people with little or no archaeological knowledge, not least among them Biblical students who are interested in the archaeology of Palestine. He has assumed that his readers have never been on a Near Eastern excavation, indeed may never have the opportunity to do so, yet wish to know how the evidence they seek is gained and processed. It is largely restricted, by the terms of reference of the series to which it belongs, to the period from about 2000 B.C. to the Roman empire. It deals therefore with “text aided or historic archaeology” (p. 6).

In going about his task the author first introduces archaeology generally. He explains the foundational principles of the discipline—e.g., stratigraphy, the three-age system of chronology (Stone, Bronze and Iron), typology and ethnography. In chap. 2 he treats the evolution of the archaeological method in Palestine, surveying methodology up to the Wheeler-Kenyon (balk/debris-layer) technique and the Israeli (architectural) tradition. Here he also takes up “site survey” of Palestinian tells: surface pottery sherds, aerial photography, etc. His third chapter has to do with matters preliminary to actual excavation. The discussion of site identification is particularly interesting and informative, dealing with some areas not given much coverage in most introductions. Numerous examples are cited from Palestinian excavation to explain how archaeologists go about the job of deciding which tells are worthy of special attention, how specific identification can sometimes be made, and how difficult and even elusive it may be at others.

The actual process of investigating a mound is his next topic. One is familiarized at this juncture with the problems intrinsic to excavation: “Are the lines seen in his trench sides rubbish tips or floor levels? Are they disturbed and, if so, why? Are there any indications of destruction by fire or of a break in occupation marked by layers of windblown sand or by the debris of turf or other vegetation sealing in ruined buildings? Exactly how does the debris relate to the floor or foundation levels of the building under excavation?” (p. 58).

Two further chapters discuss the processes brought into play after the actual excavation is finished, establishing time-scales and identifying and interpreting structures and small finds from the dig. A final installment offers observations on the use and abuse of archaeology in Biblical studies. By the time one reads to this last chapter he is impressed with how exceedingly complex this field has become in the past few decades. As Moorey himself puts it: “Practitioners and laymen alike are now increasingly required to absorb a considerable amount of technical data, if they wish to assess critically the new material emerging in such quantity from the numerous excavations current in Palestine. It needs to
be remembered that even the most sophisticated scientific technique does not necessarily yield self-evident truths. The results must be interpreted, as always, as but one aspect of a whole spectrum of evidence" (pp. 82-83). The archaeologist has therefore become more and more specialized and scientific in his approach and less and less theological in his pronouncements. This leads Moorey to the conclusion that "archaeological information proves nothing about the biblical tradition, it only offers fresh matter in the weighing of probabilities. It is, of necessity, circumstantial evidence and will only deceive if it be taken for that of eye-witnesses" (p. 121).

Our appraisal of this little handbook to Palestinian excavation is that it represents an excellent prelude to the study of the archaeology of the Holy Land. Being both up-to-date and readable, we predict for it a wide usefulness.

Daniel Hayden King

Florida College, Temple Terrace, FL


The literature dealing with Qumran and the Dead Sea scrolls being already voluminous, a new book on the subject would need something to commend it besides a catchy title. This book is devoid of an arresting title, but it does have its self-commendation in the fact that it aims primarily to present the newcomer to this study with a brief and readable summary of the archaeological data. It gathers in other material as well, but its major concern is with the khirbeh, or ruin, that stands exposed now near the Wadi Qumran on the western shore of the Dead Sea.

In our view Davies has been successful in presenting something that is sufficiently new and unique to warrant his efforts. For obvious reasons he has been heavily dependent on the reports and conclusions of Roland de Vaux, chief excavator and interpreter of the remains at Qumran. Yet he does not slavishly quote from him but sets out on his own to present the facts as reported and to draw conclusions he deems correct, sometimes at odds with de Vaux. His knowledge of the field certainly goes beyond de Vaux’s reports, as is reflected in his careful assessments of the views of other scholars (Cross, Milik, etc.).

For Davies the archaeological evidence forms the organizational framework for the material he presents. He meticulously orients the reader not only to the Qumran ruins and the nearby caves but also to work done at ‘Ain Feshkha, Khirbet Abu Tabaq, Khirbet es-Samra and Khirbet al-Maqari. What is in the scrolls, reflecting the beliefs and customs of the community that produced them, is given in relation to the levels of occupation of Khirbet Qumran. This orientation is a rather helpful feature of the work, since the reader is accustomed to the opposite perspective. Davies does not neglect the scrolls, but the book is about Qumran and only indirectly about the documents of the community.

This book, like the rest in the series, is well illustrated with black-and-white photographs and numerous maps and line drawings. Brief bibliographical notes are supplied, and footnotes are kept at a minimum. It is written with the layman in mind, but there is something here for everyone.

Daniel Hayden King

Florida College, Temple Terrace, FL


Popular treatments on reincarnation by evangelicals have been needed, and these two books help to meet the need. Albrecht approaches the subject in survey manner. He addresses the moral, historical, and philosophical-theological problems with incarnation. Albrecht is adept at theologizing but does not fully explicate or exegete the Scriptures in a
systematic fashion.

By contrast, Snyder grips the reader with the essence of the matter. His chapters are short and pithy with terse, precise paragraphs. He does not go into the history of the problem. He looks at alleged Biblical support for reincarnation briefly but accurately. The heart of Snyder’s presentation, as one can infer from the title, is that the Christian hope is in resurrection, not in reincarnation. A helpful question-and-answer section at the end of the book, plus a glossary, gives this work an advantage over Albrecht’s. However, Albrecht’s work tends to be more comprehensive with a chart on theological hybrids that is concise and circumspect. Perhaps Snyder will give us a more in-depth and comprehensive treatment in a future book. Meanwhile this could be abridged into a booklet to facilitate wider distribution.

Earl L. Brown, Jr.

Faith Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, PA


T. F. Torrance is well-known for his monumental work as editor (with G. W. Bromiley) of the English translation of Barth’s Church Dogmatics. Transformation and Convergence is the latest in a series of books dealing with the author’s own theological program, the dialogue between Christian theology and western science. The Edinburgh theologian’s major thesis is that recent epistemological breakthroughs in the scientific enterprise are opening the door to a new convergence with Barthian theology, a convergence that he fittingly refers to as “theological science.”

The book itself consists of a collection of eight addresses and two published essays produced since 1969, to which has been added an opening chapter. As is often the case with essay collections, there is some overlap among the various chapters, although the overlap is neither excessive nor tedious.

The opening chapter, “The Making of the ‘Modern’ Mind from Descartes and Newton to Kant,” sets the stage for the essays that follow. Torrance traces the rise in western thinking of the “modern” view that “it is we who, by our rational and scientific operations, clothe the universe around us with form and structure and truly give it meaning for ourselves” (p. 6). Subsequent essays introduce the reader to those scientists who have moved away from this Renaissance-Enlightenment view and toward an understanding that sees the universe as “an integrated intelligible system,” a world that “forces itself upon our inquiries in the imperious light of its own intrinsic order, as one in which intelligible structure and material content exist in mutual interaction and interdetermination” (p. 72). Separate essays are devoted to the place of Michael Polanyi and James Clark Maxwell in this scientific revolution. In addition to these two, Albert Einstein and Thomas S. Kuhn receive prominence in the book.

Torrance sees significant implications of the new mood in scientific epistemology for Christian theology. Chapter 7 delineates several of these implications in terms of three famous sayings of Einstein, using Christology as an example. It comes as no surprise to the reader that the author proposes an approach to the theological enterprise that incorporates many features of the methodology of Karl Barth, who in Torrance’s estimation advocated a revolution in theology on the same plane as Einstein’s revolution in science. The author’s one criticism of Barth is articulated in chap. 9, namely that Barth failed to appreciate fully the interconnections between the concepts of theology and natural science. Nevertheless Barth was not the dualist, who thought of God as separated from the world of nature and history, that many critics maintain, Torrance says. Rather he was, like Torrance, an interactionist and was concerned to perceive the “relation between our knowledge of God and the inherent rationality of the truth and being . . . of God himself as he really is” (pp. 295-296).
The closing two chapters of the book are not as closely related to the author's major theme as are the others. Chapter 10, the first essay written, addresses the question of authority in the Church from the standpoint of Torrance's program. The final essay deals with the Christian understanding of immortality. The author's attempt to avoid universalism while positing God's unconditional, universal love is of special interest.

*Transformation and Convergence* is not a book for the novice. Torrance's writing style is difficult. His sentences are long and complex, reminiscent of Barth. The subject matter is likewise technical. The reader is assisted by the fact that as a collection of separately written essays the book repeats the author's key theses. Torrance could also be criticized for overstating the degree of convergence that has been acknowledged between science and theology. In spite of these reservations, the book is a rewarding adventure for the one who has the patience to discover the author's interpretation of the history of recent scientific thought and his vision for a day when both theology and natural science will emerge from their respective ghettos in order that they together might develop a more unified worldview.

Stanley J. Grenz

North American Baptist Seminary, Sioux Falls, SD


At first glance, this book seems to be just another analysis of religious phenomena. However, it is much more than that. The authors of the ten essays allow the groups studied their views on eschatology, and then analyze what impact (if any) that view has had on society and the group itself.

The views studied range from Jonathan Edwards' to Sun Myung Moon's and include the Shakers, Mormons and Jehovah's Witnesses, to name just a few. The essay on Watchtower eschatology is especially stinging, but the chapter on Unification theology is aglow with praise and adoration for Moon and his ideas. This is not surprising since the writer begins by identifying himself as a member of Moon's movement. (He is, apparently, the only Unificationist among the ten authors.)

On p. xi the reader is told that the essays were originally prepared for a conference held under the auspices of an arm of the Unification Church. Once this is understood, much of the book, such as the merciless attacks on orthodox Christian beliefs and their influence on American culture, becomes very clear.

All things considered, the book does have some interesting and informative insights into American eschatological thought and the impact of that thought on the nation's development, as well as a concluding essay that suggests some possible directions that eschatological thought may take America in the near future. For those interested in understanding the how and why of some of Christianity's effect on American culture (and vice versa), this book is good reading if taken with the proper amount of caution and discernment.

David L. Washburn

The Ark Bookstore, Denver, CO


This book is another in the Christian Free University Curriculum series. Like the others, it is for "the average reader"—i.e., the nonspecialist.

As a philosopher, Nash has already shown his ability to deal lucidly with profound philosophical issues in *Ideas of History.* As a theologian, he has addressed himself to questions of religion in *The Case for Biblical Christianity.* In the present volume he has combined these
two areas of expertise and treated the vexing problem of the relation between history and faith.

A brief introductory chapter affirms that Christianity is an historically revealed religion. However, the author reminds the reader that this is not a simplistic affirmation because the very definition and meaning of history is debatable, as evidenced by the many terms used to describe history—viz., chronicle (simple narrative), significant narrative, Historie ("objective-historical"), Geschichte ("existential-historical"), etc. The author then offers his own definition of history as "the attempt to reconstruct in a significant narrative the important events of the human past through a study of the relevant data available in the historian's own present experience."

Chapter two is concerned with the attempts made during the nineteenth century to make history scientific. This trend is traced historically, beginning with Ranke's (1795-1886) position that history is a description of the past "as it actually happened"; Comte's (1798-1857) optimism that all phenomena are subject to uniform natural laws; and Buckle's (1821-1862) positivist statistical approach to human conduct. These influences helped give rise to the "quest for the historical Jesus," which in turn became a grand exhibit of the deficiency of liberal historical scholarship.

The next chapter shows the rise of historical idealism as a backlash to the old liberal collapse early in the twentieth century by recourse to the works of Dilthey (1833-1911), Croce (1860-1952) and Collingwood (1889-1943). Nash shows that the theological corollary was the rise of neo-orthodoxy (Barth) and existentialism (Bultmann). There follows an insightful chapter in which the author discusses the now famous demythologization principles of Bultmann. He does this by identifying and analyzing the four types of myth that Bultmann sees in the Bible: scientific, psychological, theological and supernatural. Using his discussion of Bultmann's methodology as a springboard, the author also includes in this chapter a discussion and critique of form criticism and redaction criticism.

After wrestling with the possibility of objective history and the meaning of historical facts in their larger contexts, the author comes, in the opinion of this reviewer, to his pivotal chapter, "History and the Resurrection of Christ." Nash's method in dealing with this subject is to formulate six crucial questions about the resurrection of Jesus and apply them to the positions of Bultmann, Barth, Pannenberg and Ladd. As a result of this methodology, the reader is able to see in a vivid way the wide range of beliefs among theologians regarding the historical or nonhistorical nature of the resurrection of Jesus.

The last chapter on "Faith and History" is largely an examination of Perrin's distinction between historical, historic, and faith-knowledge. Alternatives to Perrin's view are offered, and the chapter closes with a description of several models of faith in which faith is, by analogy, seen as leaning or resting, walking on a tightrope, and as a leap.

The book is really an introduction to what is actually a vast and highly important subject: the relationship of Christian faith to history. However, given the self-imposed format, the brevity of the treatment, and the nonspecialist target reading audience, Nash has done a very credible job of awakening the reader to the vital issues at stake in grappling with this subject.

James E. Priest

Pepperdine University, Malibu, CA


One aspect of the theological context of the contemporary Church in Europe is a significant revival of interest in the Holy Spirit. At the forefront of this revival are two prominent Tübingen theologians. Hans Küng—whose writings have been almost as influential with Protestants as with his own Roman Catholic Church—makes it a central theme in his monumental work The Church that the Church is what it is through the presence, purpose and
power of the Holy Spirit. Jürgen Moltmann is the other extremely influential (Protestant) theology professor who insists that the key to spiritual renewal in Europe is the uniqueness of the Church, which is centered in the active presence of the Spirit of God. Both men are representative of a much larger group of noncharismatics, theologians, and ecclesiologists with a strong interest in the institutionalized Church who are also focusing attention in quite a different way on the Holy Spirit. The experience-oriented charismatic movement, based on the presence of the Spirit in individual lives, is slowly giving way to the sense of the presence of the Spirit in theology and institutions.

Thus for the student of contemporary theology Moltmann is a monumental figure who deserves the most serious attention. The reviewer's recent studies in Basel and Tübingen have given him an awareness of the enormous popularity and influence of the man fondly known among his students as “the pastor’s theologian.” Kierkegaard hit the nail on the head when he said: “Take away the paradox from the thinker and you have the professor.” This book will make it clear that the paradoxes of life have never departed from the mind of this theologian. For Moltmann, she who was once called “the queen of science” is not content merely to hold fast her ancient treasures, unconcerned with adapting her message to a rapidly changing world. Theology is not a static science but rather one that is notoriously adaptable to the world of the twentieth century.

Such is the main focus of The Power of the Powerless. The book is a compilation of eighteen dynamic sermons that trace the theme of Holy Spirit power through both testaments and up to the experience of the Spirit today. In impeccable English (thanks to the able translator, Margaret Kohl) these messages are the fruit of ten years’ reflection as the author ministered in university services in Tübingen’s Stiftskirche. As sermons they appeal more to the heart than the mind of the reader. Anyone looking for a detailed account of Moltmann’s pneumatology must read his magnum opus, The Church in the Power of the Spirit. But for the one who desires a candid glimpse into the soul of this European theologian, this book will not be a disappointment.

Through all the obvious diversities of the book one can trace a common message of salvation, a common doctrine of the divine community it created, and a common emphasis on the central figure and solitary source of power of all Church revival: the Holy Spirit. The events of recent decades have demonstrated to Moltmann that theologians have too often failed to see the paradoxes in history and have too frequently presented aspirations as accomplished facts. What is offered here—in sermonic form—is an examination of the paradoxes of life from which there emerges a balance of “weak” and yet “strong,” an equilibrium of conflicts common to men both religious and secular. Herein lies the comfort of the Christian so far as he is able to comprehend it: In the presence and power of God’s Spirit there unfolds the promise of tranquil strength almost mystical in its poignancy. Herein lies the prospect of authentic power, the power of a new world of understanding and justice, the power of human liberation in all its dimensions. Power in the lives of the powerless means nothing if it is not divine, dynamic and personal, allowing God full rein in the hearts of Christians.

