

## BOOK REVIEWS

*Suffering and Ministry in the Spirit: Paul's Defense of His Ministry in II Corinthians 2,14–3,3.* By Scott J. Hafemann. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990, XI + 261 pp., n.p. paper.

To make his revised doctoral dissertation available to a wider audience Hafemann reformulated some sections, transcribed Greek and Hebrew terms into English and deleted part of the technical apparatus. The result is a concise exegetical monograph.

Hafemann starts with the assumption that Pauline texts still remain a largely foreign territory in need of discovery. He questions solutions repeated from commentary to commentary and interrogates the texts afresh. Deliberately he limits the discussion to the Corinthian correspondence, although on rare occasions he glances at other Pauline writings to highlight common thought structures and to confirm exegetical insights. These structural comparisons are true gems (e.g. p. 68). He claims not to employ a definite exegetical method, but rather “to fumble” with the text, asking simple questions of interpretation “until acts of understanding begin to take place” (p. 2). In fact, however, he displays considerable exegetical skills and method. His strengths are structural and lexicographical investigations. Above all he shows deep intuitive understanding of Pauline thought patterns. The results are astounding. Only a few can be mentioned.

Hafemann has identified 2 Cor 2:14–3:3 as “being part of the ‘theological heart’ of II Corinthians” and as such “both a thesis-like compendium of Paul’s self-conception as apostle, as well as a classic presentation of his corresponding apologetic for the authority and validity of his apostolic ministry” (pp. 1–2).

Most decisive is his study of *thriambeuein* (2:14; pp. 7–34), normally translated as “lead in triumph” (NASB) or “lead in triumphal procession” (NIV). Hafemann demonstrates that the term actually describes the triumphal procession of a Roman general at which his conquered enemies and their wives and children were publicly led to death. For Paul, who previously was an enemy of Christ, being led in the “triumphal procession” of the victor Jesus is hence tantamount to being literally “led to death.” 2 Corinthians 2:14 therefore “functions as one of four thesis-like summaries of Paul’s understanding of the significance of his suffering as an apostle” (p. 52). Yet God’s purpose in leading the apostle to death is to reveal himself. Suffering and weakness are essential characteristics of the apostolic ministry (p. 61). “They are not mere circumstance, but instead are the outworking of God’s plan to spread the gospel” (p. 62).

Another masterpiece is his study of *kapeleuein* (2:17), the meaning of which had remained sort of an enigma. It neither signifies as often assumed “to dilute” nor “to water down” nor “to adulterate,” but “selling the Word of God as a retail dealer his wares in the market.” The term carries in itself a negative connotation, by association casting doubt on the integrity of the person referred to. Paul does not put in question the practice of earning one’s living from the gospel but attacks those doing so fraudulently, seeking only their personal enrichment (p. 124). Paul’s sincerity, which he proves by working for his living, is the outward sign of his inner disposition that results from the

grace of God. What looks like weakness is part of his apostolic ministry of suffering, which is confirmed by the power of the Spirit of God in his life (pp. 176–177).

Paul views himself as an eschatological agent of revelation through whom the Spirit is now being poured forth. This ministry must take place in bodily weakness and suffering so that the glory is not his—i.e., the Spirit-giving is not associated with his own person or talent (pp. 224–225). The actual charismatic work of the Spirit manifests itself in the conversion and transformation of believers' lives, which "ontologically understood is a new creation" (pp. 208–209). So the eschatological promise of Ezekiel 36 is now fulfilled through Paul's gospel ministry in suffering.

Hafemann closes his presentation with a tight summary of conclusions and hypotheses for further research. Bibliography (pp. 234–252), Scripture and subject indices make the book a study tool. In case of republication the spelling and flexation—especially of German terms—needs checking. The study opens a new page in the investigation of 2 Corinthians and of Paul's self-understanding of the servant of God in the Messiah Jesus.

This is a strictly exegetical and historical investigation (p. 2). But as such it raises questions of importance for the contemporary debate. One must ask whether the findings apply only to the historical missionary Paul. They appear to describe a pattern of abiding significance for the gospel ministry in general, at least in its missionary form. In my opinion the relationship between suffering, manifestation of the power and authority of the Spirit, and charismatic effects of the gospel in the lives of believers needs new investigation and evaluation in the light of this meticulously performed exegetical dissertation. Especially persons on missionary assignment facing difficulties and physical limitations should receive strength, comfort and confirmation through Hafemann's efforts.

Helmuth L. Egelkraut

Freie Hochschule für Mission, Korntal-Münchingen, Germany

*Galatians*. By Richard N. Longenecker. WBC. Dallas: Word, 1990, cxix + 323 pp., \$24.99.

Having studied under Longenecker, I eagerly awaited the publication of this commentary. It has been a pleasant surprise to find that the finished product is even better than I expected. Recent scholarship on Galatians has been prolific and has raised a host of issues that today's commentator must address. Some of the factors to be considered are Hellenistic epistolary conventions, Greco-Roman rhetorical forms, Jewish exegetical procedures, Christian soteriological confessions, Paul's revelational experiences, and Paul's pastoral concerns. Handling these factors requires a careful, balanced approach—the kind of work at which Longenecker excels. The resulting commentary reflects the author's career-long study of Paul's life and thought. Many of the insights included in this commentary will be familiar to those who have studied under him or have read his other works.

The discussion of introductory matters is comprehensive and well-written. Longenecker concludes that Galatians is Paul's earliest letter, written to the churches of South Galatia before the Jerusalem Council of Acts 15. Paul's opponents were Jewish Christians from Jerusalem who carried on a Judaizing campaign to counter a rising tide of Jewish nationalism. These Judaizers taught that it was necessary to be circumcised in order to be fully accepted by God into the Abrahamic covenant (legalism)

and to adopt a Jewish lifestyle in order to check the sinful nature and please God (nomism). The church to which Paul wrote was a homogeneous unit susceptible to an indigenous libertinism as well as the propaganda of the agitators.

Using clusters of epistolary formulae to identify major breaks and turning points, Longenecker proposes a basic rebuke-request structure for the letter. This epistolary structure coincides with a rhetorical analysis that sees Paul using both judicial and deliberative rhetoric. Galatians is not a case of Paul carefully following the rhetorical handbooks. Rather, the forms of classical rhetoric were in the air. Paul used these Greco-Roman conventions unconsciously for his own purposes, often combining them with Jewish forms of argumentation.

Judicial rhetoric is prominent in the rebuke section (1:6–4:11) where Paul defends his own past actions (1:11–2:14) and refutes the Judaizers' teachings on legalism (3:1–18) and nomism (3:19–4:7). The key to this section is 2:15–21, which summarizes the content of the immediately preceding narrative and sets up the issues of the argument that follows. Deliberative rhetoric is prominent in the request section (4:12–6:10) where Paul exhorts the Galatian believers to adopt proper courses of action in the future. In so doing he addresses both the immediate external problem of the Judaizing threat (4:12–5:12) and the continuing internal problem of libertine tendencies (5:13–6:10).

Throughout the commentary, Longenecker's work is thorough, balanced and up to date. He interacts extensively with other scholarship on Galatians, citing both recent and older writings. His discussion of audience and date deals at length with the often-debated relationship between Galatians and Acts, including J. Knox's three-visit hypothesis. Helpful discussions of such topics as literary genre, epistolary analysis and rhetorical analysis are included in the introduction. Also helpful are excurses on Antioch, the Hagar-Sarah story, and Abraham's faith. All three excurses reflect Longenecker's outstanding command of extra-Biblical literature—especially Jewish intertestamental and rabbinic writings—which is evident throughout the commentary. As is the case with all the volumes in this series, bibliographic information is excellent.

Longenecker pays close attention to the Greek text, often discussing words and phrases in detail. He does not, however, let scholarship obscure interpretation. He always returns to the main point at issue. On some interpretive questions he adopts minority positions (such as viewing *pistis Iēsou Christou* as a subjective genitive, pp. 87–88), but such instances receive careful attention, and readers may find themselves convinced by his arguments.

Reflecting the WBC series desire to "serve the needs of professional scholars, teachers, seminary students, [and] working ministers," this is a technical commentary. It is not light reading, and it is not the place to turn to when preparing a last-minute sermon. It is, however, the place to turn to for a careful exegesis of one of Paul's most important letters. Succinctly put, this is an excellent commentary. Buy it. Use it. Enjoy it.

John D. Harvey  
Columbia International University, Columbia, SC

*The Epistle to the Philippians: A Commentary on the Greek Text.* NIGTC. By Peter T. O'Brien. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991, xli + 597 pp., \$39.95.

O'Brien's long-awaited commentary on Philippians has proven to be well worth the wait. It is a comprehensive and detailed exposition of the Greek text that reflects extensive interaction with recent scholarship, clarity in expressing various views, perceptive exegesis, and sane conclusions. Of special value are O'Brien's thorough and balanced treatment of exegetical and theological difficulties relating to the text of Philippians. It will undoubtedly be regarded as one of the finest commentaries written on this epistle.

The format is much improved over earlier volumes in the series. The use of footnotes (rather than internal notes) and setting textual notes apart from the main discussion greatly improves readability. Not all Greek is translated, which may be a problem for some. Each section is preceded with a translation and a thematic and structural analysis.

Along with the standard introductory topics, the 39-page introduction discusses recent controversy regarding the integrity of Philippians, the place of writing, and identity of Paul's opponents at Philippi. O'Brien rejects hypotheses that regard Philippians as being composed of fragments. He interprets, for instance, the *to loipon* in 3:1 as transitional "well then" rather than "finally." He also tends toward a Roman imprisonment and recognizes several different antagonists: certain Roman Christians (1:15–17), heathen inhabitants at Philippi (1:27–28), and Judaizers at Philippi (chap. 3). O'Brien discusses the Christ hymn (2:5–11) at some length (85 pages). He includes an extensive bibliography on the passage and special notes on the literary form, background and authorship of the hymn.

The commentary excels in making available to the student, professor and pastor the fruits of modern scholarship in an engaging, readable manner. If there were one commentary on Philippians to recommend for the serious student, this is it.

