BOOK REVIEWS


When I first received this book I expected to find a one-sided apologetic treatise attempting to convince me that the Jesus of the gospels was supported by an overwhelming amount of corroborative evidence. There are several popular works that treat the “evidence” in just such a manner. However, I underestimated the discriminating sincerity of France’s task. As it turns out France treats the evidence as a scholar with a fair and critical assessment of the data’s worth. For example, the reductio-critical treatment of Josephus’ Antiquities 18 passage is insightful and convincing (pp. 27–32).

The main thrust of the book is to evaluate the historical value of the gospels (both canonical and apocryphal) and the additional testimony of the non-Christian writers, inscriptions and archeology. In accomplishing this task, France’s work is a refreshing respite from the historical skepticism that has been fashionable in recent gospel research. Coming from a British series apparently written for laity and students, France has produce a superb work melding scholarship together with a communicable style.

There are a few instances, however, where more caution should have been exercised or where the case is simply overstated. For example, when France discusses Christian evidence outside the NT one gains the impression that it is next to impossible for researchers to discover anything genuine in the extra-canonical materials. This appears to be rather misleading. France does not want to deny that these writings may contain some genuine sayings of Jesus. The point that France argues, however, is that “it is hard to see how such genuineness might be established other than by a purely subjective impression.” Perhaps it would be more accurate to say that with great difficulty scholars are able to arrive at only a certain degree of probability regarding the authenticity of the noncanonical sayings of Jesus. Certainly the criteria of dissimilarity and coherence help us to eliminate sayings that are obviously spurious and at least point us in the right direction.

Also, France’s discussion of the gnostic writings does little justice to the diversity within gnosticism (p. 63). He asserts that docetic teaching is fundamental to these writings but fails to note that in some writings (such as The Treatise on Resurrection, 1. 44:13–34) Jesus actually takes on a body of flesh. Similarly, when it is stated that “the undesirability of women is a common Gnostic theme” (p. 76) France fails to note passages like The Gospel of Philip, 2. 63:32–64:5, and The Gospel of Mary where women are exalted above even the male apostles.

It was my impression that France’s research had an almost one-sided bias for the British publications. Perhaps it is for this reason that France seems to be unaware (p. 96) of recent questions regarding the existence of a pre-Markan passion narrative raised by a number of scholars in The Passion in Mark (ed. W. H. Kelber). France also seems to be unaware of recent German and American studies on the Q-source. His comments calling into question the existence of the Q-source do not agree with the conclusions of these studies. Distinctive themes and intentions can be discerned in Q just as well as in the canonical gospels. One would hardly expect such a large degree of consistency if the Q-material was simply a collection of miscellaneous texts found in the overlap between Matthew and Luke.

Some of France’s suggestions and implications regarding the synoptic problem are sure to raise objections in scholarly circles. The statement “It is, I believe, probable that
some, and perhaps all, of the gospels were written in substantially their present form within thirty years of the events, and that much of the material was already collected and written a decade or two before that" echoes J. A. T. Robinson's conclusions, which have as yet to gain a large following.

These few comments, however, do little to detract from a work of substantial merit. France's principal conclusions should be amiably received by scholars and enthusiastically read by laypeople.

Huntington College, Huntington, IN

Mark R. Fairchild


Tannehill approaches Luke-Acts as a unified literary work. With the help of narrative criticism he wants to show that the author has carefully provided disclosures of the overall purpose that unifies the narrative. Four types of material provide disclosures of the overall purpose: previews and reviews, repeated or highlighted Scriptural references, commission statements, and interpretive statements by reliable characters. The unifying purpose of Luke-Acts is the same as the purpose of God in the world—that is, universal salvation. At the end of Acts, however, the purpose of God is only partially fulfilled because of the frequent and persistent rejection of salvation by a recalcitrant humanity. Yet these rejections do not lead to the defeat of God's purpose but open the way for new triumphs. The strain of negativity in the plot makes the story richer and more complex.

Tannehill does not provide a complete literary analysis of Luke but chooses to focus on connections and characterization. His emphasis on the unity of the narrative leads him to note the many internal connections among the different parts of the narrative. The central chapters of this work are organized by narrative roles and concern Jesus as he interacts with groups that appear repeatedly in the narrative.

The book begins with a study of the Lukan birth narrative, which is united by a pattern of repetition and by a sequence of disclosures of God's purpose in Jesus. The narrative next moves to the mission of John the Baptist and the beginning of the mission of Jesus. The story of Jesus develops as Jesus interacts with various groups. Jesus is portrayed as a prophet mighty in work and word in the gospel of Luke. Tannehill shows how the plot unfolds as Jesus deals with the oppressed and excluded, the crowd or people, the authorities, and the disciples. The book ends with a study of Luke 24, an important bridge that helps to unify the story of Jesus and the story of his witnesses.

The nature of Tannehill's approach can best be understood by comparing his work with other approaches to Luke-Acts. First, Tannehill calls his work a commentary, but he wants it to be a different kind of commentary that highlights what he believes the narrator is highlighting through the literary design of the work. By doing this he hopes to avoid the "flattening" effect of most commentaries, in which a narrative's main interest and emphases are lost in the host of details discussed.

Second, Tannehill is interested in the nature of Luke-Acts as a unified narrative, and so he does not focus on the concerns of form and redaction criticism. He is concerned with Luke-Acts in its finished form, not with the task of discerning pre-Lukan tradition or with distinguishing tradition from Lukan redaction of that tradition. Tannehill's work is also distinct from redaction criticism because he is not attempting primarily to isolate the theology of Luke. He views the gospel of Luke as narrative rhetoric because the story is constructed to influence its readers and because there are particular literary techniques used for this purpose. A gospel story exercises influence in a much richer way
than through theological statements that might be presented in an essay. Looking
simply for a Lukan theology within Luke-Acts tends to divorce theological themes from
the larger purpose of the work.

Third, Tannehill distances himself from a reader-response criticism that attempts to
record the reading process with its many temporary interpretations, anticipations and
adjustments. Though he wants to be sensitive to the ways in which the text is leading
the reader he does not want to be confined to what is happening when reading for the
first time, with much of the text still unknown. Tannehill still talks, however, about the
influence of the text upon its readers, and he can be quite sensitive to the sequential flow
of the narrative. Some of the best material in the book is found in the places where
Tannehill pays close attention to the sequence of the narrative. This can be seen in his
discussions of the progressive disclosure of God’s purpose in the angelic messages and
prophetic canticles of the birth narrative, the tragic story of Israel, and the interaction of
Jesus with the people, the authorities, and the disciples.

Narrative commentaries on the Bible are only starting to be written, and Tannehill’s
book on the gospel of Luke is a good example of this approach. His work shows just how
much can be learned when we pay close attention to the literary techniques of the author
and to what the text is actually saying.

Joel Williams

Racine, WI

Paul and His Message for Life’s Journey. By William G. Thompson. New York: Paulist,

An attempt to make the Pauline literature a relevant part of the Christian’s devo-
tional life, this book is divided into three major sections. “Part I: Dialoguing with Paul”
is a fairly conventional treatment of Paul’s life and letters within a relatively moderate
historical-critical framework. Thompson’s goal here is to reveal the human Paul rather
than the Paul of Tridentine dogma.

The middle section comprises half the book. “Part II: Finding Meaning in Paul’s
Message” contains discussions of the major Pauline theological categories. Here Thomp-
son stands in the mainstream of modern Pauline scholarship and shows great affinity to
Catholic scholar D. M. Stanley. For each section he includes modern examples that
reinforce Paul’s affirmations (many of these are fairly radical condemnations of sexual
inequality in the Church).

The final section is entitled “Part III: Praying with Paul’s Letters.” Thompson wraps
up the book with a practical, detailed explanation of how to practice “Prayer Dialogue”
in and through Paul’s letters. It is Thompson’s suggestions for reading Paul that form
the leitmotif for his book. He is seeking to broaden the horizons of Christians who “pray
through” the gospels (e.g. by praying to the Good Shepherd, or by mentally casting
themselves in the role as the forgiven sinner). His plan for overcoming the cultural
barrier between the reader and first-century Christianity is fairly subjective: The reader
should try to grasp Paul’s feelings and desires as he reads and then gradually sort out
the similarities with his own situation. The relevance of the letters is thus heavily
influenced by the reader and his context, which Thompson assumes will follow general
patterns of experience that are universally valid. He avoids the extremes of the new
hermeneutic and a full-fledged contextual hermeneutic. Still, his model retains an oddly
horizontal feel that minimizes the vertical dimension in inspiration, illumination and
practice.

Thompson states that his plan for dialogue with Paul is an outgrowth of the Lectio
Divina tradition of contemplatively reading the Bible: “In his letters Paul tells us about
his experience, and we respond by sharing our experience.” This response is made
through mental dialogue with Paul, meditative reflection, or actual prayer. But Thomp-
son’s prescription to dialogue mentally with Paul again virtually eliminates the vertical
element from devotions. It has lately been documented that when people make decisions
they tend to converse with themselves, to “split” themselves into two persons, or
summon an imaginary “other” for dialogue. It is a religious version of this mental give-
and-take to which Thompson is calling us. “Stand in your own experience and begin to
let Paul tell you about his experience. . . . Out of your experience begin to dialogue with
Paul. . . . Listen also for God who may want to communicate with you in and through the
dialogue with Paul.” Instead of the usual assertion that “I was praying and the Lord
told me” we go further and claim “I was talking with St. Paul and he told me.” The most
obvious danger lies in substituting either our imagination or an image of Paul for Christ.
The “dialogue” theme and Thompson’s weak understanding of divine authority in the
Word are so predominant that they flavor the whole book, which otherwise has much
usable material.

Gary Shogren

Penacook, NH

The Thessalonian Correspondence: Pauline Rhetoric and Millenarian Piety. By Robert

With the addition of this volume to the Foundations and Facets series, and A. Mal-
herbe’s Paul and the Thessalonians, Fortress Press has made available two important
works on what are commonly considered the earliest of the apostle Paul’s epistolary
endeavors. Jewett previously published A Chronology of Paul’s Life (Fortress, 1979) and
here offers an intriguing glimpse into the life of an early Christian community. The
author’s thesis is that Paul was faced with a unique situation of millenarian radicalism
in Thessalonica, concerning the actual arrival of the millennium and subsequent be-
havior based on that assumption.

Jewett develops this thesis through ten chapters. He attacks preliminary issues by
discussing the problems of authenticity, sequence, literary integrity and the question of
chronology within the life of the apostle. Accepting 1 Thessalonians as indisputably
Pauline he suggests that arguments against the authenticity of the second epistle can be
explained by an audience hypothesis that explains the peculiar relationship between
writer and recipients. Jewett affirms that this hypothesis will also satisfy the peculiar
content of the Thessalonian letters, which have driven scholars like W. Schmithals to
hypothesize redactional and interpolational theories that accomplish unresolvable con-
tradictions. Using J. Knox’s interpretive principle developed in A Chronology, Jewett
eliminates any detail in the traditional framework provided by Acts 17 that conflicts
with data in the primary epistolary evidence. He places the Thessalonian correspon-
dence in the spring of A.D. 50, in canonical sequence within five to seven weeks of each
other.

The literary analysis is the heart of the study and includes a discussion of epistolary
rhetoric and the weaknesses of traditional nonrhetorical approaches and concludes with
a detailed study of the rhetorical structure and genre of each letter. The clues to the
audience situation assembled by this analysis are presented in eight different categories
ranging from persecution and the response to the congregation to the death of a member
to the criticism of Paul’s leadership and the challenge of sexual ethics.

The book concludes with the selection and evaluation of specific models for the
church of Thessalonica. Traditional, enthusiastic, gnostic and divine-man models are all
examined and discarded. It is noteworthy that Jewett’s previous discussions on the
Thessalonian correspondence tended to support the enthusiast option. After discussing the comparative use of the millenarian model, especially in Jewish messianic movements, he concludes that millenarian radicalism best fits the symbols, beliefs, practices and cultural conditions suggested by the data. The final chapter draws the results together by exploring the relationship between the two letters. The provenance of 2 Thessalonians was the massive misunderstanding by the radical millenarian enthusiasts of Paul’s position stated in the first canonical letter. Paul was forced to write again quickly to clarify his argument and intentions.

Jewett’s book is thorough and stimulating. He is acquainted with the scholarly discussion, and any further work in the Thessalonian correspondence will have to interact with his conclusions. His evaluation of previous work is very helpful. Most intriguing is his re-creation of the socio-religious background of the Sitz im Leben and the correlation of the structure, piety and practice of the mystery cult of the Cabiri with the evidence of this Pauline congregation. The structural similarities between the apocalypticism of Pauline Christianity and the Cabiri cult are striking. Both claim the expected parousia of a martyred hero, and the cultic practice and piety are similar. The creation of a religious and social vacuum by the radical shift of the Cabiri cult from a religion for the downtrodden to its incorporation as the civic religion of Thessalonica would explain how the parousia of any religious figure similar to Cabirus would be naturally perceived as subversive to Rome (Acts 17:7). Here is the real strength of Jewett’s thesis.

As noted, Jewett is suspicious of the traditional framework for the Thessalonian correspondence provided by Acts 17:1–9. The idea that Luke is interested only in depicting Paul’s ease of movement in upper levels of society and in building a case that one can be a Christian and still have social aspirations is, Jewett argues, untenable. On the contrary, Luke’s unique interest in the deprived and socially outcast is well documented. The fact that Luke mentions among the converts at Thessalonica “not a few prominent women” is paradoxical in that his continuing interest in the witness of women to the revelation of God in Christ is balanced by a statement concerning their social status. Luke is primarily interested in building a case for the apolitical nature of the Way—it is not a threat to Rome. Acts 17 does not tell us enough about the situation, and Jewett’s model explains well the charge of political subversion in v 7.