To be more specific: Steadily declining attendance, waning influence on a secularized society, internal polarization, social apathy—this is the picture that Moltmann paints of the Protestant Church in Germany and, by extension, of the Church worldwide. What should have been a healthy stream of life watering society has become a stagnation of knowledge that, because of its obscurity, cannot or will not become viable in real life. It is in reference to the wayward and impotent Church that Moltmann is at his best, speaking out like a modern Bonhoeffer (whom he cites—almost reverently—on p. 80) to denounce the failure of Christians to impact society. He decries the injustices under Naziism in particular and the evils of war in general (pp. 82, 99, 142). He lashes out against the oppressive educational system that subjects schoolchildren to unbearable pressure to compete for places at the university and for jobs, shutting out the weak of society and preventing even the strong from developing a social conscience (p. 24). He decries the kind of “Christian” society that
thoughtlessly and unfeelingly forces the handicapped to the fringes of life (p. 136).

But the author's strongest words (and deepest sentiments) are reserved for the apathetic members of the Church, for the hundreds of thousands of Germans who attend the General Assemblies (Kirchentage) of the Protestant or Catholic Churches every two years, but who never enter the church at any other time (p. 161), for those who coexist on the parish register without any human contact or common sharing. Gemeinde without Gemeinschaft is as unthinkable to Moltmann as it was to the early Jerusalem church. The solidarity of Christian love demands that Christians "struggle together, share one another's burdens, and learn to live in fellowship and community with one another" (p. 112).

These are strong words spoken with great conviction, and there is obviously much in this book that applies to the Church in America. The sermonic value of each message is beyond dispute, but in the reviewer's opinion the strength of Moltmann is in his ability to mediate between the text of the Biblical testimony and the present-day situation in Germany, and the book could therefore be read with great profit as a current history of the theological and ecclesiological climate in Protestant Europe. It is a fascinating patchwork quilt covering a variety of interesting and provocative topics. It is "practical" theology in the truest sense of the term. In short, this is the kind of book for which all of us search in studying the great thinkers of our time.

David Alan Black

Talbot Theological Seminary, La Mirada, CA


This work is the first volume in a major new series on the form of OT literature produced under the general editorship of Rolf Knierim and Gene Tucker. At the time of its publication only one other volume in the series had appeared (that on wisdom literature by Roland Murphy), and since its publication B. O. Long's contribution on 1 Kings has seen the light of day. All in all the editors promise twenty-four volumes that will come out during the 1980s.

George Coats was an appropriate choice for the volume on Genesis, since he has already distinguished himself with a number of scholarly articles on various parts of the book. The result is that his volume is both informative and well presented.

The book should not be mistaken for a commentary, however. Its main intention is to explicate the literary forms of Genesis, and rarely (if ever) does Coats deal with philology, textual matters and so forth. He follows a set pattern of explication in order to inform the reader about the forms of literature in Genesis. After a general introduction defining the nine major types of literature that he discovers in Genesis (saga, tale, novella, legend, history, report, fable, etiology, myth), Coats proceeds by discussing the textual units themselves. He starts with the largest units of literature (Hexateuch, Pentateuch and Genesis) and then writes about the subdivisions of these larger units one at a time. His chapters alternate between major structural units within Genesis followed by a more detailed analysis of the formal characteristics of "individual units." The major structural units are correctly delineated as the primeval saga, the Abraham saga, the Isaac saga and the Jacob saga.

Each major structural unit and individual passage is treated under five headings. First, Coats describes the structure of the unit. He gives a simple outline of the text, followed by explanation. This is where he appears to place his emphasis, since the "Structure" section is usually the longest and most fully argued of the five headings. The discussion of structure is then followed by brief paragraphs on genre, setting and intention. A bibliography concludes each section.

Most will find the analysis of the structure of the textual units most helpful. In the first place, Coats fully develops his points on structure, whereas in his genre, setting and inten-
tionality sections he is satisfied with assertions with very little justification.

Another disconcerting feature of Coats' book is that he proceeds from textual unit to unit, not making the relationship between them obvious. He will often, for instance, go from a large unit to a smaller unit within the large one without signaling to the reader the direction of his discussion. For instance, on p. 69 he treats what he calls the Adam genealogy (5:1-9:29), his next section (pp. 73 ff.) describes the flood tale found in 6:1-9:19, and he continues (pp. 84 ff.) with a smaller unit that he entitles the "myth of the giants" (6:1-4). Some method of indicating the relationship of one section to another (perhaps in outline form) would go a long way toward helping the reader find his way through the book.

Evangelical readers will find some of Coats' methods, assumptions and conclusions dubious. Just to list a few, Coats, while always ending with the canonical form of a text, devotes considerable discussion to the structure and genre of the J and P forms as they purportedly existed before being united in the final redaction. His treatment of the question of the historical value of these texts is also unsatisfying. There is indeed a place for describing narrative aesthetically without concern for the historical character of the text (done very effectively by Robert Alter in *The Art of Biblical Narrative*), but the relationship between form and history in the book of Genesis is of great interest and should not be swept under the carpet by stating that it is outside the intention of the book (p. 3). This is especially the case when the genre labels that are used are implicit statements about the historical value of the units—i.e. saga, tale, etc. Coats seems to be working with a false dichotomy between history and literary art. This is illustrated on p. 9 when he states: "History as a genre of literature represents that kind of writing designed to record the events of the past as they actually occurred. Its structure is controlled, then, not by the concerns of aesthetics, nor by the symbolic nature of a plot, but by the chronological stages or cause-effect sequences of events as the author(s) understood them. . . . It is designed simply to record."

In general, what would be helpful for the series as a whole (and perhaps it is planned though not mentioned in the editor's preface) is a volume devoted exclusively to methodology. What is a genre? Is each unit susceptible to only one generic label? Is there a relationship between genre and setting? What is a setting for a genre of literature? Is it always sociological or can it also be literary, historical or intellectual? The truth is that genre theorists themselves (T. Todorov, K. Hempfer, J. Derrida, E. D. Hirsch) are debating many of these questions, as are Biblical scholars (R. Knierem, M. J. Buss, J. J. Collins, E. Guttgemanns, G. Osborne, F. Letzen-Deis).

I do not want to be misunderstood, though. Coats is an excellent scholar who has written an informative and at times innovative book about a significant topic. Most of the concerns I have mentioned have flowed from my perspective as an evangelical scholar. This is not, however, to be taken as an indictment of form criticism. It is of crucial importance for an exegete to identify the genre of literature that he is interpreting. More evangelicals need to be devoted to this type of work. One can only be pleased to see works like the recent article by Grant Osborne entitled "Genre Criticism—*Sensus Literalis*," *Trinity Journal* 4 (1983) 1-27.

In closing, let me suggest that this volume is must reading for students and scholars working on Genesis. I doubt, however, that pastors will be much helped in their task by it. It is with anticipation that we await the remaining volumes.

Tremper Longman, III

*Westminster Theological Seminary*


This work is the first in a new series published by Eerdmans entitled the International Theological Commentary. According to the editors, the new series has a twofold purpose.
First, it "offers a theological interpretation of the Hebrew text," by which is meant not only the contextual interpretation but also the continuing growth of interpretation, which "may be found both within the Bible itself and in the continuing scholarship of the Church" (p. vi). Second, the series is international in scope. By this it is not meant simply that the authors are from varied geographical backgrounds, which is indeed the case, but also that the issues addressed in the commentary are not those that are strictly western in viewpoint: "In our age, especially, a commentary on the Bible must transcend the parochialism of Western civilization and be sensitive to issues that are the special problems of persons who live outside of the 'Christian' West, issues such as race relations, personal survival and fulfillment, liberation, revolution, famine, tyranny, disease, war, the poor, religion and state" (p. viii).

If judged by the above criteria, Hamlin's commentary is a success. Hamlin himself is the past president of Thailand Theological Seminary and thus surely has a nonwestern perspective. Often Hamlin makes use of his knowledge of Thai customs to shed light on his interpretation of the Biblical text (e.g. pp. 31, 119, 154-155). He continually moves from an understanding of the traditions going back to Joshua's time to their reinterpretation by the writer of the book, then later by Deutero-Isaiah, by Jesus and the NT writers, and finally their interpretation for today's world. If the author's presuppositions are accepted, there is much good homily contained in the work.

There are, however, at least three fatal flaws in Hamlin's approach. First, his commentary throughout reflects an unquestioning acceptance of the higher critical approach, which views Scripture as primarily a man-made, not God-inspired, book. He regards the book of Joshua as the product of the "Teacher," a member of the sixth-century Deuteronomic reform movement under Josiah, who combined various traditions with material from a northern ninth-century writer called the "Narrator." What this means is that for Hamlin, Joshua's time becomes less important than the time of Josiah. His remarks on the first section of the book (Josh 1:1-9) set the tone for the commentary: "The first section, in the form of a message from God to Joshua, sets forth the Teacher's guiding ideas for Josiah's role in the renewal of God's people on the land" (p. 4). So the book of Joshua, according to Hamlin, is really about Josiah, not Joshua. Consequently Hamlin's commentary is of little use to one hoping to learn something about Joshua and the conquest.

Second, no real evidence is given to support the various positions taken. The book contains no footnotes, and the references to other scholars are few and far between. There are no references to alternative viewpoints on an issue. This gives the reader the impression that there is a scholarly consensus on most matters, which is hardly the case. In most instances there is no exegetical evidence from the text marshaled to support a position. Admittedly the work is a "theological" commentary—but should not theology have its roots in sound, Biblical exegesis? The few times that Hamlin does make use of the Hebrew the results are questionable. For example, he states that translations of יָדוָרָשׁ as "drive out" "give the erroneous impression that entire populations were either wiped out or evicted from the land," whereas actually "the causative form of the verb יָדוָרָשׁ means to cause a change in the power structure on the land, i.e., to bring down the ruling kings, nobles, and rich, so that a new social order may be set up" (p. 10). Such a definition smacks more of contemporary liberation theology than of careful exegesis. Similar are Hamlin's redefinitions of לַעֲבָד and לַעֲבַד in Joshua 11 (p. 105) and his bold assertion (unsupported) that 'elep originally meant a group of ten to twenty men, not one thousand (thus explaining the large numbers in the census figures of Numbers 1 and 26 as well as the number of people sent against Ai in Joshua 7-8).

Finally, in place of solid exegesis Hamlin's commentary is filled with imaginative reconstructions and subjective spiritualizations reminiscent of devotional commentaries of past years but with a modern, third-world perspective. For example, according to Hamlin, Joshua's group did not come to kill all the Canaanites, but rather to liberate the oppressed Canaanites from the ruling elite. At the time of Joshua's coming, Canaan "was in a state of
social turmoil, with many of the villagers attempting to find a way out of the social system. There was need for liberation. . . . Concentration of power in the royal urban elite led to injustice for the poor” (p. xix). In the Gibeonite story, the Teacher does not intend to attribute evil motives to the Gibeonites, nor is he suggesting deception on their part. Rather, he is “revealing the ‘worn-out’ nature of the Canaanite culture. . . . The worn-out clothing, the moldy provisions, the poisonous wine, and the patched and leaky wineskins all symbolize the breakdown of the economic, social, and religious order of Canaan” (pp. 80-81). And the incident at Peor (Josh 22:17; Numbers 25) is somehow used to illustrate that “the diversion of disproportionate amounts of technological research into the production of more and more deadly weapons seems like the ancient sacrifices to the ‘Lord of Fire’ which may destroy us” (p. 171).

Some readers may well enjoy such homilies on the perils of modern society. To claim, however, that these observations are the result of a “theological” study of the book of Joshua is a bold leap of faith indeed. Serious students of Joshua should consult M. L. Woudstra’s commentary in NICOT, a truly international series that does not abandon the universal Biblical message derived from solid exegesis in favor of a parochial, “theological” interpretation.

Todd S. Beall

Capital Bible Seminary, Lanham, MD


Leslie Allen has written an excellent commentary on Psalms 101-150 to continue the fine work of Peter Craigie in the first of three scheduled volumes on the Psalms. Several volumes of the Word Biblical Commentary have now appeared, and the series promises to become an important contribution to Biblical studies.

Allen, formerly Lecturer at London Bible College, is now professor of OT at Fuller Theological Seminary. He has previously contributed a commentary, The Books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah and Micah (NICOT), and a study, The Greek Chronicles (VTSup). His previous work on the psalms has included a brief study of Psalms 73-150 in A Bible Commentary for Today (ed. Howley, Bruce and Ellison) and a detailed study of Psalm 139 in Vox Evangelica 10 (1977) 5-23.

This commentary, like the series in general, is designed for ministers as well as students and teachers. Comments on each psalm are divided into various sections. An introductory bibliography takes note of articles and monographs on the psalm. The author’s own translation also includes a metrical indication of each line (using the familiar “unit” approach). The section “Notes/Comments” includes a variety of technical comments keyed to the translation. The section “Form/Structure/Setting” interacts with other commentators in dealing with matters of specific form or genre, cultic and historical background, function, date and structure. The final section, “Explanation,” takes the reader through the psalm in the light of conclusions from the previous discussion, developing its original meaning and significance as well as its relevance to later theological developments, including relationship to the NT.

The commentary consists almost entirely of comments on individual psalms and assumes Craigie’s introduction in the first volume. Two brief discussions present thoughts on the composition of Psalms 101-150 and an excursus on the “Songs of Ascents.”

General characteristics of this commentary include the following: Allen’s writing style is lucid. At times his prose almost waxes poetic. Note his expression of the relation of Psalm 110 to the NT: “The great assurances of the psalm fell deep into the well of time till they finally plunged into the waters of NT revelation.” Generally following the canonical approach, he traces the theology of the psalm through the OT and into the NT.

Allen discusses in some detail the views of other commentators and scholars. Especially
helpful is his interaction with recent German literature (notably H.-J. Kraus). He presents views fairly, draws helpful insights from them, and offers critiques. Instead of simply disagreeing with another scholar and pronouncing his own view, he frequently interacts with views in detail and offers specific support for his own conclusions. Allen’s views are moderate. While his commentary will not be remembered for an extensive use of Ugaritic (Da-hood) or striking proposals about Israelite cult (Mowinckel), it will be widely used by students of the Psalms. Allen’s emphasis on putting a psalm together is especially helpful for bridging the chasm between scholarship and preaching.

Allen’s works have been noted for literary sensitivity, and this commentary is no exception. Treatments of form and structure are especially well done. In addition to building on the work of others, the author also makes new contributions to understanding a psalm’s structure. He emphasizes a psalm’s use of other psalms and OT passages. These “echoes” are potentially significant for opening up the meaning of a psalm. However, they are also debatable in determining dependence of one passage on another and the date of the presumed original (note his discussion of the use of Psalms 57 and 60 in Psalm 108).

Specific characteristics and views of the author of special interest to the readers of this Journal include the following: Textually, Allen tries to explain significant variants and is slow to adopt emendations. Regarding composition, he holds that psalms were carefully written. Thus he looks for structural clues to open up the development of a psalm (note here his discussion of Psalm 111).

Allen deals sporadically with two issues concerning the form of psalms: How far do we distinguish form from purpose and setting? How is form related to a psalm’s date? It would be helpful to have an excursus pull these scattered ideas together in one place.

The frequent heading of psalms, lēdāvar, Allen translates “Davidic.” He sees this functioning in various ways: indicating pre-exilic composition during the reign of a “Davidic” king; a psalm added to a “Davidic” collection because of similar themes; or possibly a case of historicization.

Allen’s postexilic dating of Joel, argued in his commentary on Joel cited above, also influences his date of several psalms that apparently depend on Joel. He frequently tends to adopt a later of various options for the date of a psalm, although not always (cf. Psalm 109). An early psalm may also have later additions (cf. Psalm 131).

The commentary concludes with indices of authors cited, principal subjects (which should be expanded) and Biblical texts. The volume is well produced. The only major flaw I noted was part of a bibliography: Twelve items from a section of textual studies were misplaced into a section of commentaries (pp. xvii-xviii)—no doubt the work of a later editor!

Allen’s volume on Psalms 101-150, like Craigie’s on Psalms 1-50, is indispensable for serious study of these psalms. We are indebted to them and to the editors at Word. We now look forward to Marvin Tate’s volume on Psalms 51-100.

David B. Kennedy

Grand Rapids Baptist Seminary, Grand Rapids, MI 49505


In January of 1980 a select group of Greek and NT scholars met at the University of Pretoria under the auspices of the department of Greek and the Institute for Interlingual Communication of the South African Bible Society to discuss stylistic formations and their function in the discourse structure of the Greek NT. The resultant material from this meeting was reworked and arranged by the authors of this volume. The book was intended not only as a treatise in style and discourse but also as a tool for Bible translators planning to further the work of the Bible Society's translation programs.
The book's eleven chapters discuss a wide range of subjects dealing with the general theme of semiotics. Chapter 1 argues for the necessity of studying signs as a method of Biblical research. Chapter 2 deals with the forty or so rhetorical features discussed by Hellenistic rhetoricians and found in the Greek NT (e.g. repetition, anacolutha, litotes, hyperbole, metonymy, idioms, etc.) and analyzes their functional significance in their operation at various levels of language. Chapter 3 treats the way in which various rhetorical features are characteristic of different types of text or diverse genres. Here the focus is on what the authors call socio-semiotic significance—that is, communicative functions. Chapters 4 and 5 deal primarily with the different aspects of meaning, with chap. 4 concentrating on the meaning of lexical and discourse units. Chapter 5 extends the concept of meaning to those referents of verbal signs that in themselves also constitute signs of secondary or even tertiary levels of meaning (e.g. the verbal sign "cross"—an artifact on which criminals were executed—is a referent to a further referent: the Christian faith).