Richard A. Young  
Chattanooga, TN

*Colossians and Philemon.* By Murray J. Harris. Exegetical Guide to the Greek New Testament series. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991, xxix + 310 pp., \$21.95 paper.

This book is the first of a planned 20-volume series—all to be written by Harris—intended to cover the entire NT. The series is designed to be used by three groups: (1) students who are engaged in NT studies, (2) pastors who want to use the Greek text as the basis for their sermons, and (3) teachers who instruct students in reading and analyzing the Greek NT. It assumes that the reader has completed an introductory Greek course and owns a copy of the *UBSGNT*.

A brief discussion of introductory matters (authorship, date, occasion, purpose), an outline, and a list of recommended commentaries are provided for each letter. For each paragraph in the Greek text a structural analysis and a phrase-by-phrase discussion of the text (vocabulary, textual variants, grammar, syntax) are followed by a translation, a paraphrase, a list of suggested topics for further study and homiletical suggestions (expository, textual, topical). Included at the end of each letter are a complete translation, an extended paraphrase and a full exegetical outline. A glossary of grammatical and rhetorical terms is also provided.

Harris' work on Colossians and Philemon is thorough but concise. It is well-focused and should be useful to anyone who is serious about NT exegesis and exposi-

tion based on the original language. The series appears quite promising, and readers should look forward to subsequent volumes in it.

John D. Harvey  
Columbia International University, Columbia, SC

*Commentary on 1 and 2 Thessalonians.* By Charles A. Wanamaker. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990, xxviii + 316 pp., \$29.95.

The publisher's book jacket identifies four areas in which Wanamaker's commentary makes a significant contribution to scholarship on 1 and 2 Thessalonians: (1) an extensive discussion of introductory matters, (2) a strong argument for the priority of 2 Thessalonians, (3) the use of rhetorical analysis, and (4) an emphasis on the social dimensions of Christianity. In his preface Wanamaker highlights the last area as particularly important to him. It seems appropriate, then, to give special attention to these areas after some general comments.

The introduction is divided into three sections. "Paul and the Founding of the Church at Thessalonica" lays particular emphasis on the socio-psychological process of conversion and the implications it may have had for the Thessalonians. "Literary Questions Regarding 1 and 2 Thessalonians" affirms both letters as Pauline, assumes the essential literary integrity of both letters, concludes that 2 Thessalonians was written first and proposes an outline for each letter based on the canons of ancient rhetoric. "The Historical Setting of 1 and 2 Thessalonians" concludes that there is relatively little information available to reconstruct the background of either letter when the priority of 2 Thessalonians is assumed.

The commentary proper follows the traditional historical-critical pattern of verse-by-verse exegesis. Although Wanamaker assumes the priority of 2 Thessalonians, he discusses the letters in their traditional order. His work is thorough, clearly written and easy to understand. As would be expected in this series he pays close attention to the Greek text and interacts well with recent scholarship on Thessalonians, especially Best (1977), Bruce (1982), Marshall (1983) and Jewett (1986). One minor shortcoming is that he gives neither an English translation of paragraphs nor the full Greek text of verses. Consequently the reader must constantly refer to a copy of the text itself to determine the context of various words or phrases. This is not necessarily bad, but it is annoying. Much better is Bruce's work in the same series (*Galatians*, 1982), where an English translation and textual notes are placed at the head of each paragraph and the Greek is given phrase by phrase as the discussion proceeds.

The introduction is indeed lengthy (66 pages as compared to 28 pages in Bruce's Thessalonians commentary [Word, 1982]) and provides a detailed discussion of the critical issues involved. Wanamaker has done his homework and refutes opposing arguments well. In some cases, however, he has not built his own case equally well. At one point he states: "I have shown . . . that good grounds exist for accepting the reverse sequence of the letters" (p. 53). In fact he has not really built a positive case. Rather, he has simply rebutted the traditional arguments for the canonical order without offering his own evidence for a reversed sequence. Actually, his reconstruction of the historical setting is more convincing for the priority of 2 Thessalonians than is his discussion of letter sequence.

One of the factors that attracted me to this commentary was an interest in seeing how the author applied rhetorical criticism to the Thessalonians letters. Wanamaker

is concerned primarily with arrangement—that is, his focus is on identifying the distribution of rhetorical elements and determining the genre of each letter from that distribution. In this (as he admits, p. 49 n. 9) he is heavily dependent on Jewett, and like Jewett the results are not especially convincing. He completely ignores Johanson's analysis of 1 Thessalonians (*To All the Brethren* [Almqvist and Wiksell, 1987]), which is, to me, more persuasive. He also does little with the way in which Paul argues his case or with Paul's use of *ethos*, *pathos* and *logos*. His use of rhetorical genre in the discussion of the historical settings, however, is quite good.

The socio-scientific aspect of this commentary is not as prominent as might be expected, given the author's comments in the preface (especially when compared with Petersen, *Rediscovering Paul* [Fortress, 1985]). In those sections where it is prominent the reader gains useful insight into the probable impact of Christianity on the Thessalonians and on Paul's concerns in writing to them. This is especially the case in the first section of the introduction.

It may be that the publishers promise more in terms of new contributions from this commentary than it delivers, but it is a significant step in that direction. It reflects recent trends in NT study, but it remains grounded in the text and concerned with the analysis of that text. It definitely deserves a place on your bookshelf.

John D. Harvey  
Columbia International University, Columbia, SC

*First, Second, and Third John*. By D. Moody Smith. Louisville: John Knox, 1991, 164 pp., \$12.95.

The Interpretation series is in the process of being written and compiled with 17 OT and 19 NT books currently available. Not intended to "replace the historical critical commentary or homiletical aids to preaching," the series is presented as "a third kind of resource, a commentary which presents the integrated result of historical and theological work with the biblical text." As such it is expository in nature. The commentary is based on the RSV but contributions written since the appearance of the NRSV (Smith's work, for one) incorporate and comment on significant changes made in the newer version.

Smith begins his work with a 26-page introduction in which he deals with introductory matters for all three epistles. He assumes the priority of the gospel of John over the letters. He believes the letters were written by a single author but not the author of the gospel. Nevertheless he sees very strong Johannine teachings consistent with the gospel and concludes that whoever wrote these three letters was heavily influenced by the apostle himself or the community of believers schooled in Johannine theology.

The commentary is sectioned according to the passage divisions of the RSV. In dealing with the first epistle Smith typically begins each section with an introduction in which he notes strengths and weaknesses in accepting these divisions. He includes a summary of the major theme(s) of the section, noting its place in the book and its significance to the overall purpose the author has in mind in writing the letters: "to lay down the true doctrine and defend it against proponents of the false." Smith consistently links the various themes in these sections with the overall content and thereby demonstrates the cyclical progression of thought and gives the reader a good synthetic overview of the book as a whole.

In general Smith serves to guide the reader through the content of the letters, directing attention to problematic or significant areas of concern. Grammatical and syntactical comments are general but purposeful in nature. Word studies are brief but helpful. Throughout the commentary Smith notes prominent as well as enigmatic Johannine themes. In past works Smith has noted the lack of discussion concerning Johannine-Pauline relations in recent decades. When applicable he takes advantage of his contribution to the Interpretation series to compare and contrast the Johannine letters with the Pauline, albeit in a cursory manner. He interprets the affinities between Johannine and Pauline theology from the view that both writers shared and were influenced by a common tradition.

In drawing conclusions Smith uses a common-sense approach founded upon thoughtful and thorough study. Smith occasionally raises and leaves difficult questions unanswered. While offering suggestions and conclusions of his own, Smith does not force them upon his reader. It seems that his intent is to avoid providing the reader with quick, untenable solutions and thereby to encourage the reader to pursue his own investigation into problem areas. This approach also discourages dependence solely upon commentators in constructing lesson plans and sermon outlines.

Recognizing the differences between teaching and preaching, Smith concludes each section with a brief summary, capsulizing each unit with a teaching and/or preaching synopsis and reiterating the major theme(s) with a context of practical Christian living in mind. Also included are occasional "Reflection" sections in which Smith expands upon important themes or background in order to introduce additional factors, clarify important issues and suggest resources for further study.

The commentary serves best as a springboard into in-depth study, as it provides the reader with helpful signposts that can guide and speed the researching task. The strength of the commentary is in providing the reader with a comprehensive overview that can be fleshed out in detail according to the specific need at hand. Those who are not dependent upon others to form their own conclusions but who appreciate interacting with thoroughly researched secondary works will find this commentary useful. A major weakness is the lack of footnotes, which could serve to enhance this commentary as an instigator of further study.

Jimmie F. Johnson  
Columbia International University, Columbia, SC

*The Book of the Revelation: A Commentary.* By Philip Edgcumbe Hughes. Leicester/Grand Rapids: Inter-Varsity/Eerdmans, 1990, 242 pp., \$17.95.

This work appeared shortly after Hughes died in May 1990. Hughes styles his commentary as "popular," though he indicates it is based on a study of the Greek text. There is little discussion of academic technicalities such as language, grammar, style, genre, date, authorship, background and schools of interpretation. Substantive interaction with the literature on Revelation is entirely lacking. Thus there is little resemblance between Hughes' extensive, well-known earlier commentaries on 2 Corinthians and Hebrews and the present volume, which is essentially a straightforward paragraph-by-paragraph exposition of Revelation from the amillennial, preterist viewpoint expounded in Hughes' earlier work, *Interpreting Prophecy*.

Comments on several interpretive matters should provide an indication of the direction of the commentary. It divides the Apocalypse into fourteen sections of varying length. Hughes views the author as the apostle John, who writes before AD 70

about visions he has personally experienced. The seven stars/angels of 1:20 that are held in the right hand of the exalted Messiah are human church leaders or delegates, not angelic spirit beings. The letters of chaps. 2–3 are seen as written to historic churches that also represent churches of every place and time. The 24 elders and four living creatures introduced in chap. 4 are viewed as representing the totality of redeemed mankind and the whole order of animate creation respectively. The crucial symbolism involved in the Lamb taking the seven-sealed scroll and successively breaking the seals is not clearly addressed. Neither is there a discussion of the relationship between the series of seals, trumpets and bowls, whether sequential, repetitive, or progressively parallel. In chap. 7 the 144,000 and the innumerable multitude are both viewed as picturing the full company of the redeemed. References to Jerusalem and Babylon do not refer to specific geographical locations but to the worldwide structure of unbelief. The woman who gives birth to the child in chap. 12 is the Church, not Israel. The casting of the dragon into the abyss in chap. 20 was fully accomplished at Christ's first advent. Those who come to life and reign with Christ in 20:4 are martyrs who live with Christ in heaven. The new earth in chaps. 20–21 is the renewed original creation, not a newly created earth that replaces the annihilated original earth.