Jewett admits that many will remain skeptical of the relevance of the distant cultural parallels he adduces in the construction of his millenarian model. While it is true that millenarianism is a sociological model well documented in history, appeals to ancient Jewish messianism as a plausible analogue to a predominantly pagan congregation is open for discussion. More work needs to be done in this area. What kind of evidence is available on pagan millenarian movements? Is there anything specifically millenarian in the Cabiri worldview?

In the future no study in the Thessalonian correspondence will be complete without interacting with Jewett’s work. It is well written, clearly argued and fully documented. This major contribution to the study of Paul’s first canonical writings is highly recommended.

James L. Jaquette

Union Church of South Foxboro, MA


The New Testament Commentary series has been earmarked for the pastor, since it contains a healthy balance of Biblical scholarship and pastoral insights. The format of
the commentary under review has five basic sections. First, there is a general introduction to each letter that discusses relevant background issues such as identity of the writer, intended audience, and major theological themes. Kistemaker also develops an original outline and uses it to portray the Biblical writer’s purpose for writing the letter. For example, he outlines James utilizing the themes of perseverance, faith, restraint, submission and patience. This thematic outline reveals James’ purpose for his letter since “he knew that they (Jewish Christians) were living in poverty while they were employed by rich landowners who exploited them. . . . James ministered to their needs by writing them a pastoral letter” (p. 7).

Second, following the general introduction is a verse-by-verse analysis using the NIV text. This section demonstrates Kistemaker’s breadth of Biblical scholarship. His noted sources are useful to the pastor since many of them are from available commentaries, standard word-study books (TDNT, NIDNTT), and other reference books that should be found in the pastor’s library. There are only occasional references to journal articles and materials in foreign languages (German, French).

Third, a section entitled “Practical Considerations” serves as a source for the expository preacher. Here the author bridges the gap between Biblical scholarship and Christian application.

The fourth section contains significant Greek words, phrases and constructions involving word study, where appropriate, in addition to grammatical insights. Finally, there is a section called “Doctrinal Considerations” that addresses specific theological issues. For example, the motif of the necessity of works for salvation in James has often been pitted against the Pauline concept of salvation by grace. Kistemaker recognizes this doctrinal tension and presents a balanced explanation: “For Paul and for James deeds are the natural consequence of true faith. . . . By themselves, then, works have no saving power. Nevertheless, in the setting in which James writes his epistle, he proclaims the necessity of works for salvation.” James is not suggesting to his readers that through their deeds they can obtain peace with God. Instead, he teaches that deeds flow forth from a heart that is at peace with God” (p. 90). This eases the tension and allows the reader to view the James/Paul concept of salvation as complementary and not contradictory.

At the conclusion of the commentary there is a selective bibliography that includes other commentaries, books, articles and a general listing of standard exegetical reference books as well as author, Scripture and extra-Biblical indices to facilitate further research.

Joseph B. Modica
Queens Center Alliance Church, Elmhurst, Queens, NY


This small book, on high-gloss paper and containing a number of color photographs and charts, is attractively packaged with a brightly-colored, illustrated jacket. The book covers a relatively small number of Biblical sites and topics out of the total number available for review. Surprisingly, two-thirds of the book features subjects.

Dowley has assembled several scholars—L. F. DeVries, V. H. Matthews, J. Moyer, J. Wilson and J. McRay—to do the writing.

The introductory article, “The Bible and Archaeology,” is followed by 40 pages on OT archeology. The rest of the book deals with NT archeological themes.

As to content, the first and last parts of the volume are particularly good. The introductory article is by McRay and outlines the earlier, primitive days of archeology and then comes to the great work of Petrie, Albright, Glueck and Wright. McRay gives a
good analysis of archeology—whether it be Biblical, classical, prehistoric or other—and also gives a short explanation of the scientific process involved in excavating a site. He does not forget to talk about the interdisciplinary nature of the “new archeology” and the need for the archeologist to interpret properly the materials excavated. He pauses to warn us that archeology is not to be used to prove the Bible but tells us that it can be helpful in illuminating the Bible’s historical and cultural setting.

The last sections of the book (pp. 67–140), all of which are written by Wilson, deal with NT archeology. The chapters are relatively short for the subject matter discussed. “What Did Jesus Look Like?” deals in the main with the portraits of kings, ethnarchs and emperors found on first-century-A.D. coins. In the longest chapter in this section, “Where Are the Lake Cities of Galilee?”, the author discusses the NT cities around the lake: Magdala-Taricheae with its fishing and synagogue background, Bethsaida-Julia (of Philip, Andrew and Peter), Chorazin with its basalt synagogue, and Capernaum with its “St. Peter’s House” and synagogue. Also included is a discussion of a few Decapolis cities, particularly Hippos, Gadara and el-Kursi (Gergesenes). Photos and brief mention of some of the other Decapolis cities are given. There is also discussion of the hot springs of Hammat Gader (near Gadara), Hammat Tiberias, and the city of Tiberias founded by Herod Antipas.

In the “Tombs and Bone Boxes” chapter Wilson gives a brief description and background of the use of limestone ossuaries (bone boxes used for secondary burials), various ossuary inscriptions, the Kidron Valley tombs and the burial process.

The brief 12-page chapter on the Jerusalem temple sketches Jesus’ connection with the temple area, tells of Josephus’ description of the temple, and briefly describes some of the temple area discoveries: a number of the remains found all around the temple platform, inscriptions warning the Gentiles not to enter the inner sacred precincts, etc.

The last chapter, “Where Was Jesus Buried?”, centers on such subjects as the Church of the Holy Sepulchre and Gordon’s Calvary and the Garden Tomb as candidates for the crucifixion and burial of Jesus (the author favors the former place). In addition, there are discussions about the Antonia fortress, Herod’s towers and palace, and the site of Jesus’ trial. The chapter concludes with a description of the anklebone of the first-century-A.D. man, pierced by a nail (found in an ossuary in Jerusalem), as archeological evidence of Roman crucifixion.

The smallest and weakest part of the book is the OT section (pp. 27–66). The few topics considered are briefly treated. “Meeting at the Well” deals basically with the well at Beersheba. (But nothing is said about the great water systems of Hazor, Megiddo and Jerusalem.) There follows an interesting and informative chapter on cylinder and ring seals on jar handles, document seals (bullae) and cylinder tablets. In “What Happened at the City Gate?” there is a discussion of the kinds and functions of city gates, with specifics about those at Tell Dan, Hazor, Gezer and Megiddo.

In the chapter on “Weapons and Warfare in the Book of Judges” the author describes offensive and defensive weapons, the background setting for the use of iron chariots, and swords and special weapons (such as the oxgoad and jawbone).

The brief treatment of “Household Altars” emphasizes the house-shaped altars, cylindrical incense altars, bronze and horned altars. There follow two brief treatments, one on ancient lamps (emphasizing the dating of levels by lamps and giving a description of their styles) and the second on “The Farmer and His Implements,” dealing with the schoolboy’s Gezer calendar and its reference to seasons, and the implements and activities involved in ancient agricultural production.

Discovering the Bible is well illustrated, particularly with color photos and some charts, and it includes quite a few Biblical references for comparison. But only a few footnote references (those listed are for the introductory article and the NT section) are included. There is a brief index at the back, but there is no bibliographical listing.
Evidently the book was produced for popular consumption. It will have some appeal for laity, but it will not serve as an overall, systematic treatment of archeology and the Bible.

W. Harold Mare

Covenant Theological Seminary, St. Louis, MO


Writing Jerusalem’s history from the perspective of excavated evidence, even when complemented by the Bible and other literary sources, is a difficult and, at many points, an uncertain task. The archeological data are voluminous, often contradictory, and frequently subject to different interpretations. Furthermore too many pieces of the puzzle are missing with little hope of retrieval. Given the intensity of Jerusalem’s occupation her ruins are often inaccessible, buried beneath many meters of debris or located beneath areas of modern construction or simply off limits to archeologists. The input of new archeological data flows not sporadically but continuously. The bibliography grows as quickly as the new evidence. The picture, therefore, is under constant refinement and revision.

In the light of these realities, Mare has attempted “a chronological survey of the archaeological history of the Jerusalem area from the earliest times to our modern day” (at least to the major building activities of the Ottoman Turk Suleiman the Magnificent, A.D. 1520–1566). Presenting the archeological record from a sometimes popular, sometimes semi-technical perspective, Mare’s study is generally reliable, readable and up to date, though exceptions must be noted in each category.

He begins with a very brief but helpful historical overview of the major periods of occupation (chap. 1). The remainder of the book (chaps. 2–11) surveys the city’s archeological history, complemented with Biblical and extra-Biblical sources, beginning with pre-Davidic times and ending with the Turkish period (1517–1918). Not all periods are treated with equal depth. About 8 pages of text are devoted to pre-Davidic Jerusalem, embracing prehistory through the Late Bronze age (the Chalcolithic period appears to have been omitted) with a 12-page excursus on the Dominus Flevit tomb that largely focuses on the pottery finds. The rationale is not altogether clear why this particular find merits the book’s only significant discussion of pottery typology and chronology. Numerous other pottery horizons from various excavations in and around Jerusalem are of far greater importance.

Although the archeological documentation for the period of the united monarchy is sparse, Mare’s discussion of tenth-century Jerusalem needs refinement. It neither fully nor accurately reflects Y. Shiloh’s most recent conclusions from the City of David excavations. Furthermore it is surprisingly lean on the subjects of the city’s early water systems, especially the construction and chronology of Warren’s shaft and its possible association with the events of 2 Samuel 5, and the various interpretations of the term “Millo.” Discussion of Solomonic Jerusalem, which focuses on the temple, is presented largely from the Biblical record with few references to the admittedly sparse archeological evidence or studies in comparative architecture. The author’s bibliographic suggestions for Jerusalem of this period lack some important and recent entries.

After a brief review of the Judahite monarchy, Mare focuses his discussions of this period on basically three subjects: (1) the early Iron II period as documented in the City of David excavations and by K. Kenyon; (2) the expansion of the city in the late eighth–seventh centuries B.C.; and (3) the construction of Hezekiah’s water tunnel. The second and third topics are handled well, though the walls of Jerusalem will forever perplex
scholars and students alike. The data presented for the first topic will be difficult to follow for most and subject to different interpretations.

The most significant contribution of this volume will be found in chaps. 6–9 (post-exilic Jerusalem through the Byzantine period), especially chaps. 7 (Herodian era) and 9 (Byzantine period). While some might fault the discussion for certain emphases or lack thereof (e.g. B. Mazar’s temple mount excavations and the “burnt house”), the presentation is balanced and reasonably thorough in light of the quantity of information available. Especially helpful is the historical background material on the Hellenistic and Maccabean periods and the listing of literary sources for Byzantine Jerusalem.

Chaps. 10 (early Islamic periods) and 11 (Crusader, Mamluk and Turkish Jerusalem) briefly cover the last thirteen centuries of Jerusalem’s history. Although the concentration on Biblical Jerusalem is understandable, it is unfortunate that the Moslem and Crusader periods are treated with such brevity. The Ayyubid and Mamluk periods (1187–1516) are discussed in two pages, the Turkish period (1517–1918) in less than two. Nevertheless the major monuments of these periods are presented or mentioned. Unfortunately these chapters lack the same depth of historical background materials that the reader has enjoyed previously.

A few other particulars should be noted. Several topics of controversial interpretation are not critically assessed. The reader is frequently presented with the observations or conclusions of several scholars with no attempt to resolve the differences, even when the evidence weighs heavily in a certain direction. The footnotes and select bibliography, intended “to guide the student to additional information available on various aspects of the subject,” have notable lacunae in terms of recent publications and standard works on the archeological history of Jerusalem. Given this observation, the rationale for some bibliographic entries is obscure. The photographs are of average to poor quality. The numerous plans are very helpful, as is the glossary of technical terms. Despite these criticisms and limitations, the volume will be a helpful introduction to the archeological history of the Holy City, especially for the Herodian through Byzantine periods.

Gary D. Pratico

Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, South Hamilton, MA


Although mentioned 12 times in the entire OT, Megiddo has played a crucial role in ancient and modern Near Eastern history. Its strategic geographical location and environmental setting in the Jezreel valley made it a coveted prize throughout the ages. It lay at an important junction of several routes, being accessible to international and local merchants, migrants and military forces. Thus Davies’ book is a welcome addition to the Cities of the Biblical World series. The author has participated in numerous excavations at Lachish. This is the first book to give a comprehensive and illustrated account of the archeological remains at Megiddo and the intense debate surrounding their interpretation.

The purpose of the book is to provide a brief yet comprehensive historical and archeological introduction to the site of Megiddo. Davies’ principal aim is to draw together the conclusions already reached by others rather than postulate new ones, although occasionally he gives the reader his own conclusions and rebuttals. The text is extremely well illustrated with pertinent photographs, maps, references and diagrams, each clearly identified and keyed to the text. Other useful aids are a detailed chronological table, a list of Bible references according to page, and current annotated bibliography after each chapter as a resource for advanced study.