Chapter 6 deals with the meaningful relationships to be found in a nucleus consisting of an event or state and the participants that form a set of satellites related to such a nucleus, as exemplified in Matt 5:13-16 (chap. 7). Chapter 8 is concerned with methods for analyzing the formal and semantic features of a text (with detailed examples from John 1:1-5; Jas 1:2-8; Heb 1:1-4; Eph 1:3-14; Rom 2:1-11; Luke 15:11-32), while chap. 9 treats the interpretative process and chap. 10 discusses the various theories of literary analysis. Finally, chap. 11 discusses briefly the implications of rhetorical analysis for translating the NT. An appendix classifies all the figures of speech found in the NT according to three basic principles: repetition, omission, and shift in expectancies. Each division and subdivision is provided with at least one example from the Greek NT.

The authors have served their discipline well by offering a concise and readable introduction to style in the NT at a time when there is a paucity of books on rhetorical criticism. Certainly a greater appreciation of the stylistic qualities of the Bible texts can only lead to a greater appreciation of their meaning and relevance. The book offers an excellent introduction for entry into this area of study and is worth the price for the appendix of NT figures of speech alone. More than that, the reader will find throughout the book helpful illustrations from the NT that clearly relate the principles in simple terms. For example, *makarioi* ("blessed, happy") at the beginning of each beatitude rather than in a predicate position highlights the paradoxical meaning of the beatitudes of Jesus (Matt 5:3-10). The additional fact that all of the beatitudes have a parallel structure signals not only the importance of the initial word *makarios* but also serves to indicate the unity of both structure and content. At the same time, however, the contrast between the present tense in vv 3, 10 and the future tense of vv 4-9 highlights the imminence of the kingdom of heaven and the significant blessings that follow. In addition to meaningful arrangements of verbal signs, one must also reckon with the selection of particular linguistic forms. The use of the passive form in so many of the second lines of the beatitudes, for example, clearly reflects the so-called "avoidance of the divine agency." Accordingly a more explicit translation of Matt 5:6, 7 would be "God will satisfy" and "God will be merciful" rather than the less explicit passive forms.

Many more such NT examples from this volume could be given, but the reviewer will leave the joy of discovery to the interested reader. Publisher and authors alike are to be commended for such a valuable contribution to the study of the Greek NT (marred only by a few misspelled words: p. 95, "revers"; p. 188, "SINOPSIS"; p. 194, "Lévi-Strauss"; p. 195, "Introduction"). The volume deserves to be in every class where advanced Greek is taught and in the personal collection of those engaged in a serious study of the NT literature.

David Alan Black

Biola University, La Mirada, CA

Every student of NT Greek has struggled through the indices of principal grammars looking for comments on the passage under study. The author struggled longer than most, and the volume under review is the fruit of his labors. "It exhaustively includes the indices of eight major advanced and intermediate grammars used in colleges and seminaries today" (p. 9).

The intermediate-level grammars are (1) Brooks and Winbery, (2) Dana and Mantey, (3) Moule, (4) Robertson and Davis, and (5) Zerwick. The advanced grammars included are (6) BDF, (7) Moulton, Howard, and Turner, and (8) Robertson. The author has attempted not to be selective but to reproduce the references exactly as they appear in the grammars respectively.

Robert W. Herron, Jr.
Institut zur Erforschung des Urchristentums, Tübingen


Word Publishers has two commentary series currently being produced: (1) The Biblical Commentary series, which includes F. F. Bruce on Thessalonians and R. J. Bauckham on Jude and 2 Peter; (2) The Communicator's Commentary series, of which the Larson volume is part. The Biblical Commentary series covers the entire 66 Biblical books, the Communicator's Commentary just the NT at this time.


I suppose it is a communicator's privilege to treat in fullness or scantiness whatever is in the text, which means there are major materials lightly touched upon or passed over entirely. In some places three verses are selected for comment, in other places stretches of twenty-three are chosen. What Larson has supplied are his sermons on Luke over a period of a year at his current post.

The objectives are twofold: to provide in-depth scholarship as background and relevant application as foreground. Whether Larson succeeds depends on the particular passage in question. His product is less concerned with the understanding of specific verses and concentrates more on the themes that seem to have the most relational significance. A person would not turn to this commentary to see what Luke means so much as what Larson says.

Larson makes for easy and interesting reading. It is almost an encyclopedia of illustrations. Packed in are Erma Bombeck (p. 173) and A. J. Cronyn (p. 86); Doctors Wilson (p. 109) and Nolen (p. 90); Captain Kangaroo (p. 38) and Blondie and Dagwood (p. 33); Kurt Vonnegut (p. 63) and John Travolta (p. 211); Soren Kierkegaard (p. 120) and Watchman Nee (p. 127). These are but a few samples.

The most troubling aspects of the book are the theological omissions and the theological pluralism. He rightly disclaims universalism (p. 144), but he embraces an inclusiveness that chides orthodox check-listing (p. 291). Some will not buy his relational ecumenism (p. 126) and his soft-core faith healing (p. 159). Yet there are things to cheer the heart in Larson's denial of salvation by self-doings (p. 127).

Larson knows how to communicate. The question a reader may have is this: Does he know, not what to communicate, but what needs to be communicated? Here is where a communicator must make a decision. Larson is not the last word on what needs to be communicated from Luke.

John Lewis Gilmore

First United Church of Christ, Cincinnati, OH

In order to appreciate this work we must employ proper hermeneutics. Understanding the circumstances in which the lectures herein reproduced were given, the background of the author, and the purpose Schweizer has in mind can help prevent serious misconceptions about his work.

The lectures were delivered to American theological students who probably, like most, have been heavily exposed to higher criticism. The author is not only a distinguished NT scholar but obviously a churchman who is concerned about the large numbers of church members on the European continent who mentally subscribe to theological orthodoxy but who seem not to have found a vital faith for their own lives. Schweizer’s purpose is clearly to help people—either, as the case may be, to go beyond Biblical criticism (theological students, take note) or dead orthodoxy (theologically conservative church members, give heed). This is far from a book on Lucan theology, as a second look at the subtitle should make clear. It is not to be compared with such a work as I. H. Marshall’s Luke: Historian and Theologian (a work that should be kept on hand for constant reference by professors and preachers alike). To be sure, Schweizer explores Luke’s theology or, more accurately, Luke’s narratives, but he does so in order to apply it to current thought and life. It is his conviction that Luke will preserve us from the Scylla and Charybdis of destructive criticism and dead orthodoxy.

In order to do this Schweizer has to walk a tightrope, which he does with skill but not without stumbling. It would be easy to react strongly to a number of statements. In fact my own initial assessment of the book was quite negative. But a rereading helps one to see the pattern of a number of qualifications that keep him, at least in his own mind, from veering to one or the other of the extremes he desires to avoid.

The first chapter, on the historico-critical method, shows how, from time to time, the Church has had to rethink its theology. A curious parade of examples includes Luther’s translation of the Bible, Galileo’s challenge, textual criticism, and the realization, from the evidence from the papyri, that the Biblical languages are ordinary languages. All of these are of course “safe” examples. But suddenly we come to the issue of the authenticity of such books as the pastorals, the apparent discrepancies between the gospels regarding the time of the crucifixion, and the alleged contradictions in the resurrection narratives. All of these surely belong to quite a different category from the former.

Schweizer seeks to show that form criticism has usefulness in leading the reader of the Bible to deeper truth. It is just here that we need to note a very significant feature of Schweizer’s book. It is his use of qualifying words: “The evangelists did not want to be historians in the modern sense of the word, only interested in accumulating facts” (italics mine in all these quotations), “they do not simply couch this truth in a dogmatic formula like ‘the death of Jesus is the sacrifice for the sin of the world’,” “the resurrection of Jesus was not simply a fact to be accepted as true,” “Luke offers no dogmatic formula that a believer simply would have to accept as truth in order to be saved,” “if God became simply the content of a formula he would not really have come into our world.” It is clear that at this point Schweizer is addressing the “orthodox” believers who want everything in a neat formula. Unfortunately the context reveals, as we shall see, that what Schweizer is really saying is not that “Luke provides us with reliable historical facts, but mere mental assent to these is not sufficient for salvation.” He is saying, rather, that “there are errors in the Bible, but recognition of this should help rather than hinder true faith.” It is not difficult to place this approach in the stream of twentieth-century theology.

After a brief survey of “the continental background of modern theology,” Schweizer deals with “history and salvation history.” He suggests “five points which seem to be essential for the modern concept of history.” These include the fact that the “past has happened without us,” and he later discusses this in connection with Luke and Heilsge-
schichte. Second, it is only a later generation after an historical event that can understand it. To this he links the stress in Luke on the word “today,” which he sees as significant not so much in indicating the day in which God acts but the day on which the people understand. His third point is that events do not have necessary results in a fixed pattern (contra Hegel and Marx) but rather that certain events “entail” rather than “cause” others. His Lucan parallel to this is more complex than I can take space to describe, but he deals with the providence of God and the appearance of various individuals and their unpredictable responses. The fourth point is that we do not so much master history as that we are mastered by it. We are “reference-subjects” with God as the true subject. The fifth point is that we cannot repeat or re-enter historical events. Each one is unique and has to be accepted and understood as such. With points four and five, as with the others, Schweizer seeks to show how Luke’s presentation matches these concepts of modern historiography.

My problem with this is that, like some other studies of Luke in recent years, this one attempts to fit Luke into modern categories. This is always precarious. Yet apart from Schweizer’s easy acceptance of less-than-accurate reportage on Luke’s part he is making a serious attempt to let Luke speak on his own terms.

However, when he proceeds to show how the event of Christ, understood according to the preceding concepts of historical study, can be “relevant to people of all times and places,” we come up against some questionable assumptions. “[Luke’s] Christology is far from being clear” (p. 43). “Even more chaotic is his usage of the term ‘Son of God’” (p. 44). As he continues he becomes involved in some logical fallacies. This is partly a result of his desire to avoid an “either-or” error. Here are two examples: “Again, it is a motley picture of different situations, demands, decisions in which faith has expressed itself, which cannot be reduced to some doctrine of justification” (p. 47). “The death of Jesus is an event in history which cannot be reduced to any all-embracing formula, be it that of ransom or atonement or justification” (p. 49) (italics mine in both quotations). The words “reduced to” are qualifying words, somewhat like the “simply” noted earlier. But in the presentation there is an implication of false alternatives. I would like to rescue Schweizer from this logical fallacy by saying that he elsewhere affirms the doctrines involved. However, what the reader sees at these particular points is something less than a full appreciation of the doctrines. In fact on p. 47, after mentioning justification, Schweizer continues: “It is questionable whether Luke has understood the Pauline interest in it.” I see other examples, or at least apparent examples, of logical fallacies elsewhere. On p. 6 there seems to be an irrelevant conclusion. Schweizer says that the evangelists were not “only” interested in “accumulating facts” (which is true). However, the context shows that his own conclusion is that as a result of this limited interest they actually presented error. On p. 11 there is a false alternative, that of finding the “real living Lord” by means of a questioning faith, on the one hand, over against, on the other, a faith that “represses all questions” and holds to an “idealistic picture” that is really “an idol.” It is surely illogical to say that the alternative to doubt is adoring an idol.

In spite of these criticisms I would emphasize that Schweizer’s purpose is to keep the reader from falling into a ditch on either side of the road and to lead him in the middle of the way. Thus there is a reappearance of some of the earlier language of qualification: “Faith cannot be reduced to a mere intellectual acceptance of a heilsgeschichtlich pattern or a dogmatic formula or a specific understanding of human existence,” and “it means more than being taught a truth which humans would have to accept in order to be saved” (pp. 54-55) (italics mine in both quotations). Schweizer thinks that an existential interpretation probably comes closer to Luke’s understanding than does Heilsgeschichte or orthodoxy (pp. 41-48). We must re-experience the work of God and the love of God that was experienced by the people on the pages of Luke. Luke provides us with narratives and parables. These are not to be dissected but are to be seen as expressing the unique work of God and the way in which we can relate to him.

Among the positive features of Schweizer’s presentation are his appreciation of the
unique contribution of Luke, his affirmation of the deity of Christ as expressed in Phil 2:6-8 (p. 77), his insightful interpretation of the parable of the prodigal son (pp. 78-81), and his treatment of the Christological titles (pp. 82-89). He has one of the best brief summaries of positions on the “Son of Man” issue that I have seen. There is no doubt that Schweizer attempts to support orthodox theology, even if his closing paragraph sounds uncomfortably close to process theology (p. 95).

Given his concerns with the theological students whom he addresses, his own background in continental theology and Church life, and his concern that the Bible and the person of Jesus become relevant, the discerning reader can be grateful for Schweizer’s performance on the high wire. However, the theologically “weak brother” had better not climb on his shoulders for the ride across.

Walter L. Liefeld

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL


A doctoral dissertation written at the University of St. Andrews under the direction of Matthew Black and R. McL. Wilson, this monograph is a helpful addition to the growing body of literature on the use of the OT in the NT. The approach is to take a NT theme, the passion of Jesus, and investigate the hermeneutical “process whereby Scripture was appropriated for the task of proclaiming the significance of Jesus’ passion and justifying it as a divinely-willed circumstance” (p. 4). Moo’s NT matrix is the passion narratives of the four gospels as well as other references in the gospels to Jesus’ suffering. The OT material is organized according to larger original contexts (Zechariah 9-14; Isaianic servant songs) or literary form (lament Psalms and OT sacrificial imagery). For completeness the author has a section on miscellaneous OT passages that occur in gospel passion texts.

In order to develop categories by which to analyze the NT use of the OT, the author surveys the hermeneutical process in late Judaism by which Jewish writers interpreted and applied OT Scripture. He identifies three major aspects of the process: The literary framework in which the OT was used, the appropriation technique employed to make the OT text meaningful to the Jewish writer’s audience, and the hermeneutical axioms concerning “the nature of Scripture and the community’s own sense of self-identity” (p. 57), which gave rise to the hermeneutical process. Important subcategories identified are the types of citation: explicit or implicit quotation, allusion, conceptual influence, and the kinds of appropriation techniques. He isolates direct appropriation (in the gospel narratives: prophecy or typology), reorientation of the OT text (violation of original text or context) and modification of the point of application, the writer’s and audience’s contemporary situation (creation of contemporary details out of the OT text).

Through careful exegetical investigation, which deals thoroughly with all the interpretive issues attendant to his topic, Moo traces Jesus’ and the gospel writer’s hermeneutical approach to the OT. He concludes that the Isaianic servant songs, mainly allusions, “form the OT context most often utilized as a background to describe Jesus’ passion and death. Not only are these passages cited more often than any other, they are the most popular in each of the gospels as well” (p. 356). He argues most strongly against Morna Hooker that the identification of the “servant” with Jesus originated with Jesus, not the early Church.

Moo’s consideration of Zechariah 9-14 uncovers the use of explicit quotations mainly by Matthew and John with a few references by Jesus. There is a direct appropriation of the suffering and judging shepherd-king to the suffering Jesus, except in one instance. Moo concludes that the text form of Zech 11:12-13 in Matt 27:9-10 has been altered to fit the details of Judas’ betrayal. He sees this as an example of reorientation of the text through textual modification (p. 377).

The lament Psalms provide a particular challenge to those who would understand the
A hermeneutical process involved. While the synoptics present lament psalm material as allusions, John gives it as explicit quotations introduced by a fulfillment word. How can psalms ostensibly describing David's or another ancient's experience be properly understood as prophecy now fulfilled in Jesus' suffering and death? Moo sensitively handles the issue and concludes that typological identification with a semipredictive element present is the best way to identify the hermeneutical process that establishes the relationship.

The author's discussion concerning OT sacrificial imagery deals particularly with the Passover and Akedah. He concludes that a conceptual influence from general sacrificial terminology is present and that Jesus is understood typologically as the Passover lamb especially at the last supper.