In this succinct and lucid presentation Hughes has accomplished the purposes he announced in the introduction. One wishes that the commentary were more detailed, however, along the lines of Hughes' other commentaries. But this was not his purpose. I could also wish that he had augmented his somewhat doctrinaire approach to the use of symbols and numbers in Revelation. The symbolic nature of numbers may be granted, but it is disconcerting to read repeatedly that the numbers 3, 4, 7, 12 and 1,000, along with their combinations and multiples, all signify the same referent: fullness, totality, or completeness. Symbolic use of numbers is one thing; indiscriminate use is another.

The strength of the volume arises from its stress on broad thematic issues of Biblical theology. Hughes approaches Revelation as "the end of the beginning," stressing the aspects of Genesis that recur in Revelation. There is strong emphasis on the reconciliation by the second Adam of the world ruined by the first Adam (pp. 11, 69, 76, 82–83, 221–242). In this respect the theological agenda of the present volume is close to that of Hughes' recent work *The True Image: The Origin and Destiny of Man in Christ*. Whatever one's views of the intermediate kingdom or millennium, one should appreciate Hughes' emphasis on the continuity of protology and eschatology and his vision of all creation ultimately under the Lordship of Christ.

It would be inappropriate to conclude this review of what may be Hughes' last book without a note of gratitude to God for the eminent career of this author, clergyman and professor.

David L. Turner  
Grand Rapids Baptist Seminary, Grand Rapids, MI

*The Structure of Hebrews: A Text-Linguistic Analysis.* By George H. Guthrie. NovT-Sup 73; Leiden/Brill, 1994, xix + 161 pp., n.p.

Guthrie tackles the greatly debated issue of the structure of Hebrews. He takes a "text-linguistic" approach (generally called "discourse analysis" in the United States) and thus joins the growing body of literature seeking to utilize contemporary linguistic theory in the study of Scripture. Guthrie's work is a valuable contribution not only to the methodological debate related to text-linguistics but also to the much older debate concerning the structure of Hebrews.

The volume begins with a history of investigation, highlighting important contributors to the debate from Aquinas to the present day (chap. 1). Greatest stress is placed on the twentieth-century proposals by authors such as F. Büchsel and R. Gyllenberg, who suggested outlines drawn from the back-and-forth movement between the book's two dominant genres, exposition and exhortation; L. Vaganay and A. Vanhoye, who developed structural outlines based on the author's use of literary devices; and W. Nauck, who structure the book around its parenetic rather than its theological material.

Chapter 2 takes the various approaches examined in chap. 1 and distinguishes them methodologically. Five approaches to the structure of Hebrews are discerned: (1) structural agnosticism, which either actively rejects or passively refuses to delineate any formal structure to the book; (2) conceptual or thematic analysis, which structures the book around one or more dominant themes (the superiority of Christ being the most common); (3) rhetorical criticism, which examines the dynamic of persuasion in the book, generally drawing on insights from Greek and Roman rhetorical traditions; (4) literary (or rhetorical) analysis, focusing on the literary characteristics by which the author crafted his work (features such as announcement of a theme, "hook words," characteristic words, *inclusio*, chiasmus, etc.); and (5) linguistic analysis, which draws on modern linguistic theory, seeking especially to understand constituent relationships between discourse units.

Chapter 3 serves as an introduction to the second part of the work, explicating the author's methodology and defining terms. Guthrie chooses an eclectic approach, drawing insights from rhetorical, thematic, literary and linguistic methodology. His primary tool, however, is text-linguistics. To avoid imposing modern literary categories on a first-century document, Guthrie insists his is a text-linguistics "which seeks to be cognizant of the world and ways in which the author of Hebrews developed and delivered his message" (p. 46). The author sets up his study by outlining three tasks necessary for a structural analysis of the book: identifying unit boundaries within a discourse, demonstrating the interrelatedness of units within the discourse, and determining how various units relate to the "macro-discourse" as a whole.

Guthrie identifies "cohesion shifts" and "inclusions" as the most significant indicators of unit boundaries in Hebrews and so devotes chaps. 4–5 to an analysis of these literary devices. Cohesion, which refers to features within a unit of text that give it a measure of unity, is determined by such factors as genre, topic, connection (semantic interdependence), subject, actor, pronominal reference, lexical repetition, temporal or spatial indicators and verb tense, person and number. Cohesion "shift" is identified by changes in these factors. Guthrie traces these cohesion shifts throughout the book, identifying them as either high-level, median-level, or low-level shifts. In chap. 5 he turns to *inclusio*, a literary device in which an author marks the beginning and ending section of a block of text with distant lexical parallels. He identifies eighteen important inclusions in Hebrews.

Having identified the basic structural units of Hebrews through cohesion shifts and *inclusio*, in chap. 6 the author seeks to analyze the interrelatedness of these units. Discourse units are interrelated by an author primarily through inclusions, lexical and pronominal cohesion, and transitional devices. Lexical and pronominal cohesion is attained through the repetition of elements throughout a discourse. For example, the term "son" used of both Jesus and believers builds lexical cohesion through most of the units in Heb 1:1–5:10, and the term "angel(s)" provides lexical cohesion in 1:1–2:18. Different elements may provide cohesion either to larger discourses or to smaller units ("embedded discourses") within these larger units. Transitions are also prominent in Hebrews, and Guthrie examines no fewer than ten techniques used throughout the book.

In his final chapter Guthrie brings his findings together, seeking to delineate the overall structure of Hebrews. He argues first that the expository and hortatory units should be, at least initially, considered separately. This is because of the high degree of cohesion within each genre. The expository units include two main movements: the position of the Son in relation to angels (1:5–2:18), and the position of the Son, our high priest, in relation to the earthly sacrificial system (4:14–10:25). The development of the argument in these two parts is both spatial and logical. It is spatial in that the Son moves from heaven to earth (the incarnation) and then back again (the exaltation). It is logical in that the Son, superior to the angels, became lower than angels to deliver men from sin; on the basis of his identification with men, the Son is appointed to be high priest; because of this appointment, then, the Son is able to offer a superior offering in heaven. The primary means of moving the argument forward is *gēzērā šāwā*, or verbal analogy. Like the expository units, the hortatory units also show a great deal of cohesion, with striking parallels both verbal and thematic.

Finally Guthrie seeks to show how these two genres work together and so answer the debated question of whether the expository material serves the hortatory or vice versa. He first points out that the two genres are related to each other through both semantic borrowing and semantic overlap. In every instance where expository material is followed by hortatory, the hortatory utilizes semantic material from the expository. Further, key words such as “God,” “Son,” “the word of God,” and pronominal references to the Christian community appear prominently in both genres and so bring unity to the whole. This semantic overlap suggests to the author that “the purpose of Hebrews is to exhort the hearers to endure in their pursuit of the promised reward, in obedience to the word of God, and especially on the basis of their new covenant relationship with the Son” (p. 143). In short, the expository material supports and gives motivation for the hortatory purpose of the work. Christ’s position in relation to the angels and his position as the superior high priest should motivate the believers to active obedience and endurance. On the basis of these conclusions Guthrie suggests an outline that sets the expository and hortatory sections apart from one another, with lines of relationship between the two genres clearly drawn. In this way the logical progress of the expository is kept distinctly in view without subordinating the hortatory material to the level of digression.

One of the strengths of Guthrie’s work is his willingness to follow the author’s own linguistic, literary and rhetorical signals and so depart from a traditional outline style. This, it seems to me, more effectively places the book in its own historical and rhetorical context. While the writer of Hebrews may not have developed his work around the kind of outline we prefer, there is no doubt that he was a master craftsman of first-century literary techniques. The switch back and forth between genres may confuse our modern attempts at logical analysis, but it would have had a powerful rhetorical effect on the readers, first setting out the logical truth of the person and work of the Son and then, on the basis of that truth, confronting the readers with their immediate problem.

While this book will not be viewed by all as solving the puzzle of the structure of Hebrews, it is worthwhile reading for at least two reasons. First, it is a sound and systematic analysis of the data and so will give the student of Hebrews much to think about. Equally important, however, the book serves as a good introduction to the general field of text-linguistics. By first explaining and then utilizing this methodology, the author demonstrates what a potentially powerful tool literary and linguistic analysis can be. It has been suggested by many that the future of Biblical

studies lies in the modern study of linguistics. Works like this will only serve to confirm this growing perspective.

Mark L. Strauss  
Bethel Theological Seminary (West Campus), San Diego, CA

*John Wyclif: On Simony.* Translated by Terrence A. McVeigh. New York: Fordham, 1992, 179 pp., \$27.00.

John Wyclif, whether considered a medieval heretic or an insightful reformer, must be viewed as an important critic of the late medieval Roman Catholic Church. His reflections on the condition of the Church produced extreme annoyance among the faithful and unleashed powerful forces for change among the discontented. McVeigh's translation into English of Wyclif's treatise on simony provides an important resource for understanding why Wyclif generated such reactions. Preceding the actual translation, McVeigh has written a helpful introduction detailing a brief history of the Church's problem with simony, followed by a synopsis of the treatise and of the premises upon which Wyclif builds his case against it.

Simon Magus blundered badly when he sought to purchase from the apostles the power of the Holy Spirit, and for his folly a sin bears his name, a sin that the Church struggled with for much of the middle ages. As the Church received gifts of money and land from the faithful, it began to assume the exercise of temporal power, especially as the western Roman Empire crumbled. The accumulation of this wealth and power made the acquisition of church office an attractive venture for both those who held rights of disposition and those who aspired to ecclesiastical office. Such practices eroded badly the quality of the clergy's pastoral leadership as successful candidates for church office were characterized more by their material resources than personal holiness. Scholars of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries sharply denounced the activity but—as Wyclif's treatise conclusively demonstrates—to little practical effect.