Six chapters comprise the book, concluding with a brief appendix. In chap. 1 the author presents a detailed discussion of the identification of the tell. Also discussed is
the significance of the geographical setting that made Megiddo strategic. Chap. 2 deals with the history of excavations from the initial work of Schumacher to Ussishkin's recent re-evaluation. This chapter is particularly helpful in allowing the reader to understand the tell's present appearance, how the strata came to be arranged, what the pros and cons are of each of the various excavators, and how each dealt with certain problems in interpretation. In chap. 3 Davies discusses the strata of the tell beginning with stratum XX dated to the Neolithic (Yarmukian) period (c. 5000 B.C.). The transition from Neolithic settlement to Chalcolithic village, then to Early Bronze city, is lucidly if briefly presented, with key issues noted for the reader (e.g. the nomenclature debate for the later EB–MB period). Davies prudently leaves this for the reader to follow up.

The bulk and strength of the book are contained in chaps. 4 (Canaanite Megiddo) and 5 (Israelite Megiddo). Chap. 4 covers MB and LB through the early Iron I period, corresponding to strata XIII–VI on the tell. Davies animates the archeological remains, integrating them with the contemporary cultural milieu of the ancient Near East. The author's mastery of the data allows him to focus on the essential information pertinent to comprehending Megiddo's place in the ancient international scene during these periods. The material remains found at Megiddo suggest a time of affluence (e.g. gold and faience jewelry from MB tombs, tomb provisions, LB ivories) and power (e.g. palaces, fortifications) reflecting a city of cosmopolitan proportions.

Stratum VII A (12th century) was suddenly destroyed, being replaced by poorly-built dwellings and new residents (VI B). Some attribute this to the Israelite occupation recounted in Joshua. Davies instead sees the possibility of Philistine control, yet wisely he admits the evidence is unclear (p. 70). If VI B were Israelite it would have been the tribe of Issachar. Stratum VI A (11th century) is Philistine. So, given a possible Israelite occupation of VI B, then VI A would reflect Philistine domination of the northern tribes. But Davies does not consider Joshua or Judges chronologically historical or necessarily factually reliable (p. 74; cf. his article in OTS 24 [1986] 34–53) but as products of Davidic times. While unsettling, his view does not detract from his overall work.

In chap. 5 Davies brings together in a concise and logical manner a diverse wealth of data and differing scholarly positions. He briefly traces the history of occupation, providing a backdrop to the more detailed arguments regarding stratigraphy. The settlement of stratum V B (Davidic) is unpretentious and of no political importance. Stratum V A–IV B (Solomonic), however, is rebuilt with strong fortresses and monumental architecture, suggesting a renewal of political power and international position. Davies focuses on the stratigraphic issues, avoiding trivia and technical language. The major issue is the controversial question of the stratigraphical relationship between strata V A, IV B and IV A and their identity with historical events. The author reviews this "protracted and continuing discussion," showing how and why archeologists disagree in their interpretation of the same data. In nontechnical language Davies clarifies the views and reasons of the various excavators (Yadin, Aharoni, Ussishkin). To summarize (pp. 90–92), Davies evaluates their arguments, offering his own comments. He is fair yet candid in his criticism of Yadin's work and sees strengths in Aharoni's view. When all is said and done, existing evidence strongly supports (p. 92) V B as Davidic and V A–IV B as synonymous and Solomonic. The rest of chap. 5 is given over to water systems, the Assyrian occupation, Hebrew seals and other inscriptions, and the death of Josiah. The final chapter deals with Megiddo under the Persians and its ultimate decline and fading from memory. The appendix is useful as a guided tour for visitors to the site. An aerial photograph with numbered locations identifying major structures is keyed to descriptive notes.

This book serves as a valuable resource for the student who wishes to gain an immediate understanding of Megiddo's history, or as preparation for touring the actual tell. It would also be helpful to pastors and church members seeking to know more about
archeology. Since Megiddo is usually on Holy Land tour agendas, reading this book may aid the traveler in appreciating the significance of this site.

Anthony Michael Appa

South Hamilton, MA


Because of the relative paucity of minor prophets' scholarship the appearance of any work on the twelve in a major commentary series represents a welcome event. Even poor efforts help stimulate discussion in a neglected field of study. Gratefully, Verhoef's commentary is a solid addition both to NICOT and to minor prophets' interpretation. Though not without faults, this book will basically fulfill the series' desire to meet the "needs of pastors, scholars, and students."

Verhoef's methodological approach mirrors other standard historical-grammatical studies of Haggai and Malachi. The author begins his work with a bibliography of significant books and articles, charts the prophecies' setting, authorship, etc., and offers a translation and exegesis of the books themselves. Besides these traditional concerns the writer attempts to unite the various strands of the texts through what he calls "structural analysis." This term does not refer to literary-critical structuralism but to "the division of the book into pericopes, the analysis of sentences (prose), stichoi (poetry), and discourses, and a consideration of various literary devices" (p. 171).

Verhoef's bibliography is thorough and representative of all ideological viewpoints. The list includes works as recent as 1985, which provides the reader an up-to-date survey of scholarship on Haggai and Malachi. One significant omission, though, is D. Petersen's 1984 OTL volume, *Haggai and Zechariah* 1-8.

The analysis of Haggai presents few surprises. After a survey of pertinent views on the prophecy's authorship, Verhoef observes that most scholars think Haggai's oracles "were originally delivered by Haggai himself, and, second, that there seems to be some doubt that he was responsible for the written record in its present form" (p. 13). Despite these doubts, however, Verhoef agrees with O. Eissfeldt and J. L. Koole that the prophet himself probably wrote the book. Similarly the writer argues for the unity of Haggai, stating (with R. K. Harrison) that all "stylistic clumsiness" should be traced to the book's author instead of to any editorial activity (p. 17). A good overview of Jerusalem's post-exilic situation and a structural analysis of the book are also offered. Finally, Verhoef stresses three aspects of Haggai's theology: God, the temple, and eschatology.

Despite its predictability, Verhoef's commentary on Haggai will not disappoint the reader. Indeed the author's ability to defend his orthodox critical opinions and accurately interpret the text exhibits excellent scholarly and exegetical skill. Verhoef produces insightful expositional comments on the book's major themes—obedience and faith (e.g. p. 64)—and uses his historical expertise to explain the significance of the sermons' dating (cf. 93-94). When addressing the unity of 2:10-19 Verhoef displays a wide knowledge of secondary literature and uses his structural methodology to demonstrate the interrelatedness of the passage (pp. 111-114). Thus the writer avoids taking a well-known position and boring the reader with it.

One flaw in the Haggai analysis surfaces when Verhoef attempts to make sermonic suggestions (cf. pp. 78, 90). His comments do not tell the pastor anything not already evident from the exegesis. These suggestions virtually disappear in his analysis of Malachi, which is just as well. The commentary will help preachers, but not because the author tells them what they should already understand.
In the Malachi commentary Verhoef includes the same introductory data as in the Haggai section. Concerning authorship he concludes that the book’s dialogues were originally spoken by a person named Malachi, though the issue of “whether Malachi must also be considered the author of the written copy of his speeches cannot be answered with any certainty” (p. 156). This decision seems somewhat strange in light of his arguments on Haggai’s authorship. Despite the fact that Haggai’s sermons are dated and Malachi’s are not, the issues surrounding compilation are not that different in the two prophecies. On Malachi’s date Verhoef agrees with J. M. P. Smith that the situation fits Nehemiah’s time. More specifically the writer decides that “without being dogmatic about the precise date of Malachi, we favor the period between Nehemiah’s two visits, that is, shortly after 433 B.C.” (p. 160). The reasons for this position are that the cult has been restored but needs revision, that Malachi and Nehemiah share common concerns (Mal 2:10–12; Neh 13:25–27), and that Jerusalem has no strong governor (pp. 158–159). Because he accepts this date Verhoef’s analysis fits that time frame. Still, these statements are broad enough to describe post-exilic Israel in general.

In discussing Malachi the author demonstrates an excellent grasp of the book’s ethical issues. He explains Malachi’s concerns through historical analysis, word studies, and application of sound Biblical theology. One is hard pressed to fault the conclusions on sacrifice, divorce, and keeping the covenant.

Verhoef’s technical skills remain solid in the Malachi commentary. Because its text contains more problems, his translation notes on Malachi are more extensive than they were on Haggai. Verhoef defends MT but is honest about the difficulties in 2:10–16 and does not hesitate to make reasonable adjustments in MT (cf. p. 278). On controversial verses like 1:11 the writer continues to offer balanced and adequate bibliographical information (p. 222).

Certain theological objections may arise. Reformed readers will dispute the ease with which the author separates election and human responsibility in 1:2–5 (p. 201). Israel’s election is a major part of Malachi’s covenant theology that Verhoef neglects. Non-dispersional readers may dispute some differences the author locates between Malachi and the NT. For instance, Verhoef says the promises in 3:11 show that under the old dispensation “earthly blessings were legitimate expressions of God’s pleasure within the covenant relationship” (p. 309). Likewise the destruction of the wicked in 4:3 “is cast in terms of the OT dispensation” (p. 333). If so, parts of Matthew 5–7 and Revelation also operate under the OT dispensation. Such dichotomies are really unnecessary, as K. Barker has shown (JETS 25/1, pp. 3–16).

Despite these few objections, readers will enjoy Verhoef’s strong scholarship, his exegetical excellence, his appreciation of these books’ contribution to OT prophecy (cf. pp. 307, 310, 317), and his ability to make these prophecies relevant for today. This work sets high standards for future evangelical historical-grammatical analyses of these books. Hopefully this study will not only act as a standard commentary but also incite further study in a much-neglected area of OT inquiry.

Paul R. House

Taylor University, Upland, IN


An impressive galaxy of international, interfaith scholars has been enlisted to produce this _Festschrift_ for Harvard University’s aspirant to the mantle of W. F. Albright. Due to the specialized knowledge and interests of the contributors, the main
emphasis in reconstructing Israelite religion has fallen in this volume not on the primary data base of the Bible but on the secondary evidence, the epigraphic and artifactual archeological data of the ancient Near East. This is particularly so in part 1, "Sources and Contexts," but the comparative approach and the exploitation of the non-Biblical sources continues to characterize part 2, "History and Character."

Quite a wide range of topics has been accommodated under the heading of ancient Israelite religion, but this inclusive policy is justifiable on one ground or other depending on one's theological stance. It is certainly a congenial policy for those who identify the kingdom of God with the socio-economic phenomena of sundry this-worldly political causes and programs. But even those of us who reject such identification of God's name with ordinary common-grace political enterprises recognize (or should) that in the case of OT Israel we are dealing with an institution that as a whole—in court and community as well as in cult—was the holy domain of the Lord God. And on that basis all areas of the life of theocratic Israel may be considered fair game as the subject of an essay in the present volume. Nevertheless it must be said that this collection lacks an appropriate overall balance. Only minimal attention is given to the great central realities of Israel's faith and worship, particularly as expressed in the normative cultus of tabernacle and temple.

Another not unrelated shortcoming of this volume is its failure to distinguish properly between normative—i.e., divinely prescribed or approved—and deviant expressions of religion in Israel. Apart from the orthodox Reformation view of Scripture's divine inspiration and authority there is no objective basis for distinguishing true Israelite religion from false. In the framework of the various theologies (Protestant, Catholic, Jewish) represented by these essays, "normative" tends to denote the tradition that eventually happened to prevail in the dominant circles of Israel over conflicting traditions. With this relativizing demotion of the idea of normative, it is all the more understandable that the core of true Israelite religion has been neglected while deviant practices and beliefs have been given such disproportionately large space.

One further general criticism: Insofar as the various authors do utilize the Biblical data their reconstructions of the history of Israelite religion suffer the usual serious dislocations and distortions resultant from the radically warped schema of source analysis, in which the modern guild of Biblical scholarship is still enmeshed—increasingly, it appears—with reluctance and against their better judgment.

Having delivered myself of these sentiments as a theologian and confessional churchman I would, as a professional student of the Bible and its world, hasten to acknowledge my keen appreciation of these informative, stimulating studies. The volume is a very valuable collection of state-of-the-art accounts of a host of important matters currently in the forefront of scholarly discussion of the life and history of Israel.

At this point we face the usual problem of the reviewer of a sizeable collection of essays (33 in the present case) when the policy is not one of bare tabulation of chapters, authors and titles: How, within brief compass, can I move beyond general observations to convey something about the specific contents? Here I will settle for some comments on one essay, selected because the subject (1) is of particular interest to me, (2) is of major import in Biblical religion, and (3) provides illustration of one or two of the general criticisms of the modern critical method mentioned above.

In his essay on "The Place of the Covenant in the Religion of Israel" (pp. 429-447) R. A. Oden, Jr., surveys critical opinion on that subject during the last century. He traces three stages: (1) Wellhausen's view of covenant as relatively late and of peripheral importance; (2) the recognition, in the mid-twentieth century, of covenant's antiquity and centrality; and (3) the current return of some to the position of nineteenth-century criticism.

Oden's primary concern is to account for the second stage. One factor was the influence of the Weberian sociological approach to the meaning and function of religion.
This led to the interpretation of Israel’s religion as a social institution: Israel was a covenant-bound society, a religious federation with Yahweh as a treaty partner. A second factor, the immediate catalyst, was the discovery of parallels to the Biblical covenants of Yahweh and Israel in the international treaties of the ancient Near East. Oden judges, properly, that the most significant aspect of this was the identification of the structure of Deuteronomy with the vassal treaty form, though he fails to credit this to the conservatives who first drew attention to it and he mistakenly suggests that the parallel is especially with the treaties of the Assyrian period. Actually, the distinctive structure of Deuteronomy is paralleled in the treaties of the second millennium B.C. (in the age of Moses, to whom Scripture attributes Deuteronomy), not in the treaties of the first millennium (where modern criticism would relocate Deuteronomy).