The values of this monograph are many. The breadth and depth of learning are demonstrated in the full bibliographical control of the broad range of topics. It is also seen in the command of sophisticated linguistic and interpretational methods. There are concise yet comprehensive discussions of all the major issues related to interpreting the use of the OT in the passion narratives. Whether it be the textual history of the Hebrew or Greek OT text, the date of the crucifixion, or basic issues for interpreting the Psalms, the reader will be delightfully enriched in his understanding.

The "Conclusions" chapter is especially valuable for its summary classification tables of all the OT evidence. Not only does the writer give a comparison and contrast of the various gospel writers' approaches to using the OT, but he also presents a most helpful comparison (better: contrast) of NT practice with the approaches of late Judaism. Finally, he makes a strong case for the legitimacy of the hermeneutic that the NT writers employ.

In almost every instance, they do not violate the text's meaning in the original context when they interpret and apply it as fulfilled in Jesus' passion, and they almost without exception refrain from creating NT passion details from OT material. Moo gives an especially good set of arguments (pp. 379-380) against the view that the gospel writers "historized" OT material in the construction of their passion narratives.

The conclusion concerning Zech 11:12-13/Matt 27:9-10 is given in two different forms (pp. 207, 377), which creates ambiguity. This needs to be clarified lest the potential negative impact on inerrancy from one of them (p. 377) remain. Moo concludes initially that in Matthew's appropriation of Zechariah "there is no departure from the basic thrust of Zechariah's prophecy" (p. 209). This would mean that there was no misinterpretation involved. Yet in his concluding chapter he states: "In only one instance does it appear clear that an OT passage has had its meaning altered in the process of appropriation—Mt. 27:9-10, in which Zech. 11:12 is given a significance distinct from its context" (p. 377). What is at issue is whether Matthew intends to apply the prophet's role in Zechariah 11 to Judas.

Since it is only one instance, the predominant profile of the gospel writer's hermeneutic should probably call us to re-examine the analysis and conclusion concerning this "exception." If Matthew limited his appropriation of Zechariah to an allusive reference to the price paid and the one valued, then there is no alteration of meaning. The introductory formula that points us to Jeremiah (Jer 18:2-3; 19:2) and the attachment of the quote to the consequent action of the potter's field purchase would also support this limitation. The focus is on what the leaders did with the money. Judas' receipt of the betrayal price is not in view.

Having said this, I must emphasize that with this monograph Moo has enriched us with a well-developed, comprehensive and synthetic view of the use of the OT in the gospel passion narratives.

William J. Larkin, Jr.


Jansen expressly conceives of his work as an attempt to describe the significance of Easter in the NT as a whole. It is not an exegetical contribution to NT research. He wants
to show that the meaning of Easter is "a unifying focus in the rich diversity of New Testament thought and life." The book's audience is the pastor or layperson.

The centrality of the resurrection is seen in a number of matters in the NT: Explicit reference is made to it in all NT books except 2 Thessalonians, Titus, Philemon, 2 and 3 John, and Jude; it is an "orientation point" for at least five principal NT concerns; diverse literary forms and devices are used to express it; wide and exalted imagery and vocabulary are used to express it. Even the diversity of accounts in the gospels and the NT's relating this to OT themes attest the importance of the resurrection for salvation history.

Jansen's approach in setting out the significance of Easter faith is to begin with the meaning of the resurrection as a past event and then move to its importance in disclosing the future, and finally to its significance for the present.

Easter as a past event is a revelation of a number of things. The resurrection was God's "Yes" to Jesus' ministry. Easter is God's vindication of that ministry. The theme of vindication is also closely related to that of exaltation (e.g. Phil 2:6-11; Eph 1:19-23). It is the declaration of God that he has exalted Jesus. Moreover, the cross and the resurrection together constitute the great redemption purchased by Christ. Easter also signifies restored fellowship, between Jesus and the disciples as well as between God and the sinner through Christ's righteousness. Finally, the resurrection as a past event is closely linked with intercession (Rom 8:33-34) and God's victory (Col 1:13).

Jansen then moves to the future, the "not yet." The resurrection is eloquent witness that the risen Jesus Christ is Lord and will be confessed as such by all. Easter is the revelation of the glory of God to be revealed when Jesus appears in glory. The glory of Christ, which only rarely broke through in his early ministry, is an anticipation of the future. When Christ comes in glory, that will be the ultimate vindication of Jesus. This vindication will also bring judgment on God's enemies. The bodily resurrection is a sign that the effects of the incarnation will continue, though Christ's body is a spiritual one. Easter is also related to Israel's future. He is the hope of Israel (Romans 9-11).

Christ's resurrection is also related to the future of the world. Jansen will not speculate concerning what exactly that hope is. Finally, Christ's resurrection is the ground of hope of "the resurrection of the dead" at the end of the age.

The third perspective on Easter is the present. Easter shapes the worship and work of the Church today. The resurrection and ascension result in the gift of the Spirit, who is the agent of the risen Lord today. Easter changes the day of worship to Sunday. Baptism is a symbol of Christ's victory over the devil and demons at the cross. The resurrected Lord is present with his Church in the Lord's supper and empowers them in their witness and service.

From this summary it should be clear that there is much that is of profit in this book. But evangelicals, particularly pastors and laymen, will find the often lengthy and tedious attempts to trace the origin of certain beliefs of little help or interest.

Paul D. Feinberg

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL


Gordon H. Clark was professor of philosophy at Covenant College (now retired) and has authored about thirty books. He writes from a strong Presbyterian background. It is clear from the "Introduction" as well as the two appendices that his main concern (and what gave impetus to the commentary) was the ordination of women within that denomination (see p. ix).

excursus on the Trinity Foundation, the nonprofit foundation that published the volume.

The format consists of the author’s translation in one- to two-verse segments, with commentary following. The book suffers considerably from a lack of structural awareness (e.g. each chapter of an epistle begins a new chapter in the commentary), and there is no outline to reflect the overall structure.

The tone of the book throughout may be characterized by rancor. Indeed, after completing the book I had to ask whether I understood the pastorals better or whether I had received a taste of Clark’s personal opinions. A few quite typical statements should serve to illustrate the book’s tone: “Clearly many churches today have no regard for Biblical teaching; and it is not strange that the churches with women pastors and elders also try to accept and even ordain homosexuals” (pp. 45-46). “Some commentators, relying on imagination rather than on evidence, suggest that Paul here [1 Tim 6:15] quotes a hymn—as if Paul could not by his own intelligence praise God in these terms” (p. 116).

The NEB is often maligned in terms that do not ring of objectivity: “The New English Bible merits first place in the department of terrible translations. . . Old English is much better” (p. 18). “Therefore the New English Bible is perverse: ‘Every inspired scripture has its use . . . ’ To arrive at this translation, the New English Bible had to disregard the kai (and)” (p. 179).

In my opinion the book does record valuable insights (e.g. the philological note on p. 53), but it falls short of dealing with the issues addressed in a constructive manner. All Biblical interpreters are entitled to their strong opinions—I have mine and Clark has his. When they differ (and, actually, mine and Clark’s differ quite little), the best approach is to discuss the differences, not by impugning motives or sincerity but by a relaxed re-examination of the relevant phenomena in Scripture. Believers are aided far more in their understanding of Biblical truth by the latter. 

David C. Baker

Winona Lake, IN


Paige Patterson has given us a book that his preface identifies as “an attempt to present an exposition of First Peter in the light of the current intellectual, sociological, and theological milieu.” This is a large assignment for such a small book. In reality the author seems to have given us only light from his own “theological milieu,” which is more in line with the size of the text. Yet at times the text is capably applied to our current social problems, such as on p. 103: “Now if Jesus is co-equal with the Father, yet voluntarily pours Himself into humanity (see Phil. 2:7), temporarily accepting a subordinate role of obedience to His Father in order to accomplish redemption, then how can submission to role subordination advocated in the Scriptures in other areas of our own lives be interpreted as demeaning?” But in general this work does not arrive at the stated lofty goal.

Following a seven-page introduction, the order of the chapters and verses is followed for the remainder of this work. These numbers of pages are given to the chapters covered: 47, 34, 48, 25, 19. The author appears to have been trying to remain within a certain number of pages as he moved more quickly through the last two chapters.

The desire to help students of the Word understand the richness of the help available in the study of the Greek text is apparent throughout this commentary. Yet the attempt to make Greek understandable has left the author sounding as if he were a first-year student of Greek, which he is not. Occasionally this simplifying approach to Greek has left an understanding that is tangential to the truth. On p. 159 the verb diakoneō is identified as “the word which becomes our English word ‘deacon.’” Again, on p. 110 in a discussion of kyrios it is stated: “Though the term is often used of Jesus, the word itself does not necessarily imply deity.” This appears in the middle of a discussion that causes one to ask: “Why raise
the question of deity when it is not being discussed?" Furthermore, the statement leaves a reader who has no knowledge of the heritage of kyrios in the Jewish tradition with the understanding that there is no connection between the NT use of this word and the deity of Jesus. Somewhat more clarity would have been helpful.

Another problem that may have developed because of the brevity of the book is the author's tendency to make generalizations without supporting sources or documentation. The men chosen by the Church in Acts 6 are identified as deacons (p. 177). Then the transition from apostolic to pastoral authority is assumed on p. 179.

This commentary will be a welcome source to all ministers who are twisting their minds to achieve witty structure in their sermon outlines. Every section of text is introduced by what may appear to be sermon outline headings. But the author often pushes beyond the realistic to accomplish his desired parallel structure. For an introduction to the fourth chapter he gives the following divisions: "1. Sufficient Revellings (4:1-3); 2. Strange Righteousness (4:4-6); 3. Sagacious Reciprocity (4:7-11)." Although useful, some of these headings are somewhat trite.

The author has produced a very readable text that can be recommended to the beginning student. The text itself will not offer much help to the preacher or scholar. The more serious student will find the material suggested in the four-page bibliography most helpful.

Charles B. Stephenson

Lubbock Christian College, Lubbock, TX


In short, this is a book on special hermeneutics. As such it makes a unique contribution. Most intelligent Christians have some concept of the principles of general hermeneutics. At least they have often heard that they should observe the context. But when it comes to the interpretation of individual passages, distortions in abundance intrude into Bible studies, Sunday-school classes, and even pulpits. The literature of Scripture is too rich and varied to be covered by a few general principles. Each body of Biblical literature requires an insight into its background, genre and unique forms. The editors and authors (all present or past members of the Wheaton College faculty) have produced a volume designed to address this need.

A brief but useful introduction (by Bullock), including some comments on general hermeneutics, prepares the reader for the more detailed sections. The chapter on the Pentateuch (by Samuel J. Schultz) illustrates the level of readership for whom the book is intended. It is well written and appealing, even to the Biblically unsophisticated reader. Some material that many of us might like to have seen included is omitted, probably so as not to clutter the small space available for each section. Two examples of the principles cited are "The Pentateuch is more than ordinary history" and "As a historical narrative the Pentateuch records facts about persons, places, and events." The treatment of these two topics is simplistic, but it has to be for the readership. There is, for example, no discussion of Heilsgeschichte and no reference to recent discussion on the interpretation of narratives. The interpretation of Genesis 1-11 is handled in nine lines, most of which are a reference to another scholar. The fifth principle, "The central theme of the Pentateuch is the relationship between God and man," makes no reference by name to the covenants, to "promise theology," or to other thematic approaches to OT theology. But again the editors had to decide what the intended reader could handle. The chapter closes with an "Illustrative Example," as is provided at the conclusion of each chapter in this book (in this case Deut 4:1-24).

The chapter on the historical books continues the very readable style, but the author (James E. Jennings) does introduce some technical terminology (Geschichte and historia). The section on background, though necessarily brief, is important for the average Bible
student to grasp. The author emphasizes the need for lexicology and grammar but without providing reference helps such as he does in the section on background and archaeology (his field of specialization). The section on types of historical literature, and in particular the distinction between "casual" and "deliberative" history, will open up new understandings for the layperson.

Wisdom literature is introduced by Herbert M. Wolf in a clear and concise way, including such practical considerations as the meaning of "train up a child" in Prov 22:6. The treatment of "The Songs of Israel" includes a good brief discussion of the difference between exegesis and hermeneutics. But again this is for the layperson, and one should not look here for any reference to discussion of contemporary issues. The interpretive principles outlined in this chapter are worth review by even the more sophisticated reader to guarantee that one is not introducing subjective distortions into this Biblical hymnbook. The discussion of the structural division of the Psalms into five books is necessarily brief but might have been enhanced by some characterization of each section. The principle to "investigate the NT usage" of the Psalms is of course an important one, but some will object to the author's appeal to the sensus plenior. Four possible interpretive approaches to the Song of Songs are provided, but one is disappointed not to find an unambiguous statement of the author's own preference.

It must have been frustrating for Schultz to deal with the prophetic literature in fewer than eight full pages (exclusive of the illustrative example). Yet the principles are laid out clearly and, if followed, could prevent many a disastrous sermon.

The NT receives more than half of the space in the book. This pleases me as a Neutestamentler, but in honesty I must say that the OT suffers from lack of adequate space. Yet I am sure that the authors of the NT sections felt they needed even more space than they had. After a lucid introduction to the synoptics, the author (Walter A. Elwell) provides six rules that must suffice to cover the 75% of the material that is narrative in form, warning against the excesses of form and redaction criticism (without mentioning these by name) and also outlining the necessary guidelines for the layperson to use. An example: "The material should be allowed to speak for itself" is followed by only three and a half lines of explanation. There is no discussion of or even reference to narrative hermeneutics.

The reader would have no clue as to the progress of synoptic studies over the past several decades. This is not because the author is unaware (quite the contrary) but because he is rigorously keeping to the obvious intent and readership level of the book. I assume that he experienced frustration also in the section on parables. How can one possibly do justice to the complex hermeneutics and contemporary scholarship with less than six lines to explain this guideline: "Parables usually contain one central meaning, although sometimes there may be more"? Yet author and editors had to make decisions as to balance, in this case allotting little more than a page to the parables, two pages to apocalyptic materials in the gospels and just under two pages to OT quotations in the gospels. Then a page or so is given to the synoptics individually. Scholars who specialize in the synoptic gospels will miss references to contemporary discussion of their social milieu, their theological standpoint and their purpose. A scholar reading this chapter, and probably many others in this book, without knowing the copyright date might assume that it was written decades ago. But that is not a criticism. It is my responsibility to inform readers of this Journal what and what not to expect in this work. Were the review written for a magazine rather than a journal, I would not even point such things out. Again I emphasize that the authors are competent and well-read scholars who have deliberately withheld a good deal of the "scholarly" language and comments that they are capable of providing. It is to their credit that they were able to do this so well.

That this is not easy is illustrated in the chapter on the Johannine literature (written by the late Steven Barabas). After two helpful comments for the lay person—"Read through the whole book several times" and "Read some material . . . on the background"—one stumbles upon "The next step is the recovery of the text, or textual criticism." I was going
to use this as a springboard to suggest that the next edition of the book include helpful basic bibliography for each chapter and section. But as I continued reading I came across three pages of just that kind of useful resource. I do not understand why the editors did not provide this kind of bibliography (most of which is actually general rather than applying merely to John) for the entire OT and NT sections.

Inch provides a chapter on Luke-Acts that includes some helpful thematic guidelines. A larger amount of space was allowed to Arthur A. Rupprecht for writing on the Pauline epistles, though still small considering the relative space these occupy in the NT. Rupprecht uses the space well, providing a masterful discussion that includes a survey of approaches to Paul's theology. The discussion of Hebrews (by Donald A. Hagner) introduces recent contributions to the understanding of that book and provides a good deal of useful information, yet without sacrificing clarity. The twenty-eight lines on "Heavenly Archetypes and Earthly Copies" is a compact, lucid, contemporary explanation.

The principles Norman R. Ericson sets forth in the chapter on the Petrine literature are very helpful, though the lay person may not know what "amanuensis" means or how to handle the observation of "omission of grammatical elements," etc. In the concluding chapter on apocalyptic literature Gilbert G. Bilezianian skillfully guides the lay reader into this difficult material. General principles are given that are in each case applied to the apocalyptic texts. The reader will not find, however, the summaries of different approaches to the scheme of Revelation that are customarily found in introductions to commentaries on that book.

A large portion of the book is devoted to the "Illustrative Examples." These are presented in two columns: a commentary and an "explanation." The latter leads the reader through the text in a disciplined way, exemplifying the use of hermeneutical principles. While the quality of this varies somewhat from author to author, on the whole it provides a superb insight into the discipline of Bible study. It is this praxis that contributes to the uniqueness of the book. One way I can see this text being used is to have students in a college class, young people's group, Sunday-school class, or home Bible study read each chapter and then come prepared to discuss the way the principles are applied in the "Illustrative Example."