McVeigh declares that Wyclif's attack on simoniacal practices was not an attempt to curry favor with England's social and political elite but was rather a sincere concern over an ecclesiastical abuse, which he witnessed firsthand in 1371. The pope's greedy intransigence alarmed Wyclif, who began arguing that the Church does not possess a right to ownership of properties, although it may possess them temporarily as a means of providing the resources necessary to its mission. This view arose from his theory of dominion, in which he stated that God as Creator owned all things, thus leaving man as only the steward of them. On the basis of divine dominion, the Church's exchange of properties for money or favor constituted a compounded form of simony as the Church sold what it did not own. The only remedy, according to Wyclif, was divestiture of all endowments and a return to apostolic poverty, an action that secular authorities should ensure occurs. Indeed, the distribution of ecclesiastical patronage was to be the prerogative of the lay lords, who, according to Wyclif, were better placed to know those qualified for spiritual office.

McVeigh's translation of *De simonia* adds a significant resource to the study of late medieval thought. Sound scholarship characterizes this work. Extensive notes follow each chapter, and a fine bibliography concludes the book. While a fuller discussion of English anticlericalism, strong since the reign of King John, would have sharpened the historical focus, the introduction nevertheless sets Wyclif's treatise in its medieval context, and the overview of Wyclif's thought provides helpful insight into the theologian's broader philosophical position. Finally McVeigh has three extensive footnotes discussing the collection and preservation of Wyclif's writings,

topics of note for translation work that possibly should have been incorporated into the body of the introduction.

Richard R. Heiser  
Nyack College, Nyack, NY

*One Holy and Happy Society: The Public Theology of Jonathan Edwards.* By Gerald R. McDermott. University Park: Pennsylvania State University, 1992, xii + 203 pp., \$29.95.

A generation of scholarship since the major biographies of Jonathan Edwards in the 1940s has refined our picture of the great Puritan theologian in large part by employing newly accessible manuscripts to shatter older, inaccurate stereotypes. Among the most important contributions to that refinement stands McDermott's recent demonstration that Edwards had on the one hand a very robust and on the other hand a very nontriumphalistic conviction that God's design for genuine Christianity calls for active engagement with the body politic in the civic arena.

Until recently, an evangelicalism in reaction against the theological liberalism of the nineteenth-century social gospel found itself only too happy to welcome the stylized portrait of Edwards, inherited from Perry Miller, of a scholar walled off in his study, "detached and indifferent" toward society, absorbed with the heart of the individual in personal relation to God. The one earthly good that this heavenly-minded caricature could hold out to history was the Puritan hope, popularized by the Mathers, of a millennium that would begin in America from their New England "city on a hill." To an uncomfortable degree this has been an Edwards created in the twentieth-century evangelical image, an image so deeply engraved that Martin Marty has found it fitting to substitute the terms "public" and "private" for "main-line" and "evangelical" in redescription of Protestant denominations.

Reassessment of this picture of Edwards was of course already underway in the work of H. Stout, M. McGiffert, A. Heimert and others. McDermott, however, has now managed to achieve the most eloquent defense of the reportraiture from the angle of Edwards' public theology. In 1990 R. A. S. Hall, publishing his 1984 dissertation on Edwards' social and political thought, expressed the hope that his work might provide an impetus to a "major study of the social philosophy of Jonathan Edwards" for which P. Nagy had appealed in 1971. In fact McDermott's thesis, of which this book is a revision, had already met that challenge in 1989. Hall had argued microscopically from four late "neglected Northampton texts" to an affirmation of "at least the rudiments of both a social and political philosophy" in Edwards. Independently of Hall, McDermott now presses on to reason macroscopically from a broader range of treatises and from a first-hand reading of Edwards' unpublished weekday "occasional" sermons to the more ambitious contention that Edwards' social and political theory was "as fully developed as the most prominent liberal social theories of his day" (p. 96).

Rejecting the cloistered view of Edwards as an ivory-tower recluse, McDermott returns us to the Edwards for whom true virtue consists in "benevolence to Being in general" and for whom "private affections cannot be of the nature of true virtue." Not only Edwards' philosophy of being but also his theology of love for God and love for neighbor direct McDermott to the conclusion that Edwards' understanding of Christian morality entails wholehearted and material political participation. Moreover, exactly because his public theology was rooted in deeper theological and metaphysical principles, Edwards' posture toward particular institutions in and aspirations

for civic life displays more complexity than the slogans of his own time or the stereotypes of ours. Defying alignment with any single polity, whether ideological or geographical, and devoted to a vision of every people, tongue, tribe and nation delighting in the rule of God, the Edwards that McDermott shows us has a twofold role to play: His theological principles give rise at once to social advocacy as well as to social critique.

Four carefully researched chapters surrounding the book's central, theoretical chapter give substance to Edwards' vision of that "one holy and happy society" and to the diverse ways it addresses Puritan federal theology, the millennium, the magistracy and citizenship. To summarize McDermott's analysis:

Edwards' God extends a special national covenant to New England's city on a hill. That covenant, however, is an occasion not for redeemer status and self-congratulation but rather for responsibility and warning. Even the great awakenings of his time become cause for heightened accountability as much as for hope. Unlike the Mathers, Edwards never predicts an American millennium but casts it consistently in international terms. Allegiance to one's home and nation is a good, to be sure, but a limited good. A grander globalism thus displaces provincial patriotism. Suspicious of the private interests of political magistrates, Edwards rejects the feudal deference of New England's court party. Yet he entertains no more sanguine opinion of the country party's confidence in the wisdom of the commoner. At the same time Edwards' subordinating of earthly authority to God's heavenly authority in the regenerate heart opens a path into active, responsible citizenship for the hitherto socially marginalized, a path that McDermott suggests may have conducted his later followers as far as the egalitarian republicanism of the revolutionary era. In his own circumstances that reordering of authority may have alienated the Northampton elite so far as to lead to his own dismissal.

Readers familiar with Edwards scholarship will recognize the iconoclastic nature of each of these conclusions. Many will join me in also finding them better supported by the evidence and more coherently compelling than the former conventions they replace.

The significance of this impressive book is manifold. Although McDermott preserves the perennial character of Edwards' political perspectives by remaining largely silent about their application to modern circumstances, the relevance of Edwards' wisdom for evangelicals today who seek to redress their polarization from social action suggests itself throughout the book. This was not a book I found myself unable to put down. This was a book I had to put down often, so persistently did it force me to think.

One of the book's most thought-provoking observations lies in the key significance of the first word of its title. Edwards understands the very nature of being to entail a dynamic disposition toward union. That is why the millennium must embrace all peoples in sweet harmony. That is why every regional patriotism and parochial allegiance receives only limited endorsement from Edwards. That is also why McDermott finds Edwards arguing the indispensability of public involvement for personal faith, for "the religious and civil interests of a society are woven together in a seamless garment" (p. 136).

McDermott hints provocatively at several points that it may have been reflection upon the short-lived effects of the awakenings in his congregation that brought Edwards increasingly to a new conviction that public benevolence and faith must be "two aspects of the same act" (pp. 112, 180). The historical question intrigues. So too does a related implication for Edwards' federal theology: If ethics and theology are thus so intimately linked as one, if love is now the "*sine qua non*" of faith (p.

112), then it is worth exploring the degree to which this uniting of faith and practice also undermines any distinction in principle between the covenant of grace and the national covenant from Edwards' theological vantage point (cf. p. 13). We may all the more eagerly await the publication of Edwards' sermons of the 1740s for the light they will shed on the question of whether Edwards' Sunday sermons began to lay greater stress upon the obedience of faith as a condition of grace while at the same time his occasional sermons were resting the fortunes of the nation increasingly upon its citizens' faith.

Pennsylvania State University Press may be proud of this handsome volume. The production is of the highest quality. The text is nearly unblemished by typographical errors. And the footnotes, which in this book are no mere scholarly apparatus but contain valuable substance, appear helpfully at the bottom of each page. The book's proudest feature is by all means its argument, which deserves to be read and considered not simply by enthusiasts of Edwards but by everyone who shares concern for the relationship of Christians to society.

Donald Westblade  
Hillsdale College, Hillsdale, MI

*Calvinus Sacrae Scripturae Professor: Calvin as Confessor of Holy Scripture.* By Wilhelm H. Neuser. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994, 277 pp., \$24.99.

Neuser has edited an important series of essays from a world-renowned group of scholars who gathered at the International Congress of Calvin Research at Calvin College in Grand Rapids in August 1990. Having attended the conference, I am pleased to see these essays in print and am impressed at the wide scope of scholars involved in the project.

I found several of these essays of particular interest. J. Watt analyzes the marriage legislation that Calvin introduced into Geneva and points out that the Reformer broke with canon law in a number of areas, such as in his opposition to clandestine marriages, which did not require parental consent. Calvin also advocated less stringent rules on consanguinity and affinity, and for the possibility for divorce and remarriage. He allowed for divorce on the grounds of adultery and desertion, but not for cruelty, a stance typical of Protestants in this era. Calvin also agreed with canon law that marriage was binding at the moment of consent with strict rules for releasing couples from their promise to marry. Watt concludes that Calvin's marriage laws served as the basis for Protestant views on marriage throughout the sixteenth century.

In J. B. Torrance's essay on Calvin and federal theology the author reflects a Barthian disdain for the federal system. The article is less about Calvin's form of covenant thought than it is a critique of federalism. Torrance draws a sharp distinction between Calvin and his successors, blaming Beza for the doctrines of limited atonement and double predestination, both of which became hallmarks of the federal system. The *foedus naturale* also became its coordinating principle and dominated over the covenant of grace. Torrance argues that the covenant of grace is only provided for the elect after Christ met the condition of the covenant of works. Torrance sees this elevation of the covenant of works over the covenant of grace as a major break from Calvin. Torrance also is critical of the covenant theologians for making justice an essential attribute of God while mercy is merely an optional one. But here it seems that Torrance makes too much of the differences between Calvin and the federalists. For a more balanced view, Torrance would have done well to interact more with the works

of R. Muller on the continuity between Calvin and his successors and of L. Bierma on the Heidelberg Catechism.