More tentatively Oden explains the reactionary third stage in terms of a decline of the Weberian approach, from which “the covenant centrality tradition” has stemmed. This explanation is questionable. For one thing Weber’s work commands continuing respect, even where particular applications of his sociological typologies are criticized (cf. e.g. S. Talmon’s chapter in this Festschrift). Also, socio-anthropological analysis of Israel’s religion is currently highly popular (as is strongly attested in the volume under review). There is a simpler and quite obvious explanation.

In stage two modern Biblical criticism was confronted with the challenge to abandon the subjective methodology of the skeptical, old, documentary-development hypothesis, which had resulted in the late dating of the covenant data in the Pentateuch. These results were contradicted by the now-available, objective, form-critical evidence of the non-Biblical treaties, confirming the Mosaic dating of Deuteronomy and demonstrating the early and pervasive presence of covenant in all the institutions of Israel—priestly, royal, prophetic. Stage three represents a predictable decision in favor of obscurantism in preference to an open-minded handling of evidence that is so devastating to cherished tenets fundamental to a century of critical research and publication on the history of Israelite religion.

Meredith G. Kline

Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, South Hamilton, MA


One of the chief constitutive elements of Biblical theology is the identification of discrete themes, which on the one hand allow us to appreciate the uniqueness of a perspective of an author, a Biblical book, or an historical period of time, while on the other hand they may perplex us as we seek to interrelate these divergent ideas. Goldingay’s stated purpose in this study “is to reconsider how the theologian is to handle the diversity of viewpoints within the Old Testament.” In the past the problem of diversity has been handled in at least three ways: (1) One may disregard the differences, yielding a “flat” reading of the Bible—the very situation the Biblical theology movement sought to rectify and that is now generally regarded as a deficient method. (2) One may (whether consciously or not) show preference toward some passages while downplaying competing or conflicting passages. This impulse toward favoring certain passages as more normative than others has been criticized as a weakness behind many unifying-theme theologies. (3) One may acknowledge and uphold the diversities, allowing them to function theologically, and seek criteria and methods by which to interrelate them. Goldingay advocates and explores the third of these options.

The format of this book involves an introductory chapter, followed by three parts corresponding to three ways Goldingay suggests for dealing with the problem of diversity. Each part contains one chapter that explains the approach, followed by a chapter modeling that approach.
Part 1 is "A Contextual or Historical Approach" in which Goldingay proposes that the different viewpoints within the Scriptures are appropriate to different contexts. By context Goldingay is referring to the historical circumstances behind the writings as opposed to the literary context of the passage. Thus, for instance, the differences between so-called "First" and "Second" Isaiah are attributed to allegedly differing theologically-historical situations rather than complementary theologicoliterary strategies. The task of the theologian is therefore to identify the thematic trajectories in the OT and trace them through the successive historical contexts with a view toward finding the high points (= the context in which the motif is seen in its greatest clarity). In the following chapter Goldingay illustrates this approach, using the theme of the people of God, which he discusses in the specific historical epochs (i.e. contexts) of the Abrahamic covenant, the Sinai covenant, the Davidsic covenant, the covenant broken, and the covenant renewed.

In Part 2, "An Evaluative or Critical Approach," Goldingay explains that certain diversities are due to different levels of insight on the part of the Biblical authors. Here he presents the issues at stake in attempting to identify which Biblical passages are more explicit, profound, illuminating, or normative than other, more peripheral passages—a practice commonly referred to as seeking a "canon within the canon." His subject for modeling this approach is "the teaching of Deuteronomy," providing a stimulating discussion of the theology of the book of Deuteronomy worthy of publication in its own right. Though his treatment is laudable, one is left to wonder by what criteria Deuteronomy was selected. He fails to provide the rationale by which he decided that this particular book "has a notably comprehensive and clearly articulated theology" (p. 134), a value judgment that begs the question he raises in the preceding chapter.

In Part 3 Goldingay presents "A Unifying or Constructive Approach"—i.e. the diversities within the OT are all expressions of one underlying theology. This third and last of Goldingay's approaches handles the question "Can we formulate one OT theology?" Goldingay suggests that the OT theologian ought to seek "the Lowest Common Denominator of the various versions of OT faith, that entity in which all the insights that emerge at various points in the OT can find a place because it is large enough to combine them all" (p. 184). Unfortunately, while he deals with what such a unifying approach would incorporate, he does not offer a judgment on what he believes that "Lowest Common Denominator" might be. In the final chapter he does, however, illustrate this approach with one aspect of OT theology (p. 200)—viz., the tension between creation and salvation: God's involvement in the regularities of life vis-à-vis his special acts of deliverance on behalf of his elect people Israel.

Goldingay has done yeoman's service in providing a tool by which Biblical theologians can handle the OT in a more informed and nuanced way. He effectively disabuses us of certain "a priori" hierarchical values (such as early is authentic; latest is fullest revelation; the NT alone is binding on the church; Jesus' perspective is ultimate)" (p. 98). In addition, his illustrations and examples provide excellent insights across a broad spectrum of Biblical themes. The book concludes with a hefty 50-page bibliography and indices of subjects, authors and Scripture.

R. J. Lubeck

Trinity Bible Fellowship, Kennewick, WA


Written for college students, pastors and laypeople, Mayers' work is a plea for "tolerance and equilibrium" in the theological debates that divide American evangelical and fundamentalist churches (pp. 1, 5, 179, 185). More specifically "it is intended for
conservative Christians of various denominational stances to see the doctrinal balance that the Bible seems to imply for so many of the theological issues that have historically divided us," since "established doctrine, or orthodoxy, has usually been, and should always be, determined by the balance that the Bible indicates in the various doctrinal issues" (p. 1). It is this "Biblical balance" that thus becomes "the goal and purpose" of Mayers' book (p. ix).

The "both... and" principle of doctrinal maturity advocated by Mayers will not always solve the problems that confront us. Often the issue simply cannot be solved by merely stressing the two sides equally. For example, in dealing with the question of the relationship between human responsibility and God's sovereign election the issue is not whether an individual emphasizes one to the exclusion of the other (Mayers asserts that this is done only because he equates free will and responsibility, pp. 118-119) but whether human responsibility (which all affirm) demands free, autonomous, self-determining agents (see pp. 117-121). Similarly those who disagree over the issue of "eternal security" do so not because they are overemphasizing one side to the exclusion of the other (pp. 137-144) but because they have distinct views of the same issues—i.e. the nature of the relationship between the work of the Spirit and the human will, and the nature of justification. Often we disagree not because we have overemphasized one particular aspect of an issue but because we relate the two aspects together quite differently. For example, evangelicals agree that special revelation is both event and word and that Scripture is the work of both the Holy Spirit and human authors (see pp. 69 ff., 82-91). Our disagreements are over how we ought to relate these aspects, an issue Mayers does not adequately treat.

Mayers' definitions and exegesis will be contested by many evangelicals. Doctrinal maturity is not just a matter of balancing two or more aspects of Biblical doctrines. It is a matter of ascertaining what the Bible actually teaches.

Many grammatical mistakes and excessive use of capitals in reference to God mar the reading of the book and should have been corrected at the editorial stage. Absence of indices also detracts from the book's usefulness.

Although the author's goal is admirable, the book falls short of reaching it. It is not only too brief for such big questions but also its methodology, controlling assumptions and production seem faulty.

Scott Hafemann

Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, South Hamilton, MA


In the public debate over human life issues Christians want to be characterized as "pro-life." We advocate public policy based on the theological premise that human life is the most valuable part of God's creation. But recently some among us with this same conviction have begun to question whether we are consistently pro-life. One example encouraging such questioning is the prevalent tendency for conservative Christians to be strongly against abortion while being apathetic, tolerant, or pessimistic about the nuclear arms threat. The two works here considered (representing a growing coalition) call us to consistency. Both attempt to explain how the pro-life principle should take shape across a variety of issues from abortion to tobacco promotion. They do not question why others hold views that may at first appear inconsistent (e.g. that abortion
is wrong but the death penalty is right). Instead each sets out his own constructive case for what it means to be consistently pro-life.

Erdahl takes each issue and makes his case: against abortion on demand but open to it in "tragic" situations; against nuclear war but accepting it within the just-war tradition; against institutional killing but open to forms of "mercy killing" in extreme situations; and against the death penalty. Throughout he shows why being pro-life leads to these conclusions, but he seldom examines why others applying the same principle arrive at opposing views. In all, the book sincerely desires to strike a middle ground where progress can be made among opposing views. It should be taken as an invitation to think about the question of consistency, and that is always worthwhile.

Erdahl disclaims any intent to be thorough or academic. He describes his effort as an "open letter" written "on the run." Pastoral and popular, it would serve well to stimulate discussion in a church context, especially with its numerous study questions, resource listings, and 30 specific challenges for action. But the lack of depth and minimal documentation may frustrate the more serious student. Nevertheless it can be engaging and at points provocative.

Sider's effort is based upon the same concern for consistency in our pro-life agenda. The sincerity of his desire is seen in his admission that he has had to change his thinking to a more conservative view on abortion and also in his willingness to discuss the nuclear arms question from the perspective of a just-war theory (which most Christians accept) rather than from his own pacifist understanding. Carefully setting down Biblical foundations he deals at some length with the questions of abortion, the family, nuclear weapons, and the poor, and more briefly near the end with smoking, alcoholism, and environmental destruction. (We could wish he had dealt with the difficult and debatable question of the death penalty, but space limitations would then have forced him into a superficial treatment of the other issues.) In each instance he supplies impressive documentation and empirical backing for his analysis, which produces a forceful and convincing challenge to become ardent about protecting life on every front. At the same time, when moving from generally accepted themes (like God's concern for the poor) to specific suggestions on public policy strategy he displays a good measure of humility, is open to disagreement, and is careful to avoid buying into a political or ideological agenda from either the left or the right.

As Sider works his thesis out in the face of difficult questions and ethical dilemmas the reader is given a greater understanding of the freedom needed in order to act responsibly. When pro-life functions as a mere slogan to sanctify our various and sometimes contrary opinions, it dominates the ethical situation as an abstraction that is unsympathetic to the actual circumstances. If, however, we ask what it means to be pro-life across the whole range of issues and at every level of each issue, then we are more likely to find and choose the pro-life alternative when we need it. This book honestly attempts to do so, and because of that it is much less vulnerable to criticism about being ideologically oriented than many readers might expect.

Completely Pro-Life is the more complete approach to these matters of life and death. College students and laypersons would profit by it, whereas the lack of substance in the argument and evidence of Pro-Life/Pro-Peace might tempt some to think the call to consistency is easily dismissed. When reading either of them, however, one ought to avoid a pick-and-choose kind of evaluation that so often characterizes the way we read. The thesis of each book precludes our treating their effort like one more "issues" text arguing a case for this or that position. Instead they ask us to follow the truth of the pro-life principle wherever and as far as it takes us.

Robert Umidi

Northeastern Bible College, Essex Fells, NJ

When Oxford University Press publishes a book based upon a University of Notre Dame doctoral dissertation written by a professed evangelical, it is probably worth reading. This book is no exception to that rule, though the value lies more in the problems raised than the answers given. Trembath offers a tightly-written critique of the standard Protestant theories of inspiration and presents an alternative theory that, in his opinion, answers the problems identified in the traditional views. These he classifies into two basic approaches: deductivist and inductivist. Representative theories within each position are presented, evaluated and, except for a contemporary representative of the inductivist view, found wanting.

Deductivists are identified as those who approach the Bible with a specific theological view of God and impart the results of that view (his sinlessness and authority) to the Bible. They then look for proof-texts that support the resulting concepts of verbal, plenary inspiration, inerrancy and ultimate authority of Scripture as the Word of God. Representatives of this view are C. Hodge, B. B. Warfield, J. W. Montgomery and E. J. Carnell. Though each claims to approach the Bible from an inductive viewpoint, Trembath argues that they really start with a preconceived notion about the Bible that is based upon their concept of God. In order to arrive at an inerrant text they all ultimately resort to some form of divine dictation that practically ignores the human element in inscripturation. This view identifies the end product of inspiration as a book rather than changed—i.e. inspired—lives, which is Trembath’s definition.

Inductivists begin with something more tangible than a certain view of God. They begin with man and work outward to God through an inductive analysis of the human element in the composition and reception of the Bible. This emphasis upon the recipients of the Biblical message leads the inductivists to identify inspiration as the result produced in a person by the Bible, specifically salvation and the resulting changed life. Representatives identified with this position are A. H. Strong, B. Ramm and W. J. Abraham.

Trembath accepts Abraham’s illustration of teacher-inspiring-student as paradigmatic of inspiration, defining it as the “enhancement of one’s understanding of God brought about instrumentally through the Bible” (p. 103). The locus of inspiration is not a book but the redeemed community, which responds in faith to the divine message. This view does not accord with the Biblical evidence for, as Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel found out, the divine community seldom accepted God’s message when it was given. The consistent emphasis of God’s prophets has always been on the message, not the recipient community.

The questions Trembath raises about the traditional theories of inspiration, while not new, are instructive. His solution, however, is inconsistent with the Biblical testimony and is far closer to the traditional neo-orthodox view than to that of evangelicalism.