I would urge, even though scholars who read this review may find the book elementary, that they do everything possible to secure its adoption in classrooms, churches, Sunday schools and home study groups. It could revolutionize the Bible study habits of this generation of Christians.

Walter L. Liefeld

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL


Thomas Torrance, a recognized Calvin scholar and translator, recently (1979) retired professor of Christian dogmatics at Edinburgh University, Scotland, has placed in print his 1982 lectures at the British Isles Nazarene College.

The purpose of these lectures is "to help students, ministers and pastors, and other church leaders and workers, to think theologically about the Gospel." But what pastors do you know who could make sense out of "laic destiny" (p. 40) or know the importance and meaning of "Am Ha 'Aretz" (p. 26) in the NT gospels? Torrance writes in an ample analytical style that some clergy and most laity would find complex and cumbersome. This is in spite of the fact that there is not one footnote or endnote in the entire book. But in fact this is one of the easier Torrance books to read. What one reads here are some seminal thoughts expounded elsewhere in his other writings. The lectures have a personal texture, which is a definite switch from his other sustained argumentatively arranged books. His reflections in this short volume reveal the same brilliant intellect, the same finished style, the same theological slant, but without the same elaborate argumentation.
Of special interest is his handling of the relationship of the gospel to Israel and of his ideas about Jesus’ “intimate bond with Israel” (p. 13). This should attract the attention of all eschatology buffs. Torrance says, “Jesus Christ in Israel and not apart from Israel, so that Israel . . . is nevertheless included by God for ever within his elected way of mediating knowledge of himself to the world” (p. 32). Torrance sees Israel as assimilated in the Word of God: “Israel came into being . . . as the corporate counterpart to the self-revelation and self-communication of God to mankind” (p. 23). The claim seems to be that Israel is more than a medium. Indeed “the Word of God was built into the inner structure and continuity of Israel” (p. 22).

Israel is viewed as “transient physical clothing” (p. 25). And the reality and perpetuity of its election are claimed to be as close as space and time (p. 25). Torrance believes that Israel is still elect (p. 24).

Dispensational premillennialists would find this no problem. But amillennialists, myself among them, understand that the salvific election is not a nationalistic phenomenon, nor is the chosenness of Israel the theme of chosenness in the NT. Israel lost their election in their rejection of Christ, temporarily. Indeed their election in the first place was salvific, and the Church became a new entity by the inclusion of redeemed Gentiles with redeemed Jews. As I see it there is not a postponed earthly kingdom but an abandoned earthly kingship that was the juncture where Gentiles became the new and additional target group.

The really damaging expansion of Torrance’s thesis is that Israel rises from his claim of a revelation role to a redemptive role. This is a bold step and a questionable position. He refers to “the vicarious role” of Israel (pp. 48, 54, 55). There is an implicit challenge to Jesus here, as in the earlier claim there is an implicit challenge to Scripture. If Israel becomes identified with the Word of God, then what is to stop one from ascribing the same to the Christian Church? Does this too become the Word of God? It seems to me that Torrance has taken steps not forward but backwards to the thesis of Wilhelm Hermann who taught that the Church is the Word of God. Torrance does not deal with this next step, but it seems to me that there is nothing to hinder taking it.

The inclusion of Israel into a “vicarious role in the mediation of reconciliation to mankind, apart from which even Jesus Christ cannot properly be understood” (p. 55) is attributing to Israel a significance not warranted in Scripture. Israel was indeed representative, but not vicarious in a reconciliation context. The only true Israel is Jesus Christ, according to his own words. In John 15:1 Jesus said, “I am the true vine”—i.e., “I am the true Israel,” for the vine was the symbol of Israel. Torrance has not interacted with this text and truth. To me it diminishes Israel as we know it and puts all the emphasis on Jesus.

There is another overemphasis in this slim book. Torrance believes that theology should be shaped or take its shape from current science (p. 61). This sets him up for a functional Christology (pp. 62, 71, 72), which he dialectically maintains with statements of Jesus’ full deity (p. 68).

Torrance’s book is calculated to stretch the mind. He forces the modern churchman to interact with him. Particularly insightful are his sterling and shattering lines on the natural hatred of man against the God of self-revelation (pp. 20, 21, 38).

In one of Torrance’s shortest books, however, I find unwarranted excess and lack of moderation: He grants too much to modern Israel and too much to modern science.

John Lewis Gilmore

First United Church of Christ, Cincinnati, OH


This is a well-written, attractive volume that fulfils a genuine need. On the whole it gives clear and helpful answers to questions that searching Christians may be asking about “belief.” As such, this is an excellent tool that will serve the body of Christ well. Compre-
hensively but succinctly it presents informative articles on key people, positions and movements that have influenced the Church in history. In addition it illustrates how the faith of the Church has been expressed in its pronouncements, creeds and struggles to preserve and declare its unique message to the world. Rightly, the preface points out that "no one lives without beliefs. We all believe something, have some view of what life means. And what we believe affects us deeply. In a real sense we are what we believe. So doctrine and belief are not something to be left to the theorists or the experts. Our understanding of Christianity, and our response to it, will be the most crucial thing in our whole lives."

In many ways this volume should be a handy reference for clergy and nonclergy alike. Busy pastors and clergymen will find in it an easy reference book to discover how the faith of the Church was expressed at different times and by different people. Evangelical Christians who have not pursued formal theological studies will also find much in this handbook to help them grow in an understanding of the truth.

Representing as it does the work of many authors explains why the various articles differ in quality and also in depth of discernment. For instance, all of the authors do not seem to have the same sensitivity to truth and error. The material on women in ecclesiastical office is treated in a very fair and objective way. On the other hand, many readers of this Journal may share some of this reviewer's concern about the obvious bias manifested in dealing with such matters as liberal theology and the theology of Karl Barth. No one would want to deny that these theologies stimulate the thinking and study of evangelicals. At the same time, from an evangelical, Biblical point of view one wonders whether the authors of such articles have been sufficiently critical of the departures from the truths of Scripture and the faith of the historic Christian Church as is the case with theologies such as these. In this reviewer's judgment, therefore, this volume should be used with a measure of discernment and Christian maturity.

First Christian Reformed Church, Chino, CA

Richard J. Venema


Here is a textbook that teaches, and teaches quite well. The author is both a physicist and a theologian, presently teaching systematic theology at Western Theological Seminary in Holland, Michigan.

He desires to set forth the Biblical roots of the doctrine of God, to trace its historical development to this century, and to provide a survey of contemporary alternatives to classical theism. Kaiser admirably accomplishes his purpose. In the scope of six chapters the reader is taken on a refreshing tour of the Scriptural data concerning the nature of God and its restatement and development through twenty centuries of theological reflection. Although it is a bold adventure to tackle such a massive amount of material in such a short space (128 pp. of text, plus endnotes), _The Doctrine of God_ leads the reader patiently and clearly through the maze of opposing views in the trinitarian controversy. To do this the author divides the work into three parts. Part 1: "Biblical Roots" first develops the concept of God in Yahweh's self-disclosure in the OT before examining the NT revelation of the Triune Lord. Part 2: "Historical Development" traces the formulation of trinitarian theism in three periods of Church history (the patristic, from Augustine to the Reformation, and from the Reformation to the twentieth century). Part 3: "Contemporary Presentations" discusses three contemporary theologians (Barth, Pannenberg and Macquarrie).

This reviewer finished the book with a feeling of satisfaction after having been exposed to more than elementary material about God's person. Kaiser writes crisply, giving ample restatements of ground covered to help the reader keep oriented to both the Bible and history. Examples to tantalize: "We realize that the 'deity' of Jesus, important as it may seem to us, was not an issue for the early Christians as much as the 'yahweh-ness' of Jesus was" (p. 32). "The Father is Lord and God by definition; Jesus is Lord and God by identifi-
cation; and the Spirit is Lord and God by association” (p. 43).

The brilliant synthesis of historical arguments over the Trinity will help more than beginning college students. Seminarians struggling to master so much theology in so little time, and even experienced teachers of theology, will discover a true friend in Kaiser’s work. His intrapersonal (psychological) and interpersonal (societal) models for understanding the Trinity aid greatly.

The clarity and succinctness with which the author explains Barth and Pannenberg is amazing. Educated laymen should be able to “get a handle” on these sometimes abstruse theologians. Examples: “In order to understand the dialectic of God’s self-determination, as Barth portrays it here, one must imagine that God has a time and history of his own, independent of and anterior to all creaturely time and history” (p. 116). “To say that God does not yet fully exist, or that his essence is not yet complete, implies that the process of God’s self-determination is historical for Pannenberg, not meta-historical as it was for Barth” (p. 121).

Amid the gems in Kaiser, however, the conservative orthodox reader will find a few flaws. Kaiser apparently accepts the Q-document theory (p. 34) and takes an ambiguous stand on the historicity of the account of Jesus stilling the storm (p. 34). He underestimates the contributions of American fundamentalism and revived seventeenth-century Calvinism in meeting modern attacks on the traditional doctrine of God. He maintains an accommodating stance toward secular science and historical criticism (pp. 110-111). To state that “pan-enthism, on the other hand, is the view that everything is in God, and, as such, it has good biblical precedent (Acts 17:28; Col. 1:16)” (p. 127) but not give further explanation is dangerous for the theological health of the undiscerning.

I recommend this book, even with its few flaws, for any serious-minded student of theology. The author accomplishes his goal of giving an adequate but short historical survey of the doctrine of God. Ministers will find a fresh review of theology here, and students will have an excellent supplement to their standard texts. It is part of a series that is a worthy attempt to articulate clearly the historic faith for a new generation of college students.

Floyd S. Elmore

Dallas Bible College, Dallas, TX


For many years it had been recognized among those who have worked closely on this subject that Seventh-Day Adventist literature in this area is not only partisan but also lacking in scholarly acumen—with perhaps the single exception of the major work by J. N. Andrews and L. R. Conradi, History of the Sabbath and First Day of the Week (1912). The generalization no longer holds: Not only do we have the work by Samuele Bacchiocchi, From Sabbath to Sunday (1977), but now also the work under review.

Most of the contributors are connected with Andrews University in Michigan or its associated Seventh-Day Adventist Theological Seminary. After a brief introduction by the editor the book offers 16 chapters divided into three general areas. The first six chapters deal with Sabbath and Sunday in the Biblical period: Gerhard F. Hasel, “The Sabbath in the

The central arguments of Seventh-Day Adventists regarding the Sabbath are well known. The Sabbath law is seen as a permanently binding moral requirement that cannot be weakened in any way, even to a principal “one day in seven” that might allow for the “transfer theology” especially prominent in many strands of Protestantism—a theology that argues for the legitimacy of calling Sunday the Christian Sabbath. A close reading of in-house debates recorded in AUSS in recent years, however, shows quite a number of disagreements among Seventh-Day Adventists regarding a number of technical points. For instance, Bacchiocchi’s reconstruction of the rise of Sunday observance in early Christianity is certainly not shared by all Adventists. The book’s sweep from Biblical materials right through to historical and theological assessments gives a flavor of comprehensiveness; but, correspondingly, a number of critical issues are handled very lightly or not at all. In many of the chapters on various historical periods and locations in the Church, for instance, the authors regularly speak of the “majority” view and the “minority” view at the time, without indicating whether the “minority” view, with which they are almost always in sympathy, was a major option or something reserved for the fringe. The point is not academic: In almost any period one can find fringe groups that believe all sorts of interesting and strange things. But it is misleading to argue that their opinions represent one of the genuine historical options unless one establishes the relative importance of the minority opinion in each of the eras under consideration.

The Biblical material receives rather short shrift, especially the NT. Probably the weakest part of this book is the failure to consider how the canon is put together on central issues. It is probably impossible to talk persuasively about the Sabbath without dealing with the relationships between law and grace, between prophecy and fulfillment, between type and antitype, and much more. There is no attempt to address these matters, and only the briefest consideration is given to Hebrews 4. The central defense of the Adventist position on Rom 14:5-6 is essentially ad hoc rather than exegetical, historical or theological: “Who could have a divine commandment before him and say to others: ‘You can treat that commandment as you please; it really makes no difference whether you keep it or not?’ No apostle could conduct such an argument. And probably no man would be more surprised with that interpretation than Paul himself, who had utmost respect for the Decalogue, God’s law, which is ‘holy, and just, and good’ (chap. 7:12)” (p. 335). There is no even-handed attempt to sort out the bases on which earliest Christianity did not keep some laws. The most common explanation given in Protestantism bases itself on the tripartite distinction
of Aquinas: Law can be divided into three parts—viz., moral, civil and ceremonial—and only the first continues under the new covenant. The New Chalcedon movement offers another distinction; Lutherans yet another; and I have joined with others in suggesting yet another. Although some of these structures are briefly discussed in one chapter, that chapter bases its critique on an assumed Adventist position rather than returning to Scripture and arguing the matter out at a fundamental level. Indeed it is probably this chapter that uses the least disciplined language in the book. For instance, John Murray is accused of using a "device of dissecting" the Sabbath from the seventh day of the week, of introducing "an illegitimate contrast" that is "utterly foreign to the Bible" in a position that "would destroy a good memorial of a perfect work done" by Christ, and so forth.

But perhaps this is to ask too much from one book. It is certainly unfortunate that both this book, edited by Strand, and the one I edited under the title From Sabbath to Lord's Day have come out so close in time to each other that neither was able to interact with the other's work. The reading of Strand's book has convinced me afresh that if anything new is to be done in the area, if we are to move beyond the mere articulation of polarized positions to a genuine attempt at resolution, all of us are going to have to grapple much more strongly with the enormously complex questions regarding the patterns of connections between the OT and the NT. Even for the benefit of having that conviction reinforced, I am grateful to have read this book.

D. A. Carson


In his acknowledgements Dennison states that the book is a revision of his Th.M. thesis at Pittsburgh Theological Seminary in 1973. The format of the book makes this clear also; it is offset printing from a typed manuscript.

The book is divided into chapters by periods of doctrinal development. Each period is discussed to highlight the developing contrast between Puritans and the established Church regarding Sabbath observance. In the earliest period, 1532-1603, the two groups agreed on the need for enforcing Sabbath observance but disagreed about the basis for such observance. The prelate hoped Sabbath observance would increase attendance at divine service, while the Puritan was also concerned about desecration of the Sabbath through commerce and frolics, "a relic of popery and an offense to God" (p. 22). Later in the period Puritans such as Perkins, Greenham and Bownd asserted that Sabbath observance was a creation ordinance that obligated one day in seven for divine service in worship and deeds of mercy. Bownd's classic work detailing this and other aspects of the Puritan view of the Sabbath was denounced by members of the establishment. Many of the prelatic party believed Sabbath observance was an ordinance of the Church and that other holy days might also be designated by the Church. The chapter on the first period ends with a paradoxical quotation from Richard Hooker, "perfection of the via media" (p. 42). Hooker seems to side with the Puritan view of the Sabbath rather than with the prelates.

In the second period, 1603-1633, differences between the parties became more polarized. Differences centered on three points: "(1) Whether the keeping of one day in seven is part of God's moral law; (2) Whether the Lord's day is established _jure divino_; (3) Whether the church may change the day" (p. 47). The Puritans generally affirmed the first two of these points and denied the third, believing that God inspired the apostles relative to point two. The establishment took the opposite position on each issue. Then in 1617 King James I issued the famous _Declaration of Lawful Sports_ that defended the right of humble Englishmen to engage in games and recreation on the Sabbath. This offended Puritans greatly. The offense was heightened later under Charles I and Archbishop William Laud. Differences between the parties hardened as the monarchy insisted on divine right and
Puritans affirmed Biblical authority—and that according to their rigid interpretation.

The third period, 1633-1650, saw the balance of power changed dramatically. At the beginning the Book of Sports was reissued as required reading in every church. In 1643 the Book of Sports was burned in public. Dennison details differences with respect to Sabbath observance in connection with seven questions to which the parties gave contrary answers. The opposite positions had hardened. Puritans insisted that the Sabbath be entirely devoted to “works of worship, mercy and necessity” (p. 113) according to divine commandment. The establishment insisted that Sabbath observance was an ordinance of the Church. “The Westminster Standards contain the most complete statement of the doctrine of the Sabbath to be found anywhere in the Reformed Confessions” (p. 114). Thus Puritan concern is highlighted at the culmination of the revolutionary period.