Other essays include P. Rorem's discussion of the *Consensus Tigurnus*, where the author argues that Calvin and Bullinger were able to come to a major agreement on the Lord's supper with both theologians making compromises that nevertheless preserved their essential positions on the subject. R. Gamble, who heads the Meeter Center for Calvin Studies at Calvin College and Seminary, discusses recent trends in Calvin studies and points out key issues of scholarly debate. This paper includes a chronological bibliography of recent significant monographs on Calvin.

Several articles touch on W. Bouwsma's groundbreaking biography of Calvin, including those by J. Hesselink and H. Oberman, who has recently changed his emphasis from Luther to Calvin studies. Oberman focuses on the early career of Calvin with special attention to the late medieval roots of Calvin's thought. He points out significant aspects of continuity between late medieval thought and Calvin's theology.

All of the essays are retained in their original languages—English, French, and German—perhaps limiting the scope of the potential readership of this volume. The book also does not include an index, which would have made it more usable. Regardless of such minor limitations, these are welcome essays that will no doubt make a significant contribution to the growing body of literature on Calvin and the origins of Reformed thought.

Martin I. Klauber  
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

*New Horizons in Hermeneutics.* By Anthony C. Thiselton. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992, 703 pp., \$29.99.

Everyone who has taught or studied in seminary remembers the two sarcastic slogans concerning Biblical interpretation that mocked the fundamentalist Biblicist and the unreflective pastor: "Don't give me exegesis; just give me Jesus" and "The Jesus you want is the Jesus you get." Wishing to avoid wrestling with texts and words and cultural issues and presuppositions, such hurried and harried Christians think that they are piously seeking and directly expressing the will and knowledge of God, for (as Luther said) "the Holy Spirit is no skeptic." Thiselton, however, has already declared and argued in his first excellent book on hermeneutics, *The Two Horizons* (1980), that "appeals to the Holy Spirit do not bypass hermeneutics. For the Spirit works *through* human understanding, and not independently of it. . . . Hermeneutics cannot bypass semantics and traditional language-study" (p. 440; italics his). Therefore in order to understand what the Holy Spirit says and to be moved by his power the tools and methods of hermeneutics are essential. If the text itself spoke obviously and transparently, no preacher would need to preach. He could merely read the written text to his congregation and dismiss the people. But even such a naked oral reading would subtly alter or expand the text by the reader's emphasis, tone of voice, etc., so that one cannot escape the necessity of hermeneutics.

In this book Thiselton seeks to expand the two horizons—text and interpreter—about which he earlier wrote. Wishing to reach two audiences, "all who undertake teaching, study, or research in the multidisciplinary area of hermeneutics" and "Christians who are concerned about how the Bible is read and used" (p. 2), he hopes "to provide an advanced textbook on hermeneutics" (p. 1).

This is an excellent scholarly study, except for more than a few typographical errors. Some may think the book bloated, but it actually has a breadth that is breath-

taking. Bristling with endnotes at the end of each chapter, and anchored with a concluding forty-page bibliography plus author, subject and Biblical indices of forty more pages, the book is everything that an advanced work of scholarship should be. Anyone wishing to be informed and challenged by contemporary hermeneutics—pastor, scholar, religious, secular—will find this book helpful and provocative.

Its real excellence, however, is its sustained argument that proceeds fluently and carefully toward its purpose in chap. 16, which “constitutes the climax of a sustained argument” (p. xi). With great accuracy and fairness Thiselton expounds the positions of such varied theorists as Schleiermacher and Wittgenstein, Rorty and Ricoeur, Gadamer and Fish. In the course of his explication and analysis he also addresses issues that feminist, liberation and black critics raise (chap. 12). All along Thiselton is marshaling evidence and distinguishing subtle differences so that finally in chap. 16 he offers us what all this hermeneutical plentitude means for pastoral theology.

Early in the argument Thiselton suggests that not only do texts shape and transform readers but also that readers may transform texts (p. 31). For pastors and pastoral theology, “if the particularities of the ‘first’ horizon of the biblical text provide a primary focus for biblical specialists, the particularities of the ‘second’ horizon of present situations and readers offer a primary focus for pastoral specialists” (p. 556). The whole hermeneutical task, then, is to declare how a past text (the Bible) might or should provoke or prevail in the current existential pastoral situation. Do readers produce or reproduce texts? Who is the poet or maker: the author or the reader? Should a reader be the creator, co-creator, or servant of the text? Does the historical flow over the past century from the old New Criticism, which focused on the text, to the current emphasis on reader-response theories and interpretative communities constitute an advance in hermeneutics? Does a “close reading” of a text precipitate closure that is uninformed because it fails to attend to the author, the *Sitz im Leben*, and the reader’s situatedness near the beginning of the twenty-first century? Is there an objective text out there to read? Does the humanity that Biblical authors and their *personae* share with contemporary readers provide a sure foundation on which to begin? Do Biblical texts have determinate meaning? How might we discover those meanings if there is such wide distance between text and reader? Do syntactic judgments determine meaning—for example, the ability, desire, or need to contend that a certain genitive in a particular text is objective or subjective? If philosophy provides the tools for interpretation, and method provides the means for hermeneutical achievement, does that mean that understanding of the Bible should be submitted to these public and universal instruments alone? Should socio-critical hermeneutics, which seeks to approach texts in order to “expose their role as instruments of power, domination, or social manipulation” (p. 379), govern criticism? Or should socio-pragmatic methods prevail, which claim with R. Rorty that hermeneutics is always biased or privileged in such a way that no universal, permanent, or transcendent knowledge is gained but that only the interest of a particular community is imaged or reinforced?

In his earlier book Thiselton concluded: “The hermeneutical goal is that of a steady progress towards a fusion of horizons. But this is to be achieved in such a way that the particularity of each horizon is fully taken into account and respected. This means *both* respecting the rights of the text *and* allowing it to speak” (p. 445; italics his). Now a fusion occurs when items are blended or mixed together. “Fusion” is Gadamer’s term, of course. But it solves little without criteria or recipes or menus by which to determine that the new horizon that emerges from the merger or fusion of the two horizons of text and interpreter is faithful to the text as well as fruitful for the pastor. He contends: “Texts, first we argue, open new horizons for readers.

Because of their capacity to bring about change, texts, and especially biblical texts, engage with readers in ways which can productively transform horizons, attitudes, criteria of relevance, or even communities and inter-personal situations. *In this sense we may speak of transforming biblical reading. . . . Premature assimilation into the perspectives projected by the horizons of readers leaves the reader trapped within his or her own prior horizons. . . . uneventful, bland, routine and entirely unremarkable*" (p. 8; italics his). Further, he declares: "Our second sense of 'new horizons' is matched by a second sense of *transforming biblical reading*. The kind of reflection invited by contemporary hermeneutical theory may invite *transformation of the ways in which we read biblical texts. . . .* From the point of view of more traditional theorists, this may be *transforming biblical reading into something else*. From the viewpoint of post-modernism this movement may be seen as *transforming biblical reading from routine and predictable processes to more creative and productive ones*" (pp. 15–16; italics his). But how do we know whether the words "creative" and "productive" here are only euphemisms or mere masks, hiding the fact that no transcendental or empowering truth or definable worldview has been discovered or expressed in the Biblical text?

On the one hand, Thiselton insists, "the cross and resurrection stand not only as a critique of human self-affirmation and power, but also as a *meta-critique which assesses other criteria, and which transforms the very concept of power. . . .* It remains the case that the cross can be *seen as complete, perfect, sufficient, and final within the specificity of the traditions of promise and fulfillment* reflected in the Old Testament, with its axioms about sacrifice, sin, and atonement; in Paul with his distinctive theology of being crucified and raised with Christ as a single new humanity; and in Hebrews, John, and other Christian contexts of interpretation" (italics his). Yet, he also contends, "from the standpoint of pluralism these appear 'privileged', and in the end a conflict of truth-claims may be inevitable. Here theological interests are best served by encouraging pluralities of readings, since each reading answers the agenda reflected in a life-world, and one mode of reading may lead to another" (p. 615). Such pluralities of readings from the tenants in the Heideggerian house of Being, which is language, are necessary because "neither language or the human mind is transparent or straightforward. In terms of their world-view, it may be tempting for Christians to dismiss the work of the three so-called masters of suspicion, Freud, Marx, and Nietzsche, as incompatible with the claims of Christian theology. But their insistence that the human mind can deceive itself in varieties of ways, often in the interests of individual or of social power, resonates with biblical and theological assertions about the deceitfulness, opacity, and duplicity of the human heart" (p. 14).

A hermeneutic of innocence will not do. A hermeneutic of suspicion is required to unmask unconsidered and untested ideologies masquerading as faith. Yes, there is a risk to submitting one's hermeneutic or creed or preunderstanding to the rigors of the pragmatics of Rorty, or the subjectivism and relativism of Fish, but unless such stretching of the mind toward the text—opaque and polyvalent as it may be—and from the assumed security of one's preunderstanding occurs, no fusion of horizons or creation of new horizons will happen. Thiselton concludes: "But if address *to* God can be understood as initiated by the Holy Spirit, how much more in the case of address *from* God? In a co-operative, shared work, the Spirit, the text, and the reader engage in a *transforming process*, which enlarges horizons and creates *new horizons*" (p. 619; italics his). He asserts that "understanding remains fallible and corrigible, . . . even one focused on Christology and resurrection as its centre. . . . Nevertheless, the cross, we have said, relativizes and calls into question the respective corporate

claims and corporate self-interests of Jews and Gentiles, male and female, slave and free" (p. 617). The problem is, of course, that the cross that judges and redeems all human existence (including hermeneutics) depends for its historicity, interpretation, veracity and power on the very texts that are not obvious or transparent to readers—whether they be formalist, socio-pragmatic, socio-critical, reader-response, existentialist, romantic, or otherwise. Sometimes it seems that there are as many understandings of the cross as there were crosses outside Jerusalem on a given weekend. Thiselton knows this, and that is why he has written this richly documented, carefully argued book. Would that its challenge, insight and capacious learning might trickle down to those in the trenches of pastoral ministry, where openness, rapport, promise and judgment must originate in and fuse with Biblical texts rightly interpreted, in order to be redemptive *in situ*.