William E. Elliott

Oregon State University


This volume in honor of social activist, editor and Catholic theologian Gregory Baum contains 13 essays by students and associates reflecting a wide spectrum of liberal religious thought. The key question is most clearly presented in “Peace Needs Women” by feminist theologian D. Sollee. Portraying western society as a “Cain and Abel culture,” Sollee contends: “I spent several years of my adult life speaking for Abel and
against Cain. For the powerless, whose blood still cries out, and against the gang of unfortunate C-people. For Abel and against the Lord Father who runs the whole show. A theology of pain and rage. The theology of one who is by nature second class, made out of the rib. But I don’t read this story anymore with Abel’s eyes. I am tired of being the blood, the earth and the scream. I address the storyteller and those who have passed the tale down, written it down, recited and believed it. Is that all? I ask the story teller. Where am I then? Do I have to be Abel if I don’t want to be Cain? Is there no other way?"

That is precisely the question. Is there any “other way” to deal with the complex issues of a pluralistic society? Rabbi D. Marmur in “Holocaust as Progress” proffers Maybaum’s answer of a modern Israel that has turned its own nightmare into “a gateway of progress” that affirms faith in God. W. M. Thompson in “Jesus’ Uniqueness” offers a “humanized” Jesus willing to engage in nonexclusive dialogue with world religions. Psychotherapist P. McKenna tenders the hope of a “prospective theology” derived from psychology and sociology. Social activist J. Holland submits a brilliant historical analysis of western culture accompanied by the call for a “vertical ecumenism” that is capable of reaching the depths of society. R. Ruether in “Theologizing from the Side of the ‘Other’” challenges the Church to pass beyond “complementarity” to “transformation” in its response to minorities. M. Lamb in “Political Theology and Metaphysics” proposes the retention of a vigorous spirituality through liberation theology. D. Hall in “Theology Is an Earth Science” challenges orthodoxy to pass beyond merely preserving the ambiguity of “Reformation theology” to the vital future of ecumenical dialogue. M. J. Leddy challenges her Canadian motherland to assume its own critical role in the question for world peace. Finally, Baum himself responds with a clear call for the “preferential option for the poor.” Utilizing Niebuhr’s Christ and Culture as a format he urges greater social awareness complemented by a revival of compassion and the “ascetical option” in which Christians become living witnesses to the world by placing minimum value on material satisfactions.

All of the above profiles a double disparity between evangelical and liberal options. The difference specifically involves the issues of (1) the nature of grace and (2) the meaning of depravity. Assuming the definitions of a “prospective theology,” what hope does Israel really offer? A divided Judaism that cannot understand itself contains no real hope for the future. And why should the attempt to retain Reformation theology be castigated as an attempt to objectify an intrinsically subjective past? The real question is not “Which past?” but “Which future?” And, we may ask, “By whom?”

In spite of these differences the genuine humanity of the writers dares us to examine ourselves. The role of women remains an issue that has not yet been sufficiently addressed by the evangelical Church. Likewise the call to voluntary simplicity must for us be a demand. The crucial concerns of a shrinking world cry not for the image of Cain—but for an Abel that truly reflects the absolute dependence of depraved humanity upon the freely given grave of God.

James F. Breckenridge

East Coast Bible College, Charlotte, NC


For those of us evangelicals wondering about the current state of Roman Catholic theology, this book may be a very useful contribution. Viladesau appears to represent mainstream Catholic thought, in touch with post-Vatican-II developments, yet short of radical movements such as liberation theology. This book is a follow-up to his earlier
The Reason for Our Hope, to which he refers but which is not a prerequisite for following his arguments.

Vatican II opened the door to a new inclusiveness: the possibility of experiencing God's grace outside of the Church and even outside of Christianity, a notion that K. Rahner formalized with his doctrine of the "anonymous Christian." In the light of this development Viladesau states his goal: "This volume will set out . . . to explore the reasons for explicitly Christian conversion" (p. 6). The result is an ambiguity with which anyone wishing to understand Roman Catholic theology today must be acquainted.

Viladesau's starting point is in the transcendental philosophies of Rahner and B. Lonergan in which openness to God is an integral aspect of what it means to be human. God's revelation must be sought for and found within the concrete context of historical existence, there to resolve the problems of our being, particularly the problem of evil. The need for conversion emphasizes the need to face life with a commitment toward humanity in the light of God's self-disclosure.

God has spoken in this sense particularly in the context of the higher religions, claims Viladesau. He believes that there are seven such living: Hinayana and Mahayana Buddhism, Hinduism, Parseeism (Zoroastrianism), Judaism, Islam and Christianity. These religions share a commitment to something transcendent or absolute, a universal expectation of salvation, and a soteriology in which both God and the human organization cooperate in solving the problem of evil. Viladesau describes with some detail how this program works out for each particular religion mentioned.

Now it is obvious that, even though in Viladesau's opinion there is convergence among these religions, there is also a dialectic of difference between them. Is it possible to adjudicate and discover which one of them attains its objectives most successfully? Viladesau believes that it is, and he provides anthropological criteria for doing so. These criteria try to assess which religion maximizes personhood, love, progress, and the presence of God in the world. Not surprisingly, Viladesau believes that Christianity comes out the winner in this contest.

From here the argument moves on to a discussion of Jesus Christ as God's final word. Viladesau displays the uniqueness of Christ and even makes a strong case for the historicity of the resurrection. Nonetheless all of these conclusions do not lead him to argue for an exclusivistic view of salvation through conscious faith in Christ. Rather, with a line of argumentation that appears half based on wishful thinking and half on the classical fallacy of appeal to silence, Viladesau argues that, even though the NT knows of no salvation outside of Christianity, that limited viewpoint does not totally close the door on salvation for those non-Christians who are true to their own religion. Thus somehow Christianity is preferable but not necessary—which leaves the question open as to why it is preferable. All of the ambiguity finally comes home to roost in the last paragraph of the book in which Viladesau pleads for Christian churches to provide a new western home for Buddhism, which has become displaced in the east.

The book is competently, at times brilliantly, argued. Viladesau makes good use of his expertise in Christian theology as well as the non-Christian traditions. But it is frequently a chore to wade through the jargon, much of it from the school of Rahner. Is there, for example, no better way of saying that "the human historical relation to the world perdures in the spiritual reality (self-determining freedom) it has produced" (p. 208)?

A final assessment of the book must reiterate the ambivalence of its logic. This is the kind of book one writes when one's ties to Christianity are emotional and cultural but without intellectual necessity. A case for Christianity without the conviction of the real need for Christianity is not very persuasive. But Viladesau speaks here not only for himself but also for his Church, where dialogue has become more important than mission.

Winfried Corduan

Taylor University, Upland, IN

Eastern Orthodoxy, long primarily an immigrant church in North America, continues to become increasingly visible on the American scene as evidenced by the recent incorporation of the Evangelical Orthodox Church into canonical Orthodoxy last year and by a growing sense of mission among American Orthodox laity and clergy to introduce their faith to all others regardless of ethnic background. Orthodoxy too is becoming more and more established within academic circles as exemplified by the spread of books on a wide range of theological issues by highly respected Orthodox scholars such as G. Florovsky, A. Schmemann, J. Meyendorff, T. Hopko and T. (Kallistos) Ware. Now with Guroian’s Incarnate Love there is a striking breakthrough into the field of ethics by a young scholar of the Armenian Orthodox Church in America.

In this collection of seven well-crafted, provocative essays, in which he interacts creatively with such contemporary ethicists as R. J. Neuhaus, J. C. Murray, S. Hauerwas, J. H. Yoder and S. Harakas, Guroian presents two powerful challenges. The first is directed toward contemporary ethicists and theologians concerning the very methodology of the study and practice of Christian ethics. Guroian offers a highly integrative approach to ethics reflective of Orthodoxy’s holistic worldview, which is often very different from the western tendency (both Protestant and Roman Catholic) to separate and polarize various aspects of Christian faith and life. He argues persuasively for an intimate relationship between ethics and worship, ethics and doctrine, agape and eros, Church and world (as creation), good works and personal salvation, individual acts of charity and social justice. He makes a strong case for ethics being founded in and flowing from the ongoing liturgical life of the worshiping community: “Agape is incomprehensible as a norm, virtue, or principle of the Christian life apart from its manifestation, realization, and fulfillment through the liturgy of that eschatological community which is the Church” (p. 53). In stressing the critical connection between sound ethics and sound doctrine he states: “The Trinity and the Incarnation provide the only sufficient understanding of the true character and meaning of Christian love” (p. 18).

Guroian’s second challenge is forcefully directed toward Orthodox Christians in America, whom he strongly urges to resist the temptation of “ethnic cultism” on the one hand (which has kept Orthodoxy in America to a great extent hidden in ethnic ghettos) and that of “accommodationism” on the other—the acceptance of our society’s dogma of pluralism, which would reduce Orthodoxy to simply another path toward God, equally as valid as all other paths. (He argues that most of American Protestants, Catholics, and Jews are already increasingly adopting such an Americanized “neo-Constantinianism”; p. 148.) He sternly warns against basing Christian ethics upon the proposition that traditional values are needed for the good of the society as a whole, rather than the more fundamental realization that as Christians we are called to be true to the precepts of the faith whether this in turn has positive effects within society or not. In a provocative chapter on marriage he argues that just as the Church is called to be herself, taking a prophetic stand against everything non-Christian in the surrounding culture, so too every Christian family, being indeed “a little Church,” should be led by the precepts of God, not those of the prevailing society. In another particularly insightful chapter, entitled “Orthodoxy and the American Order,” Guroian observes that with the “final cultural disestablishment of Christianity” by contemporary American society (p. 141) the Church “is now free, as it has not been for more than a millennium, to shake the foundations [of society] and through its own worship and community bring a criteriological vision and judgment of the ‘earthly’ city” (p. 143).

This book should be rewarding for all who are interested in the study and pursuit of Christian ethics and for Orthodox Christians who seek to understand better their church’s calling in modern America. It could be of particular interest to evangelical
Protestants, many of whom might be surprised to find powerful allies among American Orthodox Christians in the mission to be ethically and doctrinally sound witnesses in the midst of our increasingly anti-Christianized society.

David Ford

Drew University


What do Christians need to know about the charismatic movement in the Roman Catholic Church? Neher thinks we need to recognize that it is not part of evangelicalism. He is unlikely to get many objections from evangelicals on that, but he may not fare so well on his hidden premise. He also seems to believe that Roman Catholicism is not Christian (p. 78) and may even be the harlot of Revelation 17 (p. 116).

Neher draws on a wide variety of sources to support his conclusions and quotes many of them. In fact almost half the book consists of quotations of various lengths. Most of the Catholics he cites, however, are not official spokesmen for the Catholic Church, and hardly any of the Church's leading theologians, American or otherwise, are included. This may be due in part to Neher's belief that a book containing an *imprimatur* can be considered an official statement of Catholic teaching, whereas the *imprimatur* simply indicates that no false teaching has been found in a book. He quotes various unknown Catholic writers, citing the *imprimatur* as the basis for their authority.

Neher's many quotations follow one another in rapid-fire order with little or no analysis. Without checking each one it is impossible to know if they are presented in context, but one quotation from a Vatican II document that he uses to show the council made no change in the Catholic Church falsely universalized a particular assertion (p. 9 n. 3). Repeatedly, and at key points, Neher offers hasty generalizations unsupported by evidence (e.g. p. 65).

One reason for Neher's difficulty appears to be a basic lack of familiarity with Roman Catholic terminology and doctrinal history. He judges Catholic theological statements in terms of Protestant definitions, although the same words do not always mean the same thing to Catholics and Protestants. He also believes the canard that Rome never changes. Not only did Vatican II make major changes in the Catholic Church, but even the period between Trent and Vatican II saw changes both small and large. Neher explicitly denies this is the case (pp. 8–9). He has not read the Vatican II documents carefully. If he had, he would have seen that the council offered a little something for everyone. Sometimes its statements were contradictory or open to a multitude of interpretations (e.g. chaps. 2–3 of the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church). That is a major reason for the turmoil in Catholicism since the council. More than once the council restated Catholic doctrine in a way that showed its meaning or application had changed significantly (e.g. the entire thrust of the Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World).

Neher appears equally unaware of the pluralism within today's Catholicism. His own testimony, however, reflects that diversity. Early in the book he depicts Catholic charismatics as traditional in their approach to Church doctrine, while later he shows that many are indifferent to doctrinal niceties.

To criticize Neher's portrayal of Roman Catholicism in general and Catholic charismatics in particular is not to recommend the Roman Catholic Church as a preferred alternative for Christians. It is, however, to recognize it as a Christian body despite the defects in some of its teaching. It is also to require it be portrayed fairly and accurately. Neher does neither. He also criticizes evangelicals who say anything positive about Roman Catholicism as being confused (chap. 11).
This book will not prove helpful to those who wish to learn more about Catholic charismatics or the Church to which they belong. Neher's portrayal is frequently inaccurate and polemical in tone. Too often he fails to substantiate his claims and resorts to hasty generalizations. The book is long on rhetoric but short on substance. It reflects the Protestant ignorance of Catholicism characteristic of pre-Vatican-II Protestantism. Evangelicals desiring to learn more about Catholicism would do far better to read D. Wells' *Revolution in Rome*.

Douglas McCready

Temple University, Philadelphia, PA


The sudden and unexpected success of the two "religious" presidential candidates as well as the recent national hype of the bicentennial celebrations of the Constitution has caused the press and the print media again to question the role of religion and politics within our pursuit of the most suitable civil authority. Most of the scholarly and theological works rhetorically advocate a particular synthesis of civil discourse. Few attempt to remove the mystique of the formational years that have proved to be the most monumental and crucial in the controversy of the separation of Church and state. Fortunately Gaustad has endeavored to clear away some of the complexity that presently exists. His work is a masterful historical study of the half century between the Declaration of Independence (1776) and the deaths of Thomas Jefferson and John Adams (1826). The discourse during this half century centered not on eucharistic covenants but on the place of the Church itself in society, especially with respect to political authority. According to Gaustad, "today's public at least has a frame within which to raise and offer responses to these profound questions, but in 1776 no such frame existed. The future was uncharted and the options as limitless as the cosmos. In the beginning was complexity, and the complexity has endured."