The fourth period, 1650-1700, saw a de-emphasis on the theological debate along with a general agreement in practice. “The practice of Sabbath rest had become a national custom” (p. 119). Sectarians now arose to assert seventh-day Sabbatarianism, and refutations followed. Both theologically and practically the Puritan view had triumphed (p. 138).

Dennison’s study is very helpful in understanding the development of the Puritan idea of the Sabbath. His notes and appendices are also very useful to the scholar wishing to pursue the study further. Occasionally his meaning is obscure, such as his reference to Bownd and Greenham and their works (pp. 32 ff.) and to Bownd’s “clear” answer given on p. 36. Generally his writing style is good. The work is a useful addition to research on Puritan thought.

Central Wesleyan College, Central, SC

James B. Bross


The year of Luther’s 500th celebration did much to stimulate increased thought, if not discussion, regarding the differences separating mainline Protestant denominations and the Roman Catholic Church. The process, however, began as early as 1965 when Catholic and Lutheran theologians met to discuss such problem areas as baptism, the Eucharist, papal infallibility, Church authority and the priesthood. The discussions between these two groups have produced seven reports on justification alone, culminating in a 21,000-word report that indicated that the two groups are in substantial agreement regarding Luther’s proclamation of faith alone. The Lutherans have not been alone in their attempt to establish common ground with those of the Catholic tradition. Recently a Reformed theologian, Richard Mouw, has called the Bishops’ Pastoral Letter “a prophetic voice as a pilgrim people,” suggesting that “the time has come to find new ways to speak and act together as we travel together toward the City of God” (Reformed Journal, March 1984).

As with many trends in scholarly circles, the laity rarely understands the new quest for a synthesis within the two long-standing traditions. Rather, they maintain the radical antithesis without clearly understanding the issues at focus or the correct emphasis of each tradition. Peter Toon purposes to write for those camping within the Reformation tradition and explain for them the major differences between the two traditions, as well as explaining their common ground.

Toon begins each chapter with the Protestant misconceptions regarding Catholic beliefs and juxtaposes them over against the actual stance of the Roman Catholic Church. He focuses on the major specific doctrines that are usually questioned by Protestants. The chapters include: authority, justification, the Eucharist and the sacraments, and the role of Mary.

Toon’s historical research should benefit the reader of either a Catholic or Protestant tradition. Many of the historical creeds and edicts are quoted extensively, giving the reader a broader linguistic perspective of the actual document and of the thought behind the doctrines. It is certainly preferable to a paraphrase.
The difficulty with Toon’s effort is the occasional artistic choppiness that he employs to uncover the differences. Too often the reader is presented with a chief area of disagreement (e.g. the role of Mary), only to be told that the doctrine will be developed later in the text. Thankfully Toon, unlike many preachers, does in fact follow up these points and develops their origin and growth quite extensively. Many readers will, however, forget their primary objections and questions as to the doctrine prior to having the doctrine discussed. Perhaps the fatal flaw will be that the readers will not have the tenacity of interest to uncover the difference once the question has been aroused.

Equally disappointing is the lack of force given to the need for further examination of the traditions via dialogue. Although Toon’s purpose was to remain uncritical and to “point out where the differences lie, so that they can be taken seriously in the relationship between Roman Catholic and Protestant Churches,” the lack of any agenda or strenuous call as to a solution diminishes the overall value of this work. Toon’s effort constitutes a “learning-to-know process” rather than the “knowledge process” that leads to the establishment of truth. Yet the “learning-to-know process” is an initial stage of knowledge. Toon’s work will be a valuable tool for the layperson interested in the authoritative and fundamental statements of Catholic belief. Unfortunately the antithesis between traditions remains strong on the common level, and there it is doubtful whether understanding is desired.

John M. Kenney

The Stony Brook School, Stony Brook, NY


This powerful book is written by a Catholic priest. His struggle with the moral issues began while he was provost of Notre Dame in 1976. His initial avoidance of the issue was changed as the enormous implications of the ethical positions struck him. As he entered into the moral and theological discussion there was a simultaneous realization that while fifty million Catholics, and most other Americans, were strongly or generally anti-abortion, seven Supreme Court justices voted in favor of it.

The five essays, which are the heart of this book, are written from a biased but fair point of view. They deal with facts and law as well as theology and moral philosophy. America calls this book “a thinking person’s argument against abortion.”

Burtchaell has moved beyond the point of dialogue. He has identified an enemy of humankind, as well as of the Church, and is out to attack it. But the fire and anguish are tempered with reason. He argues that the fetus is, at every stage of development, a human being. To argue for any less would be to separate the genetic reality of personhood from the value or “full status” of personhood. Since the fetus is genetically a person, abortion is murder.

Three of the five essays draw analogies of theory and fact between abortion and the holocaust, slavery, and infancyicide: depersonalization, use of euphemisms, rejection of responsibility, uplifting of the rights of one class over another, etc. Many of the parallels are so clear that his case-study approach is hard not to accept. The underlying premise, which he assumes after the first chapter, is that the fetus has the same status as a Jew, a black, or an infant—i.e., it is a person.

The second chapter on arguments for abortion could have been strengthened. Burtchaell correctly points out that the two sides of the abortion issue rarely grapple directly with each other because they have different presuppositions and emphases. However, the remainder of the chapter analyzes pro-abortion arguments from within the context of an anti-abortion position. Therefore the pro-abortion arguments are given very little objective treatment, and the philosophical issues are never fully joined.

Despite this weakness the book is well worthwhile. Many laws and regulations, and hundreds of situations, are described and discussed. The fallacies of many pro-abortion
arguments are exposed. The moral and theological weight of opinion is marshaled and is
clear against abortion. Many alternatives to abortion and many alternatives to the situa-
tions that lead to abortion are discussed. But the bottom line is that abortion is murder, and
that we are legally performing 1.5 million per year in the United States.

Even though the discussion could have been more dialogical or more philosophical, such
a direction would not have fulfilled what I think is Burtchaell’s point. We need to be angry
about abortion; we need to oppose it actively, politically and Biblically. This book gathers
evidence, arguments and moral outrage into one sustained attack. It will not be a good
textbook, but it will be a good resource book. The author met his stated intention to be “fair
though not neutral, thorough if not exhaustive, and provocative even when not agreeable.”

Stephen M. Clinton

International School of Theology, San Bernardino, CA

1982, 188 pp., $7.95 paper.

The long-standing differences between the various branches of the Church over the
nature and practice of ordination have come to the fore in recent ecumenical discussion.
Ecumenical endeavors toward mutual recognition of ministry and mutual celebration of the
Eucharist have necessitated the various denominations working through issues regarding
holy orders and apostolic succession. Since Vatican II significant discussions have been
held between Catholics and Protestants both here and abroad. In addition to this, renewal
movements, especially the charismatic movement, have resulted in laypeople assuming
some of the ministries formally exercised only or mainly by the clergy. Such a trend inevita-
fully raises questions about the nature of authority and responsibility that ordination is
thought to convey. The question of the ordination of women raises yet other questions
about the role, status and authority of ordained persons. Some denominations are also
considering the ordination of homosexuals, which introduces still other dimensions of the
significance of ordination. While these are very different issues, they all involve the nature
of ordination in one way or another.

The late Marjorie Warkentin determined to probe the validity of ordination itself. She
approached the question from both a Biblical and an historical perspective. The first 105
pages are devoted to an “Historical Overview.” The second part deals with “The Laying on
of Hands” and the third with “Ordination and the Theology of Ministry.”

The first section traces the practice of ordination from its origins in the OT. Warkentin
notes correctly that there is no evidence that the laying on of hands was normally used for
prophets, priests, kings, or elders in the OT. There are, however, two outstanding in-
stances of the practice (in addition to simple acts of blessing, which W. D. Davies noted
employed the Hebrew šâôm, “placing” of hands, rather than šâmak, “leaning on”): the
public designation of Joshua to succeed Moses (Num 27:18-23), and the designation of the
Levites (8:1-26).

She notes that in neither case was the rite repeated with successors. It will become
apparent later in the book that the author does not think that these models, or indeed any
other models (including the prophetic), apply to the “call” or “ordination” of contemporary
ministers. They do apply, she believes, to the entrance of Paul and later Timothy (but not
successors) into the historically unique work of extending the gospel to the Gentiles. Be-
cause of some rather striking linguistic parallels between Acts and 1 Timothy, on the one
hand, and the LXX wording in the passages about Joshua and about the Levites, on the
other, Warkentin concludes that the ministry of Paul and of Timothy in taking the gospel to
the Gentiles stands in parallel with the entrance and conquest of the promised land by
Israel. With the accomplishment of this mission, the purpose for which hands were laid on
them has also been accomplished and is unrepeatable.

The selection of the seven in Acts 6, with their designation by the laying on of hands, is
a different use of the rite and parallels, in her judgment, the period in the OT when the
Israelites were “multiplying” and “murmuring” and when there was a crisis of leadership
similar to that in Acts 6:1. It is difficult in a brief review to do justice to the careful attention
to exegesis and Biblical theology that leads to such conclusions.

In order to present the sweep of her study, I have jumped over a good deal of material to
reach the latter chapters. Before proceeding further with her conclusions, therefore, I
should note that the first section continues the historical survey by discussing ordination in
the rabbinic traditions and then its development in the early Church. The rabbinic laying on
of hands is a complex topic. Warkentin is aware that there is considerable skepticism as to
whether this was actually practiced at the time of Jesus and Paul. The question is not
whether the rite as such existed then but whether it was used to grant authority to rabbis
and, if so, what the nature of that authority was. The author could have benefited by
several contributions that were perhaps not available to her as she was writing. Among
these were Stephen Westerholm’s Jesus and Scribal Authority (especially pp. 26-39) and a
probing article by Lawrence A. Hoffman, “Jewish Ordination on the Eve of Christianity,”
that appeared in Studia Liturgica in 1979. Another article in the same journal, “Ministry
and Ordination in Early Christianity against a Jewish Background” by Edward J. Kilmar-
tin, approaches the subject from a Christian viewpoint. There are other works that could
have helped Warkentin, but these in particular would have fortified her reservation (ex-
pressed more clearly in a later chapter) about the existence of an official rabbinic laying on
of hands in the first century.

Reserving extended discussion of the NT evidence for treatment later, the author pro-
ceeds to discuss the development of ordination in the early Church. She correctly points out
that it took at least a couple of centuries for the terminology and the rite to take shape. She
then shows that while the Reformers rejected the idea that ordination conferred grace and
a character idelibilis they did maintain the idea of ordination. With the shift of emphasis
from sacrament to Word, ordination was separated from the former and joined to the
latter. This important change was related also to the perceived need for authority within
each of the factions of Protestantism as they sought stability and protection from what
they considered deviant movements. This was true both of the mainstream and also of the
radical groups. Anticl erical feelings became especially strong in England.

After concluding her historical survey, Warkentin deals with the laying on of hands in
the first century. She sees the relevant passages as “contextualized by Luke and Paul
according to three OT analogies”: (1) Paul “sees his own life as a sacrificial offering (Acts
1:6) are likened to the role of Joshua whose responsibility it was to continue to implement
the Sinaitic covenant”; (3) “The missions of Paul and Barnabas (Acts 13:1-3) and Timothy
(1 Tim. 4:14) are linked by analogy . . . with the representative office of the Levites” (p.
153). The passages in which these instances occur “emphasize the continuity of Christianity
with its historic origins” (p. 154). The “hand” of God was at work in their ministry as in the
OT, and there was a genuine endowment through (dia, 2 Tim 1:6), not merely along with,
the laying on of hands. But Scripture knows of no perpetuation of this beyond the mission
of Timothy. The “appointing” (cheirotoneō, i.e., indicating with outstretched hand) of el-
ders was different from the “laying on of hands,” and the terminology of Acts 14:23 was
not merged with that of the imposition of hands until a couple of centuries later.

Warkentin observes correctly that while the community of Christians is a priesthood,
individual ministers are not priests. She maintains that there is no specific “call” to the
ministry, such as was experienced by the OT prophets. We are all called at conversion and
spiritually gifted. NT ministry is that of service, not of domination of others. Elders are set
“in” the Church (Acts 20:28), not “over” it. The Greek terminology in Heb 13:17; 1 Tim
5:17 is not strong enough to support the language of rulership found in most translations of
those passages. They call for “the dignity of responsible and intelligent response” and not
“blind obedience.” The authority of the local church lies in the Spirit of Christ, not in any
human being.

The reason Warkentin emphasizes this is because she sees that Protestantism today usually justifies ordination on the basis of a "call" that is unique to the minister and on the assumption that the preacher needs a public conferral of authority in order to teach the Word. Another common idea—viewing just one individual, the pastor, as the "representation" either of God to the church or of the church to the world—is inappropriate. Rather, the entire Church represents God to the world. The idea of representation, the author claims, is another form of sacramentalism or priestly intercession. "Office" is necessary for proper functioning, but there is no static office that was instituted in the NT and intended to remain unchanged for all time. (The preceding topics are found in the third part of her work, pp. 159-188.)

Among the weaknesses of the author’s argument are, in my judgment, the following: She does not give sufficient attention to the role of elders as the guardians of the flock and protectors of the faith. The question to be explored is whether if, as she claims, individual ministers should not possess the kind or extent of authority usually conferred on them, this authority should instead be conferred on a body of elders in each church. Is it significant that the appointment of elders is described by the word kathistēmi (Titus 1:5; cf. Heb 5:1; 8:3, where the word is used with the high priest) and cheirotonéō (Acts 14:23), a word that, while only much later linked with the idea of laying on of hands, does carry a strong connotation of public appointment?

Her rejection of a "call" will leave many uncomfortable, especially when we are told that we cannot take the Scriptural examples of the call of the OT prophets, of Paul, or even of Timothy, and apply them to the call,ordination or ministry of the preacher today. Her case would have been strengthened if she had assured us that there are indeed spiritual parallels, even though historically there are unique aspects to these earlier ministries that required a rite of imposition of hands, which aspects have been fulfilled and no longer exist. By failing to make this distinction she opens the way for the reader to react instinctively against having these marvelous spiritual examples taken away.

Her dependence on the linguistic parallels between the allegedly relevant LXX passages and those concerning the appointment of the seven in Acts 6 and of Paul and Timothy is heavy. She admits that they are not obvious to the English reader, but in the Greek the argument rests on only a few words. Nevertheless, unless their use is coincidental the evidence is sufficient in my judgment to establish the relationship between the passages.

Using this methodology, however, one must ask how we are to treat Paul’s use of Ps 68:18 in Eph 4:8, which in turn seems to go back to the separation of the Levites in Numbers 8 (see Gary V. Smith, "Paul’s use of Psalm 68:18 in Ephesians 4:8," JETS 15 [1975] 181-189). If Paul is not merely citing a verse about gifts but is actually thinking of the Levitical model behind it, how far are we to draw the implications of this? Warkentin says that all believers have a Levitical ministry. But are there those for whom there is a special Levitical ministry in which, just as the Levites assisted the priests, so the "equippers" of Eph 4:11 minister to the present-day priests who are coextensive with the whole people of God? Warkentin thinks of the Levites mainly as having a ministry of "representation." But is there not another aspect of their ministry—that of service—that is applicable to those who minister the Word in a special way today? That would not automatically mean that they need special conferral of authority through ordination, but it may give further insight on the nature of the "gifts" whom God has given to the Church.

Because of the relationship between ordination and the exercise of ministry, and because of the major role of ministry in the Church, the issues raised in this book are of extreme importance. While God can work through imperfect human arrangements, it is crucial that the Church impose no requirements that would prevent or discourage people from exercising the ministry God desires them to have. If the concept of ordination held by a given denomination or local church results, whether by design or not, in limiting the priesthood of all believers, in inhibiting the free expression of worship or service in the
manner described in 1 Corinthians 11-14, or in permitting an individual to attain stature, privilege and power beyond that which a humble servant of Christ should have, then severe correction is needed. The historical perspectives and Biblical insights of this book should receive wide dissemination. It is time for discussion of this crucial issue. While there is always the danger of "throwing the baby out with the bath-water" through a hostile antiper clericalism, this book implies the need of a healthy critique and modification of current practices of ordination.

Walter L. Liefeld

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL


According to Fowler and House, to confront means to "bring two views together for comparison or examination, followed by the acceptance of one view and the rejection of the other" (p. xl). Accepting this as a working definition helps the reader to perceive the purpose of this book. It seems that the authors have written a textbook to allow their students to confront feminism, abortion and homosexuality. Their objective of presenting Biblical data with which to confront our culture is achieved, and it is fortunate that the authors have shared their insights by publication of this material.