John S. Reist, Jr.  
Hillsdale College, Hillsdale, MI

*Christian Ministries and the Law: What Church and Para-Church Leaders Should Know.* By H. Wayne House *et al.* Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992, 249 pp., n.p. paper.

Jesus admonished his disciples to be harmless as doves, not dumb as dodos. Christian leaders should therefore welcome a book that promises an overview of legal areas affecting their ministries and tips for avoiding hidden minefields. This book by eight Christian lawyers provides such a broad introduction. It cannot replace consultation with an attorney about specific facts and circumstances, but it does prepare the reader to make the most of such a conference.

House and his seven co-authors deliver useful information on topics as diverse as the liability exposure of Christian counselors, church discipline, school issues, the pros and cons of incorporating a church, taxation, zoning, charitable giving, and involvement in politics (but regrettably nothing on copyright law). Every Christian leader should read the chapter on resolving conflict through conciliation instead of litigation and, more importantly, utilize its advice when appropriate.

House seems to operate from the fortress mentality of the religious right. Not all evangelicals will see today's legislators as humanists (p. 20), Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas on a par with the framers of the Constitution (p. 24), or the law primarily as the enemy's instrument of oppression for hindering evangelism (pp. 43, 53). The Bible does encourage laws that punish criminals and (with limitations not mentioned here) that advance business interests in a free market (p. 20). But the OT is also full of laws regarding the merciful (even preferential) treatment of the poor, widows, foreigners and others without power or protection—a point House neglects to make. There are true Christians who also happen to be poor, or alien, or black, and their unique pressing concerns go unaddressed.

Legally there are also several problems. A summary judgment is not the same as dismissal for failure to state a claim (p. 59); American courts once were deeply involved in religious matters (pp. 65–66); and the judicial principle of *stare decisis* (by which courts build case law on the shoulders of earlier decisions) does not grow out of Darwinism and randomness as House alleges (p. 25) but presupposes order, aims at predictability, and has precedent in the Mosaic code.

Biblically and doctrinally there is also room to disagree. Mainstream Churches of Christ leaders do not believe that a church member cannot voluntarily abandon membership (and church discipline) or that the Bible requires a congregation to continue public excommunication procedures against a fornicating former member who has already taken that step (pp. 69–76). The interpretation given to Jesus' nonre-

sistance counsel in Matt 5:40 is novel but strained (pp. 175–176). The authors are right to say that the Law of Moses provided damages for intentional torts and for gross negligence, but they are wrong to deny that it provided recovery as well for ordinary negligence, which they minimize as a “good-faith mistake” (pp. 179–180).

Despite these imperfections, House’s book should benefit any church or parachurch leader who uses it as intended: as a general overview, not as a substitute for live counsel. House wisely refers readers seeking more detail to Richard R. Hammar, *Pastor, Church and Law* (Springfield: Gospel Publishing, 1983).

Edward Fudge  
Houston, TX

*No Other Standard: Theonomy and Its Critics.* By Greg L. Bahnsen. Tyler: Institute for Christian Economics, 1991, 345 pp., \$9.95 paper.

The book under review is from the theonomist (Christian reconstruction; dominion theology) camp defending its position against would-be detractors. Most notably it is a response to *Theonomy: A Reformed Critique*, written by a number of faculty members at Westminster Theological Seminary. Bahnsen not only defends theonomy as a Biblical position but also clarifies the position of theonomists regarding the OT, specifically the law and its penal sanctions. He states: “The focus of this volume will be on the hermeneutical, exegetical, theological, and political matters which have been raised by the critics of theonomic ethics” (p. 15).

In the chapter entitled “Introduction to the Debate” Bahnsen makes statements and claims that need further thought in light of some significant Scriptures. He states that “*Theonomy in Christian Ethics* argued that God’s word is authoritative over all areas of life.” But whose life? If one says “everyone,” inclusive of both believer and unbeliever, then consideration must be given to Rom 8:7–8, which states that “the sinful mind is hostile to God. It does not submit to God’s law, nor can it do so. Those controlled by the sinful nature cannot please God.” In all of Bahnsen’s emphasis upon hermeneutics and exegesis I find no consideration given to this in light of applying Biblical ethics to the unbeliever.

Bahnsen also writes: “For these reasons theonomists are committed to the *transformation* (reconstruction) of every area of life, *including* the institutions and affairs of the socio-political realm, according to the holy principles of God’s revealed word (theonomy)” (p. 11). If Bahnsen is drawing his principle for “transformation” of the institutions and affairs of the socio-political realm from Rom 12:1–2, then I suggest that his exegesis and hermeneutics are not correct. As I read that passage, the exhortation from Paul relates to the believer’s life. Further, if Bahnsen is not basing his statement on Romans 12, then I fail to see where theonomists derive this mandate Biblically. Our mandate according to Scripture is to make disciples. The only way to make disciples is by the proclamation of the gospel, for without the Spirit of God indwelling any individual, people do not want God’s law. Nor are they able to obey it.

Bahnsen also states that “the final section of this book concentrates on what amounts to the central controversy over theonomic ethics: its application to political affairs” (p. 15). I believe that his hermeneutics and exegesis are faulty. Many of the Scriptures used are pulled out of context. There is no consideration given concerning to whom the letter(s) (instructions) were written.

Theonomists do have something to contribute. One of the positive things that Bahnsen’s book brings to our attention is the issue of the application of the law to society. With its application we need to consider the penal sanctions as well. As evan-

gelicals, we need to think about how to communicate God's truth and standards to a world that wants nothing to do with them. Yet the only way we are going to see significant change is if we see God regenerating hearts, thereby renewing minds toward him and his Word.

Al Paetz

Fellowship of Evangelical Baptist Churches, Marysville, BC

*No God But God*. Edited by Os Guinness and John Seel. Chicago: Moody, 1992, 223 pp., \$16.95.

This recent release is a book for our times. In light of the loss of evangelical influence in the 1992 elections, and in the shadow of other numerous and questionable premises within modern evangelicalism, these editors have assembled a formidable collection of iconoclasts. Their goal: to expose and critique contemporary idolatry within the evangelical camp. Beginning with the preamble, Guinness and Seel announce that it is time for another hammering of ninety-five theses on the door of the Church. Specifically within the evangelical church, they contend, an insidious idolatry has crept in unawares. The burden of this book is to overthrow those evangelical idols and warn of the "wider cultural captivity of evangelical churches in America" (p. 12). Guinness laments the two most recent idolatrous trends: "Ten years ago the attention was on the Christian Right; today it is on church growth. Then the cry was 'Mobilize!'; now it's 'Modernize!'" (p. 153). These authors warn their audience that merely to march to the drumbeat of the audience-driven, felt needs without Biblical examination "is a recipe for compromise and capitulation" (p. 157).

Recognizing a moment of crisis, and that radical confrontation with sin, heresy, idolatry and worldliness is in order, these essayists call for a reexertion of Biblical leadership, a renewal among the laity, a reintegration of truth and theology, and a recovery of the past: "Most evangelicals, however, suffer from historical amnesia. Like Rip Van Winkle's return from sleep, they act as if there were no jump from the last chapter of the book of Revelation to the first pages of the story of modern times. For American evangelicals, the loss is especially severe" (p. 19).

R. Keyes provides the backdrop for the succeeding essays in an analytical and perceptive chapter on the essence and pathology of idolatry. Each of the ensuing chapters focuses on a particular modern form of idolatry, of which many evangelicals are likely unconscious. M. Cromartie exposes the implicit faith lodged in the political process in "Up to Our Steeples in Politics," while Seel critiques the majoritarianism of those in search for Christian America. Guinness in "More Victimized Than Thou" unmasks the faulty Rodney Dangerfield "I don't get no respect" mentality of evangelicals when they perceive themselves to be a minority, often resorting to a humanistic ploy claiming their "rights" while exercising the politics of resentment. Two excellent critiques of the role of psychology are included in P. Vitz, "Leaving Psychology Behind," and Guinness, "America's Last Men and Their Magnificent Talking Cure."

The other idols revealed by this work are the idols of church growth (Guinness, "Sounding Out the Idols of Church Growth"), professionalization in the ministry (a superb chapter, "The D-Min-ization of the Ministry," by D. Wells), and organizationalism, laid bare by A. McDonald in "The Grand Inquisitor Lives." Each of these chapters is current, penetrating, and proffered with prophetic bravery. So convicting are these pieces that the authors will indubitably receive scorn and rebuke

rather than gratitude, just as the prophets of old were treated when they denounced idolatry.

Perhaps the single best chapter is "On Not Whoring After the Spirit of the Age" by converted liberal T. Oden, who warns: "We have blithely assumed that in theology—just as in corn poppers, electric toothbrushes, and automobile exhaust systems—new is good, newer is better, and newest is best" (p. 195). Against faddism in theology, Oden reminds us that "we are moving in the wrong direction when, as individuals, we say, 'I've got my Bible; that's all I need,' so as to imply 'No church, no history, no mission.' . . . Our modern individualism too easily tempts us to take our Bible and remove ourselves from the wider believing community. We end up with a Bible and a radio, but not church" (p. 199). Oden cautions against innovation, creativity, self-expression in theology, and the insatiable search for the novel. In his view we are now in a winter wilderness of theology, our only hope being lodged with the faithful remnant who will challenge the idols of modernity.

This is a tract for our times. It is also a gift to the Church. This volume will be profitable for classes on Christ and culture and for adult discussion classes in the church or home. It will be widely circulated and discussed as it calls us to be guided by God, and God alone, in such strong words as these: "If the church makes anything other than God's truth and resources the principle of its existence, Christians risk living unauthorized lives of faith, exercising unauthorized ministries, and proclaiming an unauthorized gospel" (p. 158).

David W. Hall  
Covenant Presbyterian Church, Oak Ridge, TN

*Dictionary of Scottish Church History and Theology.* Edited by Nigel M. de Cameron. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1994.