To unravel the complexity Gaustad draws heavily on primary sources of the "inspired" men of the period. The work opens with a concise historical etching of the ideals and institutions of the American Church during this crucial epoch. The author then focuses on the ideology of the framers of the new nation. The enlightened and libertine philosophy of Jefferson is given primary consideration. As a legendary force in the Continental Congress, Jefferson came to "understand much of western European history as needlessly besmirched and tragically bloodied by the heavy hand of despotic religion." The impact of his vision and views regarding the proper limits of religious power are highlighted and well documented. Often Jefferson's cogitations are viewed in unison with sympathetic but less radical proponents of a government that was to be free from denominational and clerical influence. The dynamic tension and often tangled synthesis of the new government is also examined in the light of perspectives held by Franklin and Washington, considered by Gaustad to be the icons of the era. The work concludes with two helpful appendices, both of which focus on pertinent religious documents of the half century.

The work is authoritatively and gracefully written. Its strength is its documentation and its rich use of original sources. Adequate stress is applied to the influence these "icons of American history" had on the public at large and the churches of the new society. Gaustad's analysis of the foundational assumptions on which our present religious/political tensions are based will be a source of information to those who seek a clearer understanding of the controversy between Church and state.

John M. Kenney

The Stony Brook School

Poythress proffers here a creative challenge to the study of theological method. "Symphonic theology" seeks to recognize and make explicit the inherent necessity of using multiple perspectives in theology and to exploit that as an advantage. The use of perspectives is readily observed in everyday life, from two people who see different things in the same diagram, to the natural sciences (cf. Kuhn's work), to the social sciences such as psychology (psychoanalysis vs. behaviorism). Further, there is a God-ordained diversity of perspective in the Bible itself, seen in its metaphorical language, its use of analogies, and in the gospel writers' selection and thematic arrangement of material. Thus we too should use a perspectival method when we read the Bible or do theology, with the goal of gaining complementary (not contradictory) angles on truth and avoiding dichotomizing and compartmentalizing tendencies. Poythress compares different perspectives to the facets of a gem: "The whole jewel...can be seen through any one of the facets, if we look carefully enough. But not everything can be seen equally easily through only one facet" (p. 37).

Poythress anticipates the criticism that his viewpoint degenerates into construing truth as simply relative and thus he "delineate[s] the differences between symphonic theology and destructive relativism" (p. 44). Truth is absolute regardless of our perspectival apprehension of it. Symphonic theology denies the relativity of truth while affirming inherent human limitations in understanding it. Our knowledge of absolute truth is always relative, conditioned, partial, fallible and analogical. "The use of perspectives is a way of becoming self-conscious and deliberate about the use of analogies and in this way promises a systematic way of searching to advance knowledge" (p. 54).

After a chapter on "Words and Precision," which draws on the insights of D. A. Carson, J. Barr and A. Thiselton, Poythress moves on to summarize symphonic theology in chap. 7, the longest of his ten chapters and the heart of the book. Here he sets forth "Twelve Maxims of Symphonic Theology." Chap. 8 develops "Distinctive Methods in Symphonic Theology," while two final chapters apply the proffered method to a case study on miracles, showing how two common and often contrasted perspectives (miracles have ceased vs. miracles occur today) enlighten each other. For a fuller application of this theological method readers will want to turn to Poythress' Understanding Dispensationalists (Zondervan, 1987). In his epilogue, as in his opening acknowledgement, Poythress identifies three key influences on his recent thinking (C. Van Til, J. M. Frame and K. L. Pike). A brief and partially annotated bibliography completes the book.

Symphonic Theology readily exposes the myth of neutrality, that fruitless endeavor that forces theology to achieve an ever-elusive Euclidean certainty or precision. As God alone is the fitting witness of himself, theology will always be a penultimate discipline that should be marked by humility (not skepticism), modesty, and openness to multiple perspectives. Poythress' short work will serve well as a primer for theological method and prolegomena.

William Tyndale College, Farmington Hills, MI

Daniel B. Clendenin


Recently both the Presbyterian Church (USA) and the United Church of Christ issued documents affirming the validity of the Jewish faith. These documents point to a
rather embarrassing fact that Christians—and, alternatively, Jews—must face: The continued existence of the Church and synagogue testify to the vitality of the respective faiths. The statement attributed to Gamaliel in Acts says it well: “If this [religion] is of men, it will fail, but if it is of God, you will not be able to overthrow them—you might even be opposing God!” For two thousand years Christians and Jews have largely avoided the issue of the continued existence and vitality of the respective faiths.

In 1975 a group of distinguished clergymen and scholars, Jews and Christians, met to discuss topics of interest to both groups. A similar group met in 1980. Each conference resulted in a book of published essays. A Time to Speak is the fruit of a third meeting, held at Gordon College in 1984. Some participants and the topics have changed from conference to conference, but the purpose remains the same: “To come to know and understand each other as people and not as spiritual abstractions” (p. xi).

The essays in this volume cover a range of topics from self-definition to mutual understandings to cultural roles. Theologically, the essays by D. Blumenthal (“The Place of Faith and Grace in Judaism”) and W. Kaiser (“The Place of Law and Works in Evangelical Christianity”) are particularly interesting. Similarly the essays on Israel as a state are thought-provoking. As interesting as these are, the two sets of essays tread rather softly and are challenging as much for what they fail to say as for what they do say. Some of the essays have written responses, which enhance the value of the essays and emphasize the ongoing process that is required in such a debate. Moreover questions at the end of each essay facilitate understanding as well as encourage use in a group discussion.

Books such as this and the documents issued by the Presbyterian Church and United Church of Christ will provoke some turmoil, possibly dissension. If they can also initiate further dialogue, and if the debate can be held in a spirit of humility for what we can learn, rather than simply affirming what we already think to be the case, then each participant in the Jewish-Christian encounter, whether formal or informal, can progress past the abstractions and stereotypical portrayals.

The present volume is stimulating and interesting. As the dialogue—and trust—grows, more serious discussion must take place on Biblical, theological and cultural levels. Christians must face squarely “anti-Jewish” (however limited we may eventually settle on in the use of this term) remarks in the NT and anti-Semitism throughout the Christian era. Jews on the other hand must face some rather remarkable claims about the uniqueness of Jesus. The role and continuing presence of the old covenant and the implications of the new covenant require fresh approaches and serious reflection if any breakthrough will be found. Finally, the validity and usefulness of the much-abused phrase “Judeo-Christian heritage” must be re-examined. This volume of essays shows the significant differences that separate Jews and Christians, just as it shows that a little bit of trust and honesty can result in a lot of growth and respect.

A. J. Petrotta

Sterling College


This is the ninth in a series of selected writings edited by J. Farina and entitled Sources of American Spirituality. Hodge is an excellent choice for this series because he not only personally instructed more theological students than had attended any other seminary in the country but also wrote nearly 10,000 pages of theology, making him one of the most influential voices in nineteenth-century American religion. Even though he is best known for his widely-read Systematic Theology, the focus of this volume is on his
contribution to practical spirituality. The entire text of Hodge’s *The Way of Life*, published in 1841, is reproduced here as the best example of his convictions about the spiritual life. Three other small extracts are added at the end: an 1836 commentary on Rom 6:1-11; 14 sermon outlines from his Sunday afternoon conferences; and 5 pages from his *Systematic Theology* relating the Scriptures to the work of the Holy Spirit.

But the greatest contribution of this volume is Noll’s extensive introduction. Rather than remembering Hodge as the one who bragged that a new idea never originated in the seminary, Noll praises Hodge as a theologian who lived out his convictions and put the theoretical into practice. Hodge sought a balance between the objectivity of truth revealed in the Bible and the subjectivity of lived religious experience. Attempting to preserve this balance, he wrote numerous polemics combating the theological errors of his time. Confronting deistic rationalism he used the traditions of Scottish commonsense philosophy and Augustinian Christianity. Against Schleiermacher’s teachings, which made feelings the source of religious authority, he championed the authority of the Bible. And countering uncheckered revivalism Hodge offered the Calvinistic view that God has fixed, ordinary and deliberate means for inculcating faith rather than the disorderly and disruptive practices so widespread in his day.

Noll has done a fine job selecting these works to represent Hodge’s views on the spiritual life. Each individual choice is representative and enhances the theme. I only wish there were room for more from Hodge’s *Systematic Theology*.

Kenneth A. Daughters

Dallas Theological Seminary


According to the publisher this book is a seminal work by a Catholic author. Perhaps so, but the virtue is an evasive one. From an evangelical point of view, though some of McBrien’s contributions do merit praise, this reviewer cannot easily recommend *Ministry* to anyone ungrounded in the conservative tradition. I can say, however, that McBrien’s style is readable and free of lengthy theological terms and that his love for Christ and concern for humanity is clear and obvious.

Much of what the author presents appears to be ecumenism with a purpose: to lure non-Catholics into the Roman sheepfold. Likewise, strains of liberationism are everywhere present. And although McBrien uses Scripture he uses it with the same force and in like manner as various other Catholic sources (e.g. councils and encyclicals). This appears to me to be a denial of the authority of God’s Word.

I was, however, pleasantly rewarded in a few areas. One such instance was the author’s discussion of reciprocal relationships between minister and congregation. Another was his careful avoidance of such terms as “mother church” and “mother of God,” terms likely to arouse theological discomfort in many evangelical Protestants.

One serious question I have deals with McBrien’s definition of a Christian: Just who is and who is not a member of the body and the kingdom of which he speaks? The author states: “The Kingdom, after all, is not something available only to Christian or to the Church. The Kingdom is for everyone. In fact, many people in the Kingdom are not in the Church, and many people in the Church are not in the Kingdom.” He then cites Matt 7:21 for Scriptural support. This sort of flexible theology smacks of a subtle universalism.

Possibly the most disturbing element of the book is the author’s preoccupation with psychology. The solution to nearly every problem, it seems, it rooted in psychology. For example, psychology becomes the means for screening out unacceptable ministerial
candidates. The absence of the Holy Spirit in this process forces me to wonder if, for McBrien, psychology has not replaced Biblical discernment and justice.

One of the better parts of the book is chap. 3 ("What Qualities Do Ministers Need?"). Though not worth the price of the book alone, anyone having access to a copy of Ministry might find this chapter worthwhile. On the whole I found the book too expensive and too convoluted for pastoral or theological needs.

John Gillmartin
Sierra Baptist Church, Independence, CA


For well over a century, Emil Schürer's Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi has been an invaluable presentation of virtually all the known evidence related to Jewish history, literature, culture and institutions from Maccabean to Hadrianic times. First published in 1874, it went through four German editions. An English translation, A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1885-1891), was made from the second German edition. The manuscript of the final volume of the work under review was completed exactly one hundred years after the publication of the first volume of that translation. That Schürer's original opus was important enough to warrant the present revision is a tribute to his genius.

The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ, while retaining all the undoubted virtues of Schürer's tour de force, corrects and updates it by making use of the enormous amount of new information gleaned from twentieth-century discoveries in the areas of archeology, numismatics, and epigraphic and literary evidence, including QL (1947) and the Wadi Murabba'at (1951), Nahal Hever and Nahal Ze'elim (1960) finds. In addition older, already-known materials have often been reinterpreted in the light of fresh insights and by means of new methodologies. The English translation is entirely new, and the translating, revising and editing was done by a formidable international team of well-known and highly competent scholars.

Volume I treats the scope and purpose of the entire work, discusses auxiliary disciplines (archeology, geography, numismatics, epigraphy), surveys literary sources in more than 100 pages of description and evaluation, and provides an in-depth historical survey in two parts: (1) the Maccabean rising and the age of independence, 175-63 B.C.; (2) the Roman-Herodian age (63 B.C.-A.D. 135). Eight helpful appendices conclude the volume.

Readers of JETS will be fascinated by the 29-page excursus on the census of Quirinius mentioned in Luke 2:1-5. Conclusion: "The evangelist based his statement on uncertain historical information." It is claimed that since Justin Martyr made historical mistakes there is no reason to assume that Luke was always historically precise—an assessment that sees no qualitative difference between the source of Luke's inspiration on the one hand and that of Justin Martyr on the other.

Equally absorbing is the 14-page excursus concerning Josephus on Jesus and James (Ant. 18.3.3 secs. 63-64; 20.9.1 secs. 200-203). Conclusion concerning Josephus on Jesus: "Josephus mentioned Jesus. The present text... is only to some extent his own." Once later Christian excisions and interpolations are taken into account, the resulting abbreviated remnant leads to the assumption that "Josephus wrote more about Jesus than we
are able to extract from this text.” In any case, “the impression . . . is that he was not on the whole unsympathetic towards Jesus.”

Commendable caution is exercised concerning the date of the end of the first Jewish revolt. Masada was conquered in the spring of either A.D. 73 or 74, but two recently-discovered inscriptions lean toward 74 as “probably” the correct year.