The format of the book has its positive and negative features. On the positive side, each section of the book is clearly outlined and well footnoted. Primary arguments for a Biblical perspective on the issues of feminism, abortion and homosexuality are persuasively presented. One could find in this book a first source for study of each of these issues with references to many other works from various perspectives. For example, Fowler and House do not shy away from quoting and disagreeing with Scanzoni and Hardesty (All We're Meant to Be) in the feminism section.

The most negative feature of the book is also found in the format. Each section is too short to be a full argument, and the reader upon completing the book may wish that Fowler and House had taken more time and written three books. For the purpose of a survey of three current issues from a Christian perspective the book is sufficient. But for the purpose of serious study of each issue it is rather thin. The best section is the abortion discussion, which could easily be expanded into a full treatise on the topic.

There is a surprise in this book that was to this reader a disappointment. Part 4 is a miniature counseling manual for Christians confronting feminism, abortion and homosexuality. It is neither long enough to be called a counseling manual nor complete enough to tackle the complexities of the issues raised. In fact this section is almost frightening because there is the danger that some readers will suspect that they can now counsel anyone with any of the three problems discussed.

The central thesis, that a Christian should examine the Bible for answers to modern problems, is communicated well. But that thesis is weakened considerably by the broad scope of the discussion. The book is worthwhile just for the information in the abortion section and for its notes, but the serious student will have to supplement his study from those notes.

Robert D. Andrews

Dallas Graduate School of Psychology, Dayton, TN


What kinds of books dominate the "science" or "apologetics" section of most Christian bookstores? Books interpreting the Genesis creation narrative in a rigidly literal way.
Books that depict evolution as a gigantic swindle perpetrated by an atheistic scientific establishment. Books claiming that the earth cannot be more than a few thousand years old and that basic life forms have not changed.

Such claims bring those books into conflict with almost universally accepted findings in just about every branch of natural science. These books do not see evolution as valid science. They fear, rather, that theism is being supplanted by an evolution-based pseudoreligion, adumbrated in Carl Sagan's Cosmos series. Thirty years ago, in The Christian View of Science and Scripture, theologian Bernard Ramm urged evangelicals to confront such pseudoreligion on philosophical grounds. Instead, modern fundamentalists with scientific training have labored to construct a substitute science called "creation science" or "scientific creationism."

Ordinaril; it would make sense to shun any showdown between a pseudoscience and a pseudoreligion. Recently, though, the pseudocontroversy over science teaching has become a political battle fought out in local school districts, state legislatures, and the courts. Both the scientific community and that portion of the religious community that does not see established science as a threat to its beliefs have found it necessary to respond. The two books reviewed here are collections of representative responses, allowing readers to sample a wide range in either book.

Broadly speaking, the Christian responses reflect sadness more than anger. It is sad to see energies wasted and churches divided. To this reviewer it is sad to see the Biblical doctrine of God's relationship to the natural world constricted to only 144 hours of activity in the past. The title Is God a Creationist? is an ironic reminder that the full meaning of the term "creation" is all but lost in contemporary discussions. The word now has a narrow anti-evolutionary connotation because it is inconvenient to keep it enclosed in quotation marks or appropriately modified in order to specify "recent creation" or "young-earth creation." Is God a creationist? Are you? Christians who deny that the earth is billions of years old can answer unhesitatingly, since they are creationists by either definition. The rest of us first have to ask in what sense the word is being used. (For that matter, the term "evolutionist" is equally ambiguous.)

Frye is a profession of English at Princeton who has also studied theology. He has selected eleven essays by authors who take Genesis and the doctrine of creation with full seriousness while criticizing the recent-creationist approach. Frye introduces them with a helpful overview of creation science against the religious background and ends with an epilogue on "the two books of God"—nature and the Bible.

Each chapter of Is God a Creationist? is a complete statement. For anyone tired of hearing that belief in creation requires believing in a static universe that may look old but really is not, this roster of Biblical creationists (some professional scientists, some professional theologians) provides a welcome resource.

An article from Christianity Today by an evangelical leads off: Whitworth College geologist Edwin Olson understands and sympathizes with the "hyper-literalists" but concludes that they do more harm than good. In an article from Theology Today, another Presbyterian geology professor, Richard Berry of San Diego State University, argues that "the God story of the creationist and the scientific objectivity story of the evolutionist" are both "profoundly important stories of ultimate meaning."

Theologian Langdon Gilkey of the University of Chicago Divinity School, known for his Maker of Heaven and Earth (1959) and more recent works on the interaction of science and religion, tells why he testified against creation science in the 1981 "Balanced Treatment" case in Arkansas. Roman Catholic Biblical scholar Bruce Vawter of DePaul University graciously credits "scientific creationists" with contributing to the self-examination of science and helping people clarify the distinction between evolution and evolutionism; but Vawter has a stingy rebuke for the "speciously secular, nonreligious definitions" given to "creation" and "creator" by defenders of Arkansas Act 590 in their effort to turn creation into a science: "The concept of a creator God distinct from the God of love and mercy is a
reopening of the way to the Marcionist and Gnostic heresies, among the deadliest ever to afflict Christianity."

Calvin College geologist Davis Young, in an edited excerpt from Christianity and the Age of the Earth (Zondervan, 1982), pleads for his fellow evangelicals to stop defending or refuting a false creationism so that we can "spend our energies on interpreting the Bible and the world that God in His mercy and grace has given us." In an article from The Christian Century, Gustavus Adolphus professor Conrad Hyers shows from a literary understanding of Genesis why a literalist approach "constricts the cosmic dance" the creation narrative was written to depict.

Next comes a lecture on "Natural Science and Religion" from an earlier round of the controversy; it was delivered in 1880 at Yale Divinity School by the Harvard botanist Asa Gray, a devout Christian to whom Darwin's ideas made sense. Gray's lecture is followed by the testimony of an astronomer and historian of science currently at Harvard; with full appreciation of modern cosmogony, Professor Owen Gingerich sees the scientific picture of the universe as "far more satisfying if we accept the designing hand of a superintelligence," the message of the Genesis narrative.

The final three chapters present mainstream theological and Biblical conclusions that the narrow "creationist" position amounts to a distortion, whatever truth it may contain. Comments on science and Christianity taken from three addresses by Pope John Paul II are followed by an excerpt from Understanding Genesis (1970), a theological work by Nahum Sarna of Brandeis. In the final essay Bernhard Anderson, emeritus professor at Princeton Seminary, outlines the creation faith of the OT and links it to the NT doctrines that "in Christ all things were created" and that God will finally "sum up all things in Christ."

In Science and Creationism, Princeton anthropologist Ashley Montagu has collected a score of essays by scientists and philosophers irked enough to respond to "scientific creationism," including several who identify themselves as Christians. Calvin College historian George Marsden tries to understand fundamentalist views of science while explaining that no amount of scientific evidence can settle fundamental religious questions. When economist Kenneth Boulding ponders what an evolutionary theology might look like, he expresses hope that both sides will come out of the current conflict "a little more humble." Paleontologist Roger Cuffey's description of known transitional fossil sequences was first published in the evangelical Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation. Evolutionary biologist Kenneth Miller answers several anti-evolutionary arguments while confessing his (Roman Catholic) belief in creation.

In Science and Creationism these faithful witnesses are surrounded by a cloud of scientists flying other philosophical flags (including atheism) or who have decided to know nothing except science, and it crucified—or at least under attack by anti-scientific forces. The fine writing styles of paleontologist Stephen Jay Gould, anthropologist Laurie Godfrey, and Isaac Asimov are exhibited alongside some self-serving pedantry by biochemist Sidney Fox. In a sense the book resembles a scrapbook more than a well-planned, carefully edited effort. Some confusing typographical errors indicate haste in putting it together.

Many of the chapters seem to come white-hot from the Arkansas "Balanced Treatment" trial, in which several of the authors served as expert witnesses for the plaintiffs. One chapter consists of Judge William R. Overton's historic decision in that case, already published in many journals and in Norman Geisler's The Creator in the Classroom (Mott Media, 1982). Here one can compare native Arkansas writer Gene Lyon's report of the trial (from Harper's magazine) or Michael Ruse's (personal) account of "A Philosopher's Day in Court" with Geisler's own account. (Geisler, a Dallas Seminary professor, was an expert witness for the defense.)

In that Arkansas trial "scientific creationism" had its day in court and came off as fundamentalist religion, not as science. One sees why in the preface by Science magazine writer Roger Lewin, "A Tale With Many Connections." Lewin describes how Act 590 came to be introduced and passed. It is fitting that a law so religiously inspired was challenged, in
McLean v. Arkansas Board of Education, by the Reverend William McLean, general presbyter of the Presbyterian Church in Arkansas, and other religious leaders.

Is God a Creationist? and Science and Creationism both acknowledge that many issues are intertwined in the legal controversies over teaching “creation science” in public schools. Many supporters of such teaching expect to win the next round, partly because the legislative history of the Louisiana act is less tainted with the partisan religious associations of the Arkansas act, as traced by Roger Lewin. The definition of “creation science” is also less specific than in Arkansas. Rumor has it that all that is being fought for now is the teaching of “the sudden appearance of complex forms.” What is sudden to a paleontologist may take a hundred thousand years, of course, and a proton that looks simple to a biochemist may seem complex to a quark-hunting nuclear physicist.

Yet even if the “creationists” win, has not the full Biblical doctrine of creation been lost?

Walter R. Hearn

New College for Advanced Christian Studies, Berkeley, CA


The theology of Dietrich Bonhoeffer is never an easy topic for analysis. The shifts that occurred in his thinking as he developed his views and the unfinished nature of his last writings are formidable barriers to overcome in any attempted interpretation of his thought.

In this study on Bonhoeffer’s efforts to relate ecclesiology to ethics, Thomas Day deals with these barriers in a competent manner by placing these efforts within the different social and historical contexts of Bonhoeffer’s life. The result is a study that shows some of the personal and social concerns that helped Bonhoeffer develop his view of the Church as “Jesus Christ existing as community” in the world.

The four chapters of the book are designed to emphasize four main periods of Bonhoeffer’s life where significant shifts occurred in his thinking. The various writings of each period are briefly analyzed to show the development of his thought.

In the first chapter, Day presents Bonhoeffer’s early “aristocratic” ecclesiology and the influence of his family life on his view of the Church as a community (p. 11). Bonhoeffer’s experiences in Rome, Barcelona and New York are described to show how they helped him develop a more communal approach to the Church. Chapter 2 is a discussion of Bonhoeffer’s return to Germany in 1931 and his increased focus on the Church as the community of the new humanity created by Christ (p. 85). His differences with Confessing Church leaders over relations with the Third Reich are also discussed and related to his intense concern to relate ecclesiology to “the command of God.” This command of God involved the practical response of the Church to the need for meaningful community between people (p. 68).

Day describes, in chap. 3, Bonhoeffer’s movement away from a presentation of the Church as a religious institution and toward an identification of the Church with humanity as a whole. The type of identification proposed by Bonhoeffer was a participation in the sufferings of humanity that would lead to the restoration of communal life destroyed by sin but now made possible by Jesus Christ. Bonhoeffer’s own involvement with the political conspiracy to overthrow Hitler was an indication of how much he was willing to identify with the struggle for the restoration of communal life in Germany. In chap. 4 Day summarizes Bonhoeffer’s unfinished ecclesiology and offers a sympathetic yet critical evaluation of his thought. His desire is not to project what Bonhoeffer’s ecclesiology would have been in its final form but to show some of the guiding principles in his thought.

On the whole the book is a helpful introduction to Bonhoeffer’s ecclesiology, but it ought to be supplemented with other studies. For evangelicals the book offers an opportunity to discern some of the crucial ethical questions that Bonhoeffer asked in his efforts to relate
the Church to the world. While Bonhoeffer’s answers were incomplete and often ambiguous, his questions are thought-provoking and provide a focus for further discussion.

Henry Lazenby

Avondale Estates, GA


From St. Augustine to Billy Sunday, from nominalism to fundamentalism, and from the Children’s Crusade to Vatican II, Bill Austin has filled his book with information about the major personalities, events, and movements in the development of Christian institutions and theology from their beginnings in the person and work of Jesus Christ right up until the recent past. The author, a former pastor and professor of religion at Hardin-Simmons University, has written several books, including a treatment of Karl Barth’s theology, but this apparently is his first venture into Church history. Within his self-imposed limits of space and scope he succeeds rather well.

As Austin admits, this work is not a history of Christianity everywhere (pp. 8-9, 113), for its emphasis is clearly on the European and North American Church. Indeed the closer Austin comes to the present the more he focuses on those elements likely to be of interest to his present American readers. For example, he discusses the Sunday-school and temperance movements at length but has nothing to say about the Norwegian Haugean revival or the *Kulturkampf* in Germany. Furthermore Austin allots more space to the modern Church than he does to the ancient. Thus he discusses the first thousand years of Church history in only 150 pages, whereas the period from the American Revolution to the present receives 166 pages.

Austin’s treatment is both chronological and, as the title suggests, topical—i.e., arranged by subject. Accordingly he divides Church history into eleven major chronological epochs, but within each epoch he discusses individuals and institutions around certain themes. For example, his chapter on the late Middle Ages treats five distinct themes: (1) relations between east and west; (2) nationalism; (3) conciliarism; (4) proto-Reformers; and (5) the Renaissance. This kind of treatment necessitates some repetition (e.g. one must mention the Council of Constance under at least three of the above themes) and some arbitrariness (e.g. Nicholas of Cusa is discussed in connection with the Renaissance rather than with medieval philosophy). But it does organize the data, which is precisely Austin’s aim. To that end, in fact, he introduces each chapter with an outline of its contents and then repeats each section or subsection of the outline when he comes to it in the text so that the reader is always aware of how a personality or event fits into the flow of the narrative.

Of course this kind of work is not written for the expert. Indeed the more one knows about a particular topic the more likely he is to take issue with Austin’s sweeping generalizations. For example, is it really correct to say that the Elizabethan Settlement represents a “religion halfway between Rome and Geneva” or that “the basic content of fundamentalist teaching was identical with that of classical Protestant orthodoxy” (italics mine)? Austin, however, is not worried about what the expert thinks but rather about how the student can begin to organize the data of Church history. If that student learns not to accept Austin’s judgments uncritically, then this work can be a useful tool.

There is, unfortunately, one thing that keeps the work from being as useful as it might otherwise be for the beginner, and that is the omission of a bibliography or even suggestions for further reading. Perhaps Austin and his editors are justified in eschewing footnotes in a work of this type, but they should encourage even the beginning student to go beyond this text in the study of Church history. They do not, however, and so the reader is on his own if he wishes to find out more about any specific topic. Otherwise *Austin’s Topical History of Christianity* is a useful introduction to a complex subject.

Cameron A. MacKenzie

Concordia Theological Seminary, Ft. Wayne, IN

The author (president of Ligonier Valley Study Center) presents here a series of thought-provoking and personal reflections on the importance of human dignity for all people in all of life’s manifold relationships. The first three chapters comprise the theoretical foundation for the application of the theme of dignity in the chapters that follow—i.e., dignity in the state, home, school, hospital, prison, church and work place.

There is, according to Sproul, an “aspiration for significance,” a “quest for esteem” deeply imbedded within the human person. This universal experience of the human search for dignity can only be accounted for adequately by acknowledging humanity’s origin as God’s creation made in his image, and by recognizing that people, though fallen, have been sought after by God in the cross. “Man’s dignity rests in God who assigns an inestimable worth to every person” (p. 94). Yet although humans are creatures of great intrinsic value, sin has produced an erosion of human dignity on every front. Much of the emphasis in the chapters on specific spheres of relationships concerns the various assaults to human dignity that people constantly face. Sproul offers penetrating insights regarding how parents and children; teachers and students; doctors, nurses, and patients; prisoners, judges, and law enforcement officers; pastors and their congregations; employers and employees may affirm the dignity of one another. They need to recognize that the structures of most relationships work to tear into shreds the delicate fabric of value that clothes the inner person. The indignities that people constantly encounter are here exposed for the purpose of restoring the dignity that rightfully belongs to all people.

The work is genuinely personal in tone throughout. Numerous anecdotes from Sproul’s life and background color each chapter. The author is to be commended for using illustrations (personal and otherwise) that really do illumine what is said. Also of help are the “Questions for Further Discussion” that conclude each chapter, making the book more useful for group study. Apart from chap. 4, “The Marxist Option,” in which Sproul endeavors to vindicate capitalism as an economic system that may rightly be seen to affirm rather than depreciate human worth, the remainder of the book should be acceptable in its emphasis by all evangelicals for its helpful perspectives in understanding all people as genuinely worthy of our respect, fair treatment and love.