In putting together this masterful volume the editor has enlisted the aid of dozens of the top scholars in the field, mostly from Great Britain and the United States. Comprehensive in scope, this work includes brief biographies of Scottish figures as well as others who have had an impact on Scottish church history. It also contains significant articles on a host of theological topics along with relevant bibliographies.

Scottish church history and theology have particular relevance for both the European and American religious experience. Scottish immigrants into the United States brought with them their own unique religious experiences, and Scottish missionaries were active throughout the globe. Scotland has been a center of theological scholarship since the time of John Knox and has produced scores of individuals whose religious impact has been profound not only in Great Britain but in every corner of the world as well.

In the case of the United States, Scottish common-sense philosophy had a significant impact on the nineteenth-century Princetonians and also served to combat the skeptical philosophy of Hume. P. Helm argues that Scottish realism affirmed *a priori* ideas (contra Locke) and was thereby able to counteract the skepticism of Hume. Common-sense philosophy agreed with theism on the point that a belief in God's existence is inherent in man's nature. J. Witherspoon introduced this system into the curriculum at the College of New Jersey (Princeton University) in 1768.

I found several articles of personal interest. The entry on covenant theology by D. Macleod was particularly helpful because it provided an overview of the federal

system with detailed descriptions of the various covenants along with significant discussions of its historical development. In the covenant of works, Adam was representative of the entire human race. Because Adam and Eve were organically the source of the human race, their guilt of sin could legitimately be imputed to us all. Although this covenant is no longer in place the concept of following God's law is still valid, along with the theoretical possibility of justification by perfectly following it. This is not practically possible, however, because of the weakness of the flesh. In the covenant of grace the role of faith was prominent. Covenant theologians debated over whether faith was a condition of the covenant or a promise from God for the elect. Macleod analyzes twentieth-century critiques of federalism, including that of J. B. Torrance who argues that the federalists elevated the covenant of works over that of grace. Torrance sees such an assertion as a betrayal of Calvin, who made grace a priority.

Another interesting entry, by A. T. B. MacGowan, is on the doctrine of assurance, which was a major issue in post-Reformation Reformed thought. Although Scottish theologians saw assurance as attainable, the debate centered on whether assurance is an integral part of saving faith. If it is not, the believer must wrestle with this issue throughout his or her spiritual journey. The author interacts with contemporary historian R. T. Kendall, who argues that Calvin believed that the experience of assurance was a direct act of faith while Calvin's followers saw it as something to be gained subsequent to faith. The author then points out that Kendall's critics, including R. Letham, argue that these two positions on assurance have always been a part of discussions within the Reformed camp and are not indications of a great cleavage between Calvin and his successors.

K. E. Collins' article on the Jews in Scotland is also fascinating. He points out that the Jewish presence in Scotland was not significant until the late eighteenth century and that there was no Jewish cemetery there until 1795. By 1847 there were only 107 Jews in Edinburgh and 128 in Glasgow. By the 1870s the Jewish community expanded, with most of the new arrivals focusing on the textile industry. By the 1880s large numbers of Russian Jews began to arrive as a result of poor economic conditions. The author goes on to detail Jewish organizations and their interaction with Christian institutions as well as the impact of Zionism in Scotland.

Probably the most significant article in the book is on missions. The 27-page entry by A. F. Walls discusses the origins of Scottish missionary activity and the extent of its influence. The Scottish Society for Propagating Christian Knowledge (SSPCK) was founded in 1709, and Scots were active both in the Society for Propagating the Gospel and the London Missionary Society, whose most famous Scot was David Livingstone. During the latter half of the eighteenth century a number of voluntary societies sprang up, including the Glasgow and Edinburgh Missionary Societies. These societies drew support from many denominations and sent out missionaries and educated those at home about missions. Scottish activity centered originally in West Africa and in the nineteenth century in India. The article concludes with an historical description of Scottish missionary activity throughout the world along with a lengthy bibliography focusing on various geographic efforts.

This reference tool is a must purchase for any university or seminary library and is an excellent starting point for students writing research papers and for scholars seeking basic information. Pastors can also glean a wealth of important material for sermon illustrations.

Martin I. Klauber  
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

*Great Divides: Understanding The Controversies That Come Between Christians.* By Ronald Nash. Colorado Springs: NavPress, 1993, 240 pp., n.p. paper.

In this book Nash deals with issues that divide the Church, such as the prolife debate, the role of women in the Church, radical feminism, divorce and remarriage, psychology and counseling, the health-and-wealth gospel, Christian involvement in politics, reconstructionism, lordship salvation, and eschatology.

Nash desires unity within the body of Christ, a unity that is based upon an honest inquiry into our beliefs, a unity that is aware of the human limitations that prevent us from having all the answers. We have a tendency to equate our beliefs with the Bible as if all our beliefs came solely from Scripture. Christians need to comprehend which concepts are the essentials and which are the nonessentials of the faith. The resultant unity will enhance our witness to the world.

But unity does not exclude the responsibility of calling a heresy by its name. Nash is not advocating ecumenicism at all costs. There is a place to draw the line, though we should exercise great tolerance in doing so. There are also those with whom we cannot agree but with whom we can still enjoy fellowship.

Unfortunately Nash falls short of his goal. First, his book deals primarily with the divisions that exist among evangelicals. He presupposes that being evangelical is synonymous with being Christian. Second, Nash is not fair in presenting those views that differ from his own. For example, chap. 1 is a blatant attack on those who subscribe to a pro-choice position. But there is no sincere questioning of our views in light of the pro-choice arguments, and there is certainly no tolerance shown toward those who hold such views. The work of the abortionists "makes the Nazi Holocaust look like the work of rank amateurs" (p. 20). The rest of the book is not as harsh, though it fails to live up to the standards that were set in the introductory chapter.

This volume is really only a presentation of Nash's own views. Those interested in finding out what his stance is on these issues should read the book. But if one is expecting a book that credibly presents diverse viewpoints on these issues, then one will be greatly disappointed.

Jorge Crespo  
North Bergen, NJ

*A Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation.* Edited by R. J. Coggins and J. L. Houlden. London: SCM; Philadelphia: Trinity, 1990, xvi + 751 pp., \$49.95.

This is a unique dictionary, one that truly lives up to its name. It is not a Bible dictionary in the sense that such a work presents and summarizes topics of Biblical content. Rather, it is a dictionary that focuses on Biblical interpretation, on how the Bible has been approached and interpreted over the centuries. The editors state that the articles fall into several categories: (1) Biblical books; (2) schools, movements and periods in the history of interpretation; (3) technical terms, approaches and methods used in interpretation; (4) on occasion, individuals, both Biblical and post-Biblical (pp. v-vi).

A sampling of topics will illustrate the wide range of concerns in this work, many of them fascinating and unexpected. Among the schools of thought or periods will be found "Antiochene Interpretation," "Scandinavian Old Testament Scholarship," "Fundamentalism," "English Interpretation," "Black Christian Interpretation," "Feminist Criticism," "Mediaeval Interpretation," "Myth and Ritual," "Muslim Interpretation," and many more. Among the technical terms will be found "Florilegia," "Irony," "Ideology," "Metaphor," "*Sensus Plenior*," "Peshet," "Trajectory," "Ethos,"

and many more. Approaches and methods overlap in many cases with schools of thought but include "Form Criticism," "Rhetorical Criticism," "Narrative Criticism," "Narrative Theology," "New Hermeneutic," "Canonical Criticism," and so on. Among Biblical persons we find Abraham, Moses, John the Baptist, and a few others, but not Jesus (although there are two articles on Christology). Among non-Biblical persons we find such individuals as Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, Augustine, Marcion and Tertullian, as well as such modern scholars as C. C. Torrey, A. Schweitzer, Westcott, Lightfoot, Hort, R. Bultmann, C. H. Dodd, etc.

Articles do appear on every Biblical book. But they do not focus on the contents of the books. Rather, they concentrate on how these books have been interpreted over the centuries (although some authors do provide brief summaries of the books' contents or major themes). For example, the article on "Kings" begins with the Chronicler's interpretations of it, moves on to discuss its interpretation in the LXX, Ben Sira, Josephus, Talmud, medieval Jewish and Christian circles, its impact on the English language and English coronation rituals, and concludes by discussing modern theories of the deuteronomistic history.

Miscellaneous topics include "Miracle in the Biblical World," "Philology," "Ethics," "Nag Hammadi," "Music, The Bible in," "Other Faiths," "Hymnody," "Enlightenment," "Translation, Problems of," and a host of others.

I am not aware of any other work like this one, focusing exclusively as it does on interpretation of the Bible. It has an all-star cast of 149 contributors (mostly British), representative of the mainstream of critical scholarship today, although a tiny handful of British evangelicals does appear. The writing is clear, and each article contains a short bibliography. Those familiar with the recent magisterial *Anchor Bible Dictionary* will know that such matters as methods of interpretation and epistemology play a large if not dominant role throughout most of the articles in that work. This volume, however, is self-consciously limited to these issues. The editors explain in the preface that this reflects "partly a shift of interest towards matters of interpretation, but also, and perhaps more significantly, a certain loss of confidence" (p. v). Sadly, the latter is too much the case in Biblical studies at the end of the twentieth century.

The dictionary is well worth a place on every evangelical Biblical scholar's bookshelf for up-to-date treatments of a host of topics related to Biblical interpretation, many of which are not represented at all in other dictionaries. Beyond this, evangelicals should produce such a volume of their own.

David M. Howard, Jr.  
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

*The Hebrew Bible, The Old Testament, and Historical Criticism.* By Jon D. Levenson. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1993, xv + 192 pp., \$14.99 paper.

In this collection of essays Levenson critiques the historical-critical school of OT (or Tanakh) criticism in contrast to the traditional school. He asserts his separation from both camps, maintaining that neither the traditionalists nor the historical critics will approve of his work if properly understood. The traditionalists cannot approve his work because he accepts historical-critical presuppositions. Historical critics, however, will disapprove because he notes that the logical conclusion of the historical-critical method eradicates any *raison d'être* of their field of study, or at least of its prominence in the modern university.