We now know that the name of the leader of the final Jewish rebellion against Rome was Sim(e)on bar Kosiba. Rabbi Akiba (followed by Christian writers) punned on the name by calling him bar Kokhba, “Son of the Star” (cf. Num 24:17 and its messianic interpretation in QL). By contrast, bar Kosiba’s opponents called him bar Koziba, “Son of the Lie” (i.e. “Liar”). Akiba died a martyr’s death during the three-and-a-half-year insurrection of 132–135. His flesh was “ripped from his body with iron combs.” Volume I ends: “Yet the tears of mourning concealed hope, and hope refused to die.”

The contents of Volume II include such matters as cultural setting, political and religious institutions, sects and parties, education, law and messianism. Our best efforts have been unable to clear up the origins of the Samaritan sect, an uncertainty shared even by rabbinic Judaism. Aramaic was the dominant language among Palestinian Jews, but “mishnaic Hebrew served as an additional means of oral communication.” “No new evidence has . . . emerged [to solve] the old enigma concerning the equivocal use in Jewish Greek sources of . . . Hebraisti” in reference to Aramaic words. This makes it difficult to know whether, e.g., Paul spoke Aramaic or Hebrew in Acts 21:40; 22:2.

Coins of the period are discussed not only in an introductory way but also in admirably selective detail. And there is an outstanding 100-page treatment of Hellenistic cities of the time.

The statement that zibhê šēlāmîm is “known as ‘thank-offerings’ but more properly ‘communion sacrifice’” (p. 261) reminds us of the NIV rendering “fellowship offerings.” Poor editing is doubtless responsible for yet a third rendering: “peace-offerings” (p. 295).

The section on the canonicity of Scripture is superb. Unfortunately, the editors were unable to profit from more recent studies such as, for example, R. T. Beckwith, The Old Testament Canon of the New Testament Church (Eerdmans, 1985); D. G. Dunbar, “The Biblical Canon,” in Hermeneutics, Authority, and Canon (ed. D. A. Carson and J. D. Woodbridge; Zondervan, 1986) 299–360, 424–446. Haggadic midrash is to be found in certain NT passages (e.g. Acts 7:53; 1 Cor 10:4; Gal 3:19; 2 Tim 3:8; Heb 21[sic]:2 [p. 351; perhaps 13:2 is intended]).

“School” is treated in 5 pages, “synagogue” in 32 pages. This demonstrates good balance, since much more is known about the latter than about the former. The treatment of Sabbath observance and regulations is fascinating. One may not rid clothes of vermin by lamplight on the Sabbath. A schoolmaster was permitted to supervise children reading with the help of a light, but he himself was forbidden to do so. Intervention by a physician was allowed only when life was at risk.

Many readers will be surprised when informed that the concept of the expiatory suffering of the Messiah is alien to Judaism.

Volume III.1 includes discussions of diaspora Judaism, Jewish literature composed in Hebrew/Aramaic (90 pages are devoted to QL), and Jewish literature composed in Greek. That there were Jews living in each of the seven churches of Asia mentioned in Revelation 1–3 is carefully and clearly documented. The existence (or lack thereof) of so-called God-fearers is debated, with the editors coming out on the side of their existence (contrast, e.g., A. T. Kraabel).

Subdivisions under the topic of literature are for the most part appropriate and helpful, although evangelicals will be dismayed to find the canonical book of Daniel listed under “Prophetic-Apocalyptic Pseudepigrapha.” On the other hand, the Qumran copper scroll (3Q 15) is deemed to be closer to reality than to fiction.

The section on Jewish apologetics is important and informative, although the fact that 36 pages are devoted to the Sibyline Oracles can only be attributed to the specialized interest of one or more of the editors.
The pagination of Volume III.2 is continuous with that of III.1. The contents of the final volume of this magnificent set include Jewish literature of which the original language is uncertain, the writings of Philo, and extensive indices. The main index comprises more than 100 pages, but unfortunately there is no Scripture index.

The project took more than twenty years of intensive effort to complete. The end result is an indispensable work that, far into the twenty-first century, will demand frequent consultation by all who are interested in intertestamental, New Testament, rabbinic, early-Church and related studies. Though a few slips escaped the proofreaders (e.g. *hilkh* for halakhah, 2. 341), the set is remarkably free of typographical errors. Extensive passages in Greek and Latin are cited without translation, but Hebrew texts are always given English equivalents.

An overall impression is that of scholarly caution. The work gives the data and draws tentative conclusions, but it expects its readers to make up their own minds. The first paragraph of the introduction to Volume I is as true today as it was a century ago, and it remains well worth quoting: "Since it was from Judaism that Christianity emerged in the first century a.d., nothing in the Gospel account is understandable apart from its setting in Jewish history, no word of Jesus meaningful unless inserted into its natural context of contemporary Jewish thought. The task of the New Testament scholar, when enquiring into the phenomenon of the birth of Christianity, is to relate Jesus and the Gospel, not only to the Old Testament, but also, and above all, to the Jewish world of his time. Such an aim involves a full assimilation of the findings of students of inter-Testamental Judaism and of Hellenistic and Roman Palestine."

Ronald Youngblood
Bethel Seminary West, San Diego, CA


For some time the tide has been running in on the sensitive, volatile and significant "women's issue." The theological surf is full of books, articles, tapes, lectures and discussions about the place of women in ministry. The tone of argument runs from the banal and shrill to the urbane and reflective. Hayter's study is, happily, among the latter. The work is well researched, well reasoned, and well written.

Part 1 treats a group of topics that cluster around sexuality in the Godhead and the nature of priesthood. Hayter rejects, among other things, any attempt to introduce notions of the goddess into Christian theology. She also rightly rejects the notion that a male or female priesthood reflects the sexuality of God, the categories of sexual differentiation being in God transcended. So it is not necessary to have a male priesthood on the supposition that only such represents God. For Hayter, however, this observation does not warrant the rejection of the traditional, Biblical address to God as Father. In fact the move to female metaphors or inclusive language in addressing God does not so much help the worshiping community as it harms the doctrine of God by making sexuality explicit. In the end, as Hayter sees things, the all-male priesthood of the OT is best accounted for by the theological subordination of woman, a concept much larger than priesthood alone because it cuts to the heart of woman's status in created reality. For the present debate over woman's place in ministry the question turns, then, upon the nature of this subordination in the OT, the way the OT is understood by NT writers, and ultimately how the Church should understand the Biblical data today.

Part 2 of the book takes up that question in a narrowed investigation of the texts commonly adduced by proponents of various views: Genesis 1–3; 1 Cor 11:2–16; 14:33–36; 2 Cor 11:3; 1 Tim 2:11–15; Gal 3:27–29. Herein are canvassed the usual points in the debate, such as the meaning of *kephalê*, *exousia*, *authentein*; the textual status of 1 Cor 14:33b–36; the extent of the implications of Gal 3:27–29 (which for Hayter are nearly
boundless); etc. The final chapter of the book attempts an apologetic for what Hayter calls a “culture critical method” in hermeneutics. She articulates principles to guide deliberations over what teaching should be taken as limited to the original context and what is transcultural and transtemporal. Also included is her defense against charges of relativism, canon in the canon, subjectivism, etc., to which her view is open. Whether one finally agrees with this method, her points are vigorously made and the challenge of a coherent hermeneutic is put once again to conservatives.

Hayter is a fine scholar and protagonist for her position. It should be noted that she has no obvious feminist axe to grind and that she avoids the sometimes odd conclusions at which doctrinaire feminists occasionally arrive. By the same token it is passing strange that radical feminists and conservatives are found guilty of the same interpretive fault: an overly literal reading of the text—respectively motivated, it seems, by the impulse to overthrow the status quo or to preserve it.

Although the book is a study in others’ use and misuse of the Bible, Hayter is also offering her own view on woman’s place in ministry: Woman’s subordination, and therefore limitation in ministry roles, is not the creational intent but rather arises from the fall. Christ’s redemption is a reversal of the fall, the aforementioned subordination included. This truth is enshrined most clearly in Gal 3:27–29, it being adumbrated by Jesus’ treatment of women. One accounts for the apparent continued conscious subordination of women in the NT by realizing that cultural factors militated against the full implementation of the new pattern in the NT era (and may do so today in some contexts).

Hayter’s brief for admitting women to orders with its permutations and relative merits has been argued by others in the relevant literature. Its acceptability depends upon the prior acceptability of the hermeneutics that govern the way in which one text is given preference over another in determining ecclesiastical policy. One might add that Hayter adheres to the philosophical orthodoxy of critical scholarship, with which agreement is required at a few places to secure her position.

In conclusion, I believe that hermeneutics is precisely the area in which Hayter’s thesis needs greater support. She may be right, and her argument is elegantly and strongly put, but it remains for it to overcome the kinds of arguments to the contrary ably made by, say, J. Hurley and D. Moo.

Richfield Evangelical Free Church, Richfield, MN

John L. Easterwood


This volume is a collection of essays in Christology written during the late 1970s and 1980s. Much of the material in the book is Hebblethwaite’s response to articles and arguments that appeared in The Myth of God Incarnate. He clearly disagrees with the conclusions in that book and defends the doctrine of the incarnation as a crucial doctrine in the Christian faith. In fact Hebblethwaite considers two doctrines of crucial importance to the uniqueness of Christian faith in God: the doctrine of the incarnation, and the doctrine of the Trinity. The incarnation makes little sense without the Trinity of persons in the Godhead. The notion that God is love requires “us to think in terms of an internally differentiated and relational deity” (p. 22). We understand God’s love for us because we see it pictured in the Father’s love for the Son within the Trinity itself.

Hebblethwaite emphasizes the point that the man Jesus can only be thought of as God incarnate, and he is unique in history as God incarnate. The incarnation is not repeatable. The incarnate Jesus Christ was not two separate individuals; we need to
think of the divine substance, “which is such as to include within its own subjectivity the human subject, Jesus, as the expression and vehicle of God’s incarnate life” (p. 31).

Contrary to writers like J. Hick, Hebblethwaite insists that the salvific significance of Christ’s death demands that he be God in the flesh. God himself bore our sins and died; he was not merely sympathetic to or aware of our sufferings. Atonement for sin demands an incarnation. The death of a mere man would not have saved anyone.

In spite of many valuable contributions in this book, several cautionary observations are necessary. For one thing, Hebblethwaite accepts most of the conclusions of higher criticism regarding the Biblical texts. For example he says, “It is almost impossible for a historically sensitive person to treat the Bible as itself God’s self-revelation. It has to be understood as a human historically and culturally conditioned collection of witnesses to divine revelation” (p. 102). The Bible cannot be understood to be God’s “immutable self-revelation for all time. . . . Few serious theologians today would be able to accept that kind of ‘pure datum’ theory” (p. 105). The doctrines of the incarnation and the Trinity cannot be accepted because of nor established “simply by citing authoritative texts, whether of scripture or tradition” (p. 128). We must rationally reflect on God’s actions in human history and in human lives to see how much “sense they make” (p. 129).

Second, Hebblethwaite is not very friendly to an exclusivistic notion of Jesus Christ as the only way to God the Father. He wants to make sense of “the idea of the universal presence and activity not just of God but of Christ” (p. 162). He clearly leans toward universalism.

Third, Hebblethwaite makes some claims that would trouble an American evangelical. For example he says that “in the light of informed and critical study of the New Testament, as well as of philosophical and psychological realism about what it is to be a man,” it is implausible for us to suppose that Jesus knew himself to be or thought of himself as God. John 10:30 comes to mind, but Hebblethwaite says we can no longer defend the divinity of Christ “by reference to the claims of Jesus” (p. 74). We must somehow balance a proper doctrinal sensibility with a proper historical-critical sensibility, although Hebblethwaite acknowledges this to be a very difficult task indeed.

All in all there is much valuable material in this book, and I recommend it—though with some reservations. Some of it is addressed to the Anglican community and Anglican debates in England. But in spite of this, most of the material has universal interest and applicability and can be of benefit to all students of Christology.

Paul C. Boling

Anchor Foundation, Inc., Knoxville, TN


What is the meaning of spirituality, and how can it be faithfully practiced? How is spirituality related to the lordship of Christ and the sanctifying work of the Spirit? Richards believes that “Reformed, Wesleyan and Dispensational theologies deal with spirituality in ways which are not particularly helpful in our personal quest for practical spirituality or for helping others grow spiritually.” He declares that “each system sees the spiritual life as a struggle against the limitations of our humanity” (p. 45). But is that really the problem? The hindrance to our progress in spirituality is found in our sinfulness—not our creaturlessness.

Richards defines spirituality as living a human life in this world in union with God. He sees it as essentially incarnational—a manifestation of “Jesus’ continuing incarnation” (p. 58). To live a human life means to accept fully the reality of personal responsibility and accountability to others. Christian spirituality calls us to live responsibly
and to "acknowledge God's right to guide us and to choose, as Jesus chose, to please the Lord" (p. 83). The development of spirituality is also related to prayer, worship, confession, forgiveness, suffering, compassion, personal morality, social justice, discipleship and servanthood.

In discussing submission to lordship, Richards emphasizes that both the strong and the weak (Rom 14:1-15:7) are accountable to him. Where Scripture neither commands nor condemns, we are to act with sensitivity to those who differ from us. He concludes, however, that "since Jesus is in charge of all judgment, there is no area in which we, individually or together in ecclesiastical courts, have a right to judge our brothers" (p. 168). Such a sweeping generalization seems to run counter to both dominical precept and apostolic precedent as given in Matt 18:15-20; Gal 1:6-9; Acts 15; 1 Cor 5:1-8. Surely in steering clear of the Scylla of legalism we ought also to avoid the Charybdis of a nonjudgmental permissiveness regarding moral and doctrinal deviations.