Bruce A. Ware
Bethel Theological Seminary, St. Paul, MN


Given the current interest in hermeneutics and particularly in the issue of the role of women, Slavery, Sabbath, War, and Women is likely to become a well-regarded resource on hermeneutics in many circles. The book’s inductive approach, its stance and its conclusions are likely to win for it a wide hearing.

Swartley, director of the Institute of Mennonite Studies and associate professor of NT at the Associated Mennonite Biblical Seminaries in Elkhart, Indiana, has given us an inductive hermeneutical study of slavery, Sabbath and war aimed at providing hermeneutical principles helpful in solving the thorny issue of the Biblical perspective on women. In successive chapters he presents two (or more) opposing views on each of these three issues, drawing conclusions about hermeneutics from the use of Scripture made by each side in the respective debates. In a fourth chapter he applies his hermeneutical conclusions to the debate about the role of women, and in the fifth chapter he proposes a general model for interpreting Scripture that reflects the book’s conclusions. Several lengthy appendices are included, and an extensive bibliography is provided on each of the four case issues. Chapter 3 presents the pacifist view in some detail (it is the author’s view), and chap. 4 defends egalitarianism with the standard arguments. The book is intended to defend the use of the
Bible to address socioethical issues.

Swartley writes from the perspective of the historical-critical method. Three assumptions undergird his work: "1. The historical and cultural contexts of specific texts are considered seriously. 2. Diversity within Scripture is acknowledged, thus leading to a recognition that (a) intracanonical dialogue must be heard and assessed, and (b) the Gospels in their direct witness to Jesus Christ are to be taken as final authority. 3. The basic moral and theological principles of the entire Scripture are given priority over specific statements which stand in tension either with these principles or with other specific texts on the subject" (p. 23).

The treatment of the slavery issue may serve as an example of the book's method and its weaknesses. The treatment makes particularly interesting reading. The pro-slavery case is well-documented (in part from the writings of Charles Hodge), as is the anti-slavery position. Afterward the author lists "hermeneutical alternatives" for understanding the Bible's approach to the slavery issue, then draws his hermeneutical conclusions. It is here that Swartley formulates his third undergirding assumption listed above (p. 61).

It is somewhat disturbing, however, in a book devoted to hermeneutical method to find that the conclusions drawn seem to be based on inadequate reflection. Possible alternatives for understanding the Bible's perspective on slavery are left out of the discussion and thus render his conclusions suspect. Furthermore Swartley's example of the third undergirding assumption raises problems. He illustrates by saying that Jesus' foundational command to love one's neighbor, though it "doesn't mention slavery...has direct bearing upon any evaluation of the moral character of slavery as an institution." As a "basic moral principle" it therefore bears more theological weight than do the "specific directives on the topic of slavery" found in 1 Tim 6:1-6 (p. 61). Aside from the question of whether Swartley's exegesis of Jesus' command is correct, this raises distressing methodological questions. Swartley admits (in his treatment of the Bible's perspective on war) that the liberation theologian justifies his condoning of violence in just this manner when (following Swartley's method) he "appeals to basic biblical theological emphases." But, Swartley objects, "the condoning of violence to achieve those ends brings in nonbiblical values through the door of social analysis and national self-interest" (p. 147). While we cannot but agree, it should be observed that the difference between Swartley's approach and that of liberation theology is a difference of degree, not of kind. Who is to determine which Biblical injunctions are "basic" and which peripheral? The principle, as stated, seems incapable of discriminating between the two alternatives.

This reviewer was left disappointed in the book's contribution to hermeneutics. While the conclusions (summarized in 21 "learnings" on pp. 229-234) include a rather full range of interpretive principles, and while the case studies serve to illustrate many of them well, there is little here that is not already commonly acknowledged. Emphasis on such things as the interpreter's recognition of his biases and of his "distance" from the world of the text are certainly proper but are common knowledge. Those few suggestions that are more distinctive are problematic and are by definition limited in their usefulness to those who assume the need to deal with contradictions in the Biblical record.

To summarize: interesting reading; helpful juxtaposition of views on the case issues; helpful illustration of some recognized hermeneutical principles; disappointing in its fresh contribution to hermeneutics.

Van Campbell

Homer, LA


In 1978, when I moved to a small southern town after four years of graduate school in Boston and Princeton, I was shocked to hear white Christians speak of their "nigras" who kept their houses and yards and raised their children. I looked for good material to read to
help me understand my new cultural environment, but I found little help except for a good journal article a former professor sent me. Would that I had had a book such as Beyond Liberation available to me at that time. Ellis has written a provocative, thoughtful and often poignant chronicle of the ongoing struggle for black freedom and dignity. Although Ellis writes from a black perspective, his work “is not intended to be only a black book” (p. 12). His desire for all of his readers is offered in the opening chapter: “It is my prayer that you will be encouraged to know God in new and deeper ways as you gain a new understanding of Afro-American history and culture. Whatever your background may be, I pray that this study will help give you new insights to analyze the culture in which you live. Finally, it is my prayer that the principles contained in this book will play a role in building bridges of understanding and in facilitating reconciliation where there has been alienation” (p. 12). Most readers will find Ellis to have been generally quite successful in attaining his goals.

Ellis traces the black struggle through several phases, showing the contributions and failures of each phase. A major portion of the book (about one-third) is devoted to the work of Martin Luther King, Jr., and Malcolm X. The chapter on King is especially good, although the author’s obvious immense respect for King seems to have blinded him to some defects in the civil rights leader’s theology. For example, Ellis says (p. 74) that “during his doctoral studies at Boston University Divinity School, the ‘social gospel’ expressed by Walter Rauschenbusch left an indelible imprint on King’s thinking. Brother Martin never, however, bought Rauschenbusch’s ‘unwarranted optimism concerning human nature.’” Yet at the beginning of that same chapter (p. 63) King’s own book Stride for Freedom is quoted as follows: “Men often hate each other because they fear each other; they fear each other because they do not know each other; they do not know each other because they cannot communicate; they cannot communicate because they are separated.” This quote itself seems to reflect the kind of shallow view of sin that Ellis is repudiating.

The author’s own respect for Scripture (he affirms inerrancy) is one of the many good aspects of the book. Chapter 11 is an excellent apologetic for a God-centered approach to culture that ought to be read and heeded by contemporary white culture with its American folk religion, as well as the black culture to whom it is specifically addressed. Here Ellis points us to the Word of God for an assessment of our condition.

The writer’s style is rich in imageries and metaphors, and this makes for easy reading. The glossary at the end of the book is helpful for those who may be unfamiliar with some of the theological terms used freely through the book.

One omission is unfortunate for a book entitled Beyond Liberation. This reviewer would have liked the author to have included a consideration of the black liberation theologians such as James Cone. Cone is mentioned briefly twice, but his “theology of liberation” is never treated.

In spite of this minor flaw, Ellis’ book should be read widely. Pastors, seminary students, and informed laymen, black or white, will find stimulating and convicting reading between its covers.

Daniel E. Deaton

New Covenant Presbyterian Church, Aiken, SC 29801


This is a stimulating book, well worth reading for all who are concerned about the condition of the Church, the body of Christ. J. I. Packer’s essay, “Steps for Renewal of the Christian People,” is a must. With characteristic skill Packer defines and expands on the meaning of renewal (awakening, revival) from a Biblical perspective, then details what marks genuine renewal and how it comes. Mark Kinzer’s “A Strategy for Pastoral Renewal” distills essential Biblical principles of pastoral ministry, which, though widely dis-
cussed, have yet to make the badly needed impact on the way so many of us pastors do things.

The book is a collection of essays that grew out of "an unusual meeting of Protestants, Catholics, and Orthodox leaders" held in Ann Arbor, Michigan, in October 1982. The preface explains the background and nature of the conference. The burden of that meeting and these essays is the preservation and recovery of "a way of life distinct from surrounding society by its faithfulness to the teaching of Christ." Some readers of JETS may be put off by the ecumenical blend of contributors and not even consider the book. Some may be repelled by what they consider the overworked and often flabby word "renewal." Both attitudes would be mistaken in this case. The papers are sober, uncompromising (not only in central tenets of Biblical truth but also in matters of Biblical holiness) and, in some cases, deeply convincing. Only one essay addresses the subject of ecumenism in detail, that of Stephan B. Clark entitled "Orthodox, Protestant, and Roman Catholic: What Basis for Cooperation?" For many this will be the most disagreeable portion of the book. One bone that will certainly stick in many evangelical throats is what Clark calls "the theological fact of our brotherhood and sisterhood in Christ." Yet instead of reacting we would do well to listen thoughtfully and consider carefully, a quality that has not been a particular strength among evangelicals. In principle, Clark's main point applies to us all. We do have a Christian duty enforced by clear Biblical commands to everyone we recognize as brothers and sisters in Christ, no matter how much we may differ.

The major strength and the major weakness of these essays is the same. Their approach is general, their analyses are broad and sweeping in hopes of identifying those forces in post-Christian western society that make faithfulness to Christ particularly difficult and essentially different than it once was. This breadth is also the book's strength. The writers have made a significant if not always original contribution to this discussion, and that was their stated purpose. Such perspective is vital for us who are in ministry and face the perennial problem of missing the forest for the trees. Some may come to a book like this hoping to find specifics for their difficult or unrenewed ministries, only to be disappointed. This is not a how-to collection of recipes, a fact freely acknowledged in the preface. However, the book does tell how to have access to tapes and transcripts of other sessions of the conference that were not included in the book and that delve into some of the hands-on issues.

All in all, a book worth recommending; in particular I wish that Packer's article could be put into the hands of every pastor and Christian leader for frequent reading.

Scott Golike

Faith Community Church, Simi Valley, CA


Bob E. Patterson has edited the eighteen volumes of the Makers of the Modern Theological Mind series, which began in the early 1970s. The earlier volumes were on Barth, Bonhoeffer, Bultmann, Küng, Tillich and a dozen others. In introducing this final volume, Patterson comments: "As editor of this series... I had to select an (or the) outstanding American evangelical about whom to write a book. The choice was simplicity itself—Carl F. H. Henry, of course, and now in his 70s the unofficial elder statesman for the entire tradition." Then the editor chose himself to write on Henry.

Patterson has obviously read most if not all of Henry's books (at least 27 of them) beginning in 1941 but first making a contribution in theology with The Uneasy Conscience of Modern Fundamentalism (1947). He treats Henry respectfully, knowledgeably and, I think, quite fairly and accurately throughout.

The first 57 pages, approximately a third of the book, are devoted to a history of the fundamentalist-evangelical movement in America. The chapter does not appear to be an insider's report by one whose roots lie in the movement or who grew up with it, such as
many fundamentalist-evangelicals of Henry’s age or older might write. Most of his sources, besides the writings of Henry himself, are books written within the last 10 years, and of these several are by men who were scarcely born yet when Henry started his teaching and writing career.

Fundamentalism seems to be honestly assessed. Yet I wonder how the chapter would read if Patterson had consulted the living memory at a place like Biola University, Dallas Theological Seminary and a dozen other “fundamentalist” schools or had interviewed the sons of some of the fundamentalist pioneers or inquired at denominational headquarters of one of the newer “fundamentalist” denominations such as the Christian and Missionary Alliance or the General Association of Regular Baptist Churches. Perhaps it is too much to expect in this day of scholastically oriented religious and historical writing. Anecdotal accounts are not necessarily scientific history. Yet I cannot imagine reading the OT or the gospels with interest if they reproduced not a single incident or conversation. The true story of twentieth-century evangelical religion in America under the name of “fundamentalism” includes far more of missionary and evangelistic effort, Christian training schools, Bible institutes and the like than of academic accomplishment. If this were not the case there might not now be a body of evangelicals to read Henry’s and Patterson’s books. Patterson’s chapter is, in spite of these animadversions, an informed and sensitive sketch of the scholastic side of the last century of orthodox, evangelical, Protestant movements in America.

Yet the chapter sometimes fails carefully to distinguish what really happened from what at a distance of several decades only seems to have happened. From a distance of nearly four decades it seems to Patterson as if The Uneasy Conscience of Modern Fundamentalism must have created a great stir. But it did not. About 20 years ago I heard Henry himself publicly cite his book with the remark that it had been “somewhat stillborn.”

Carl Henry has written and worked mainly in three areas of Christian thought: apologetics (clarification and defence of Biblical Christianity), the doctrine of revelation, and the doctrine of God.

Chapter 2, “Philosophical Apologetics: Is Christianity Defensible?”, explains Henry’s apologetic “presuppositionalism.” Though not rejecting mystical experiences of divine grace, Henry finds no strong basis for apologetics therein. Nor does he think that reasoning from the observed world in the manner of Joseph Butler or Thomas Aquinas will lead to assured knowledge of God. Rather, in the fashion of Augustine and Calvin he starts with the Biblical revelation as presupposition and seeks by demonstrating its superiority and consistency to show that saving knowledge of God is found there and only there. Henry does not deny the existence of natural revelation, even if there is small basis therein for a natural theology. “Divine revelation is the source of all truth, the truth of Christianity included; reason is the instrument for recognizing it. Scripture is its verifying principle; logical consistency is a negative test for truth and coherence a subordinate test” (p. 64 quoting Henry, God, Revelation and Authority, 1. 10).

Chapter 3 is entitled “Revelation: The God Who Speaks and Shows.” Patterson shows that although Henry’s doctrine of revelation is historic Protestant orthodoxy, it is formulated against the foil of neo-orthodoxy, for Henry feels its influence toward wrong views of revelation is still pervasive. His main theses are that (1) revelation “is a divinely initiated activity, God’s free activity” (p. 84); (2) it “is given for human benefit, offering us privileged communication” (p. 85); (3) it “does not completely erase God’s transcendent mystery” (p. 86); (4) the “very fact of disclosure by the one living God assures the comprehensive unity of divine revelation” (p. 87); (5) it is “exclusively God’s determination” (p. 87); (6) it is “uniquely personal” (p. 89); (7) “God reveals himself . . . universally in the history of the cosmos and of the nations . . . redemptively . . . in unique saving acts” (p. 92); (8) the “climax of God’s special revelation is Jesus of Nazareth” (p. 94); (9) the “mediating agent in all divine revelation is the Eternal Logos—preexistent, incarnate, and now glorified” (p. 97); (10) “God’s revelation is rational communication conveyed in intelligible ideas and
meaningful words, that is, in conceptual verbal form” (p. 99).

Chapter 4 is “The Bible as Authoritative Norm.” The theses continue as follows: (11) “The Bible is the reservoir and conduit of divine truth” (p. 105). The vexing problems now being debated under the rubrics of inerrancy and infallibility, cultural, literal and the like are handled by Henry in this connection. He comes out on the side of enlightened historic Protestant orthodoxy. (12) The “Holy Spirit superintends the communication of divine revelation” (p. 114). At this point Patterson discusses Henry’s debate and controversy with Lindsell, Schaeffer, Beegle and others over the inerrancy of Scripture and related issues. Though an “inerrantist” himself, Henry does not think this position should be a test of evangelical loyalty. He does not shrink from controversy. He stands against both the right- and left-leaning partisans of his own party in the strife over views of the Bible.

Chapters 5, “The Doctrine of God,” and 6, “Carl Henry and His Critics,” close the book except for a complete list of Henry’s books and symposia articles. More attention could have been given to his articles and editorials in Christianity Today, of which he is the founding editor and which may be the vehicle of his most powerful influence on recent American Christianity. They are certainly easier to read, for despite all his early newspaper experience Henry does not employ a lilting journalistic style. Quite the reverse. Henry is exceedingly prolix in many of his books. Several are positively formidable in size. The editorials, however, present most of the same ideas in bite-sized morsels and are the distilled thought of Carl F. H. Henry.

Patterson has done us all a great favor by digesting all that Henry has written, including the ponderous Christian Personal Ethics (over 600 pp.) and all six volumes of God, Revelation and Authority (published 1976-83). This book is of great value as a brief, honest, objective digest of all Henry’s writings—strong on reportorial content and wisely reticent on appraisal. Let the next few years do their own appraising. It is going to be impossible to ignore a man who has written and said so very much and leaves his personal and intellectual footprints in so many places.

Robert Duncan Culver
Winnipeg Theological Seminary, Otterburne, Manitoba

Erratum: In the recent review of Productive Christians in an Age of Guilt-Manipulators by David Chilton, the reviewer categorized Chilton’s eschatological views as “amillennialism.” The word should have been “postmillennialism.” The reviewer attempted to make the correction before the review appeared, but unfortunately the correction arrived too late. We regret the error.