Christian spirituality progresses through the experience of purposive suffering as well as a realistic approach to the fact of death. It also grows as we exercise compassion in response to human need and express Christ's life in the world. Such spirituality, moreover, requires the pursuit of justice in the social order. Above all, "to live a human life in union with God demands commitment. And for us, commitment means to live our daily life as disciples of Jesus and as servants of our fellow human-beings" (p. 219).

Mariano Di Gangi

Ontario Theological Seminary, Willowdale, Ontario


The chapters of this text were delivered as papers under the auspices of the chair of Judeo-Christian studies at Tulane University. They represent a loosely coordinated dialogue on the topic of science and religion. Collectively the authors argue for a radical break with the twentieth century's epistemological bifurcation of science and religion. They call for what they term a "critical, non-naive realism" that encourages science and religion to interact and engage in mutual modification. The authors argue that continual testing, experimentation, peer review, and other modern scientific methodologies make it possible for science to avoid the contextualizing dangers exposed by sociology-of-knowledge critiques.

Insofar as the authors believe science and religion, fact and value, subjective and objective should be integrated phenomena they make Biblically supportable points. But several serious substantive and mechanical shortcomings may be identified in this text: Tradition is elevated to a position of cognitive superiority over divine revelation; religion and God are repeatedly defined only in functionalist terms; Scripture is reduced to little more than a collection of metaphors from which a coherent view of the world might be constructed; numerous typographical errors are evident; on one page a paragraph is reprinted; a Darwinian paradigm is not subjected to the same critical review applied to other theories; the concept of sin is curiously absent; liberal theological accommodationism is everywhere apparent; Biblical literalism is rejected as naive or uncritical.

The term "public policy" in the book's title would not make much sense but for the final chapter written by J. T. Noonan, Jr. This essay is the book's principal redeeming feature. Noonan wrestles with the Church's competence to formulate a moral foundation for public-policy issues. While the Catholic Church provides the context of his analysis, the questions asked and many of the suggestions proffered are relevant to the evan-
gelical community. Nuclear arms and abortion act as case studies. It is unfortunate that Noonan’s fine piece is buried in a text destined for little influence and an undoubtedly short shelf-life. Needless to say, the book is woefully overpriced.

Rex M. Rogers

Cedarville College, Cedarville, OH


Ever since the publication of Oscar Cullmann’s seminal study Christ and Time, modern theological scholars have been aware of the pivotal role that the concepts of time and history play in Biblical theology. Parry’s study of an obscure sixteenth-century cleric shows that this awareness has been around for some time. Harrison has hitherto been known primarily for the Description of Britain, his contribution to Holinshed’s Chronicles. Now the discovery of a manuscript of his “Great English Chronology” gives Parry the opportunity to study Harrison’s views on the theological significance of time.

Harrison anticipated Cullmann’s notion of linear time, viewing history as the purposive unfolding of God’s intentions for the world. For Harrison the main “plot” of time is the conflict of the two Churches, the faithful or elect Church descending from Abel and the apostate Church descending from Cain. He was convinced that a careful attention to exact chronology from the standpoint of the correct interpretation provided by the elect, prophetic, covenant line as it appears in Scripture (and continues throughout history to the present in the Reformation churches) would yield a fruitful understanding of history that would simultaneously give meaning to the present and confirm the truth of Scripture. Parry’s thesis is that Harrison’s writings show that the whole Protestant worldview depended on this kind of historical interpretation.

There is much that might be learned from Parry’s research, but he makes it exasperatingly difficult to learn it. He writes in an exceedingly soporific style, his long and inelegant sentences clogged with repetition that advances the discussion by infinitesimally subtle degrees. He betrays a distressing lack of respect for his data, cavalierly accusing the NT authors of sitting loose to objective facts, distorting or inventing details in the history of Jesus to make it conform to messianic prophecy and explain away the scandal of the crucifixion (p. 85). This passing statement—totally unsupported—is just one example of Parry’s unfortunate tendency to pontificate: He hardly ever bothers to quote from the very document he is supposed to be studying. One suspects that Harrison’s Chronology might be a book well worth reading, but from Parry’s study it is hard to tell.

Donald T. Williams

Smyrna Christian Academy, Smyrna, GA


This study presents a forceful, detailed approach to nonconformist writing during the Restoration period in England, arguing that we have “been misled into identifying the political defeat of Puritanism with its cultural demise” when in fact “the contrary seems rather to be the case: political defeat was the condition of cultural advancement” (p. 22). According to Keeble, standard literary histories have accepted the cultural premises of
the victors and located the only worthwhile literature of the period in the wit and license of the court. Milton and Bunyan are explained away as merely the inevitable exceptions that prove the rule: Milton thus appears as a relic from the Renaissance and Bunyan as a genius whose creativity broke the bounds of his dreary religious didacticism.

Keeble introduces his alternative view with a meticulous history of nonconformity in England, beginning with Pelagius in the early fifth century and ending with a survey of the sects still active after the Restoration had blighted what remained of the frantic diversity of the late 1640s and its Diggers, Seekers, Levellers, Ranters, and Fifth Monarchists. His first chapter then surveys the historical circumstances of Restoration nonconformity, claiming that the harsh legislation enacted by the Cavalier Parliament actually tended to unify the ordinarily discrete and even antagonistic sects—from Presbyterians to Quakers—by persecuting them all equally. Even those moderates who had always hoped for communion within the national religion found themselves "church-outed" by the Parliament. Now they were all dissenters together, nonconformity within the Church having been effectively legislated beyond the pale of good conscience. (Ironically, in the 1680s the nonconformists actually found themselves siding with a persecuting Parliament against monarchs willing to offer toleration—because they suspected that Charles and James were simply seeking an opening for the Papists.)

Chapters 2–4 establish that the effect of draconian measures (the infamous Clarendon Code) prohibiting the sects from meeting was to force them into print for purposes of devotion, instruction and mutual support. Despite strict censorship, sympathetic London publishers banded together to publish substantial works of nonconformist divines. Prices were kept low for a largely middle-class audience whose interest was keen and whose literacy rate, because of the longstanding Puritan emphasis on education, exceeded that of the population at large. Relative to the audience for, say, Dryden's works, the audience for a Baxter or Bunyan was huge if—by court standards—vulgar.

Chapters 5–9 carry the book to its end by addressing the cultural, creative and esthetic values of nonconformist authors. While Keeble admits that certain sects (particularly Baptists, Levellers and Quakers) denigrated learning and rational exercise and others (particularly Presbyterians and Congregationalists) approved rather heartily of it, there was general agreement that reason had to submit to the emotional and spiritual verities of individual religious faith. One consequence of this agreed-upon position was to open an alternative to the Augustan esthetic of coldy rational literary creation. Instead, in what Keeble describes as a kind of proto-romanticism, the nonconformists welcomed the intuitive, the emotional, the imaginative and the spiritual as an impetus and guide to literary creation. Once their politics became nonrevolutionary, it seems, the nonconformists' literary practice became the ground for a genuine counterculture.

Hence, as opposed to the decorous, public nature of surface-oriented mainstream literature, nonconformist writings focused on interiors—the private, often indecorous and embarrassingly sincere spiritual revelations of individuals. The nonconformists invented many of the modern usages associated with the prefix "self," including "selfish." Though it is difficult to forgive them for that, they could hardly know how today's popular psychologists would abuse their terms. They also invented the genre of autobiography and generally championed the claims of emotion and sentiment in an age otherwise given to brittle wit, political distrust and emotional sterility. Furthermore, unlike the fantastic heroes of typical Restoration heroic dramas and prose romances, the nonconformists' heroes and their settings were realistic in the modern sense. Nonconformity eschewed the superior hero of traditional narratives and dramas for the socially inconspicuous, flawed, and often inadequate everyman of everyday life. The characteristic theme of such writings was that of personal regeneration within the context of a general providence. Consequently the story we typically associate with nonconformist writers is that of a travel narrative expressing (1) the immortal longings of inept and
quirky mortals for fulfillment and eternal rest and (2) the unpredictable workings of the divine will through their experience.

Keeble's book deserves a wide audience because its argument fundamentally—and I am convinced correctly—challenges the way we think about English literature after 1660. Keeble even suggests that we should understand English Romanticism as something of a rebirth of nonconformist values. Furthermore he illustrates the intimate ties between religious philosophy and esthetic values and presents an interesting historical lesson for those who would attempt to legislate and censor society into religious and moral conformity. I think it extraordinary that Keeble manages to move so easily and convincingly from historical circumstance to literary theory and practice.

For all its importance, it is not a perfect book. The opening chapters are laden with seemingly endless historical detail, a portion of which is irrelevant. Furthermore, though Keeble writes in an expansive style that at its best articulates and exactly substantiates his convictions, too often the prose verges on being longwinded and repetitive—one might even say preachy. Finally Keeble is not content merely to praise the diversity and innovativeness of nonconformist literature. He seems to feel it necessary to bury the Episcopalian establishment and writers of the court. Neither their writing nor their philosophy was as bankrupt as he suggests, and often their complaints about the anarchical impulses of the nonconformists had justification. I note that he never mentions Swift and seems oblivious to the genius of Dryden and Congreve among others. By appearing so partisan to the cause of those whose culture he wishes to establish historically and so unjust to those who were admittedly themselves unjust, he actually undermines his case. Keeble could have taken a lesson in decorous restraint from the neoclassicists whose values and work he needlessly tramples.

Nevertheless, as I have tried to suggest, this book will be of interest to historians, students of literature, and those concerned with the relations between religious and artistic expression. It is an impressive achievement and, if a bit extreme in its contents, sound and resourceful in its scholarship.

John Peter Rumrich

The University of Texas, Austin


Walters was commissioned to revise and update Ropp's excellent 1977 work, The Mormon Papers. Ropp's untimely death in 1978 was a loss to the kingdom, but thanks to Walters' thoughtful revisions his book will remain timely and accurate.

Walters made three changes to the appendices: (1) Two appendices were deleted (B, Dee Jay Nelson's letter of resignation from the Mormon Church, and D, a dated excursus [1977] on developments in the Spaulding/Rigdon theory regarding the origin of the Book of Mormon); (2) a new appendix, B, was added, which is a list of Biblical doctrines supported by reference from the Book of Mormon that are contradicted in official Mormon teaching; (3) appendix A contains the new letter and expanded bibliography from the Smithsonian Institution regarding the Book of Mormon and the archeology of the New World.

The changes to the body of the book are typically brief insertions or revisions (though at places paragraphs are added) that improve the impact of the work. Walters unobtrusively offers additional information that adds sharpness to the points being made (pp. 35, 46, 50, 69, 71, 83, 90, 103, 105, 112, 114).
The ten years since the book's first publication necessitated the updating of some references to reflect current scholarship research (pp. 17, 25, 43). One also will note that a number of footnote corrections (both within the quotations and in the identification of quotations) have been made.

More importantly Walters updates some of the technical matters central to the issues. For example he imports Spencer Kimball's 1976 condemnation of the Adam-God doctrine—thereby strengthening the case that Mormon theology is internally inconsistent (pp. 18-19). He then details recent Mormon responses to the problem of the integrity of the Book of Abraham in light of the linguistic evidence against it (pp. 91-96). Also, Walters critiques recent Mormon attempts to explain the lack of archeological verification for the Book of Mormon (pp. 60-61).

Finally, he eliminates all references to Nelson, the Egyptologist who resigned from the Mormon Church in 1975 following his discovery of the fraudulent nature of the Book of Abraham. Subsequent to Nelson's resignation his academic inadequacies came into question, thus tainting any positive contribution he could make. The case against the Book of Abraham is better served by making reference only to sources of unimpeachable integrity. Walters wisely quotes both Mormon and credible non-Mormon sources in his revision of this section.

I believe that Ropp's revised book is one of the best available, for many reasons. First, it is relatively brief and quite readable. Second, it is well written and documented so that one would know what to study next (the glossary and annotated bibliography are adequate though not exceptional). Third, it can be widely used as a Sunday-school text due to its size and price. Last, the final section, "Witnessing to Mormons," is one of the book's best features—showing the reader how to employ its material redemptively.

The booklet by Tingle has also become more useful since he revised it. The new larger format of InterVarsity Press' "Viewpoint Pamphlets" is a great improvement over its much smaller, less attractive predecessor. Thankfully the brevity of the booklet has not affected the quality of its contents—but its usefulness in informing and/or witnessing is hampered somewhat by its size. This pamphlet would best be used to whet the appetite of the reader so more substantial material would be desired.

Like Walters, Tingle made adjustments to the documentation, which strengthen its force. The new references and discussion in the section on the "History of the Mormons" improve the argument while the rearrangement of the material on "Mormon Teachings about God" makes it more effective. Pages 10-11 now include a critique of the comparison Mormons often make between Joseph Smith's death and that of Jesus, and p. 13 gives new critique of the non-Biblical nature of the structure of the Mormon church. Other changes as well are made that add clarity and precision.

Tingle dropped the 58-line discussion employing the testimony of Nelson on the fraudulent nature of Smith's translation of the Book of Abraham. The main criticism of the revised pamphlet is that this major test of Smith's credibility (which he failed) is dropped entirely. It appears that Tingle replaced this with an indictment of the Pearl of Great Price for its role in keeping blacks out of the priesthood (p. 23). This is a poor trade-off. It is unfortunate that Tingle did not retain this argument by changing the references as Walters did above.

Both of these works are solid resources that can be employed very usefully in the Christian community. Tingle's work, because of its size, has more limited use than does Ropp's, but both are successful in raising appropriate questions about Mormon theology and bringing significant critique.

Daniel H. Cameron

Richwoods Christian Church, Peoria, IL