I found the first essay the most challenging, since it lays a foundation for the subsequent chapters. While Levenson argues for the validity of the historical-critical method he critiques it for its erosion of any literary context. Likewise he assumes purely human authorship, while he correctly observes that this has devastated study of both the OT and NT. When each human author is viewed as autonomous, the critic is left without canonical boundaries, which promotes heresy, since there is no valid determinant of orthodoxy. He complains that Christian scholars tend to read the OT through a NT grid, noting that if the historical-critical view is correct the NT is merely one of several traditions, including the Talmud and Islam *et al.*, and is no more valid. Rather, because the Talmud represents the mainstream Jewish tradition, it takes priority. Because Levenson primarily addresses historical criticism and seems familiar only with liberal scholarship, he never addresses the issue of the historicity of NT events. Those who accept the historicity of the NT events are dismissed as fundamentalists and ignored.

The second essay notes the dearth of Jewish OT theologies. Levenson concludes that Jewish scholars are uninterested in pursuing OT theology because the field has been viewed as anti-Semitic, based on its Christian perspective of OT fulfillment in the NT. Moreover Jewish scholars have traditionally thought in terms of action rather than beliefs, resulting in a systematization of law, not theology. Noting the lack of a commonly accepted theological center of the OT, he suggests that the idea is contrary to the historical-critical process of OT development, which should make the problem one of a series of contextualizations. Again, he suggests that rabbinic Judaism with its historical dialectical development is a better alternative.

The third essay continues this issue by discussing Maimonides' eighth principle of Judaism, which asserts that the Torah was given to Moses (by God). In the process Levenson notes that the issue at hand is not whether Moses wrote the Torah but whether the Torah is of divine or human origin. While maintaining that the origin must be divine or there is no reason to maintain it (which contrasts strangely with his acceptance of the historical-critical method) Levenson suggests that the historical process undermines the integrity and interdependence of the whole. His conclusion that "no Jewish theology consonant with the classical rabbinic tradition" (p. 81) can be built on the historical-critical method raises serious questions about his own assumptions. In the process Levenson makes one of his most telling points: "How can the classic, historical-critical method, with its concentration on 'one meaning' (the author's), do justice to a text that, as it stands, has no author?" (p. 78).

The fourth essay addresses combined Jewish-Christian OT studies. He maintains that when Scripture study is done within any context of a religious commitment, combined study is impossible. In other words, it is only when Biblical studies become a purely academic subject, ignoring such issues as the messiahship of Jesus, that such combined study is possible. In reality this is a denial of that claim.

The fifth essay directly challenges historical critics. If the historical critics are correct, and if the value of the OT lies solely in the historical culture of the final compilation, then why should study of that field have primacy in the American university? While the conservative would stand in agreement here, as Levenson expands this criticism he denies any religiously based evaluation of any other system and again prejudices the issue of the historicity of Jesus the Messiah.

The final essay explores the question of liberation theology as a parallel drawn from the exodus. Levenson exposes the weak exegesis that supports liberation theology, but again lumps all Christianity together in terms of the exegetical base, as he ignores the conservative position. He does approve of some uses of the OT by modern move-

ments, however, such as Martin Luther King Jr.'s term "I have seen the promised land." It is viewed as valid since it works in terms of analogy, not appropriation.

Overall, Levenson argues that the solution to the problems raised by historical criticism is to restore tradition as the authority. The question is, which tradition? He claims that the Talmudic tradition is just as valid as the Christian and, since it was the mainstream Jewish consensus, it should take precedence. Unfortunately, since Levenson accepts the conclusions of the historical-critical school regarding the composition of the OT his authority base is no more valid than theirs, and he has no real answer as to why his tradition should be chosen. Still the questions he asks are pertinent, and the challenges to the historical-critical method itself should be thoughtfully evaluated. They should also serve to remind us of how far-reaching the effects of the question of the historicity of both OT and NT events are.

Michael A. Harbin  
Taylor University, Upland, IN

*A Song of Power and the Power of Song: Essays on the Book of Deuteronomy.* Edited by Duane L. Christensen. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1993, xiv + 428 pp., \$32.50.

Students of Deuteronomy must now stand in debt to Christensen for having selected, from a plethora of choices, a number of essays that those who labor in the Book of the Covenant will recognize as major *oeuvres*. These include an important new article by the editor himself, "Deuteronomy in Modern Research: Approaches and Issues," and reprints of M. Weinfeld, "Deuteronomy: The Present State of Inquiry"; N. Lohfink, "Recent Discussion on 2 Kings 22–23: The State of the Question"; S. McBride, Jr., "Polity of the Covenant People: The Book of Deuteronomy"; E. Nicholson, "Covenant in a Century Since Wellhausen"; G. Wenham, "Deuteronomy and the Central Sanctuary"; P. Craigie, "Deuteronomy and Ugaritic Studies"; C. Brekelmans, "Wisdom Influence in Deuteronomy"; T. Veijola, "Principal Observations on the Basic Story in Deuteronomy 1–3"; W. Moran, "The End of the Unholy War and the Anti-Exodus"; P. Skehan, "The Structure of the Song of Moses in Deuteronomy (32:1–43)"; G. Mendenhall, "Samuel's 'Broken Rib': Deuteronomy 32"; G. Coats, "Legendary Motifs in the Moses Death Reports"; A. Mayes, "Deuteronomy 4 and the Literary Criticism of Deuteronomy"; A. Phillips, "The Decalogue: Ancient Israel's Criminal Law"; F. Fensham, "Malediction and Benediction in Ancient Near Eastern Vassal-Treaties and the Old Testament"; E. Bellefontaine, "The Curses of Deuteronomy 27: Their Relationship to the Prohibitives"; A. Rofé, "The Covenant in the Land of Moab (Deuteronomy 28:69–30:20): Historico-Literary, Comparative, and Formcritical Considerations"; M. Greenberg, "Some Postulates of Biblical Criminal Law"; P. Miller, "'Moses My Servant': The Deuteronomistic Portrait of Moses"; G. Braulik, "The Sequence of the Laws in Deuteronomy 12–26 and in the Decalogue"; N. Lohfink, "Distribution of the Functions of Power: The Laws Concerning Public Offices in Deuteronomy 16:18–18:22"; R. Polzin, "Reporting Speech in the Book of Deuteronomy: Toward a Compositional Analysis of the Deuteronomistic History"; C. Labuschagne, "Divine Speech in Deuteronomy"; D. Christensen, "The *Numeruswechsel* in Deuteronomy 12."

The editor freely confesses the inevitably arbitrary nature of his choices, listing many other scholars whose works could have been included (p. ix). Each critic will, of course, denigrate the selection of some to the exclusion of others, and I am no exception. Striking by their absence, in my opinion, are F. Garcia Lopez, "Analyse Littéraire de Deuteronomie 5–11," *RB* 82 (1977) 481–522; *RB* 85 (1978) 5–49; B.

Halpern, "The Centralization Formula in Deuteronomy," *VT* 31 (1981) 20–38; S. Kaufman, "The Structure of the Deuteronomic Law," *Maarav* 1/2 (1978–79) 105–158; J. Levenson, "Who Inserted the Book of the Law?," *HTR* 68 (1976) 203–233; J. McConville and G. Wenham, "Drafting Techniques in Deuteronomy," *VT* 30 (1980) 248–252; G. Minette de Tillesse, "Sections 'tu' et sections 'vous' dans le Deutéronome," *VT* 12 (1962) 29–87; J. Niehaus, "The Central Sanctuary: Where and When?," *TynBul* 43 (1992) 3–30.

Only the hitherto unpublished essay by Christensen ("Deuteronomy in Modern Research: Approaches and Issues," pp. 3–17) will receive special attention here. The second half of the essay provides an overview of all the other contributions so, in fact, only pp. 3–11 need to be addressed.

After reviewing what he describes as three major impulses in the modern study of Deuteronomy (centered on Wellhausen, Steuernagel and Staerk, and Noth respectively), Christensen introduces his own "new model of analysis" (p. 6) to the discussion. As those conversant with Christensen's innovative (if not always convincing) approaches to the study of Deuteronomy already know, his point of departure is interdisciplinary, one that seeks to understand epic and narrative poetry within the context of musical performance of texts in antiquity. On the basis of this assumption he posits that the Song of Moses (Deuteronomy 32), the only authentically pre-monarchic text in the book, was at last embedded in Deuteronomy in such a way as to make of the entire composition a Song of Moses. When finally put in written form, Deuteronomy played an important role in the Josianic reform and, more significantly, "became the center of a canonical process that eventually produced the Hebrew Bible as we now know it" (p. 8). Among other evidences as to its being a musical composition, Christensen argues, is the five-part concentric design of Deuteronomy, a pattern typical of liturgical expression from ancient to modern times.

While offering a fresh and highly evocative approach to the study of this crucial OT book, Christensen's method, and hence his conclusions, may be called into question at several points. First, he severely deemphasizes the covenant structure of Deuteronomy—a structure recognized by the majority of modern scholars—and thus fails to appreciate its nature as a covenant text. Second, the analogies he draws between modern primitive cultures and Greek classical traditions, on the one hand, and the ancient Semitic world of the OT, on the other, are hardly convincing. What are needed are examples that are more culturally and contextually compatible if his case is to be made. Finally, to plead that Deuteronomy is musically liturgical because of its concentric literary patterns and the like is to suggest that much of the remainder of the OT is also of the same genre and function since these same literary features are pervasive, as many recent rhetorical-critical analyses have shown. One would think Christensen would at least have mentioned some of these shared patterns.

These cavils aside, Christensen has rendered a service here, not only by collecting essays that in some cases are difficult to access but also by translating others into English and providing full indices of authorities and Scripture references.

Eugene H. Merrill  
Dallas Theological Seminary, Dallas, TX

*The Aramaic of Daniel in the Light of Old Aramaic.* By Zdravko Stefanovic. JSOTSup 129. Sheffield: JSOT, 1992, 128 pp., \$47.50.

The authenticity of the book of Daniel has been challenged on various grounds. One of the strongest reasons for dating it in the second century BC has been the so-

called late features of the Aramaic of the book (DA). Stefanovic strives to reverse this trend, making an attempt to show how close DA is in relation to Old Aramaic (OA). The work is in the spirit of such scholars as R. D. Wilson and K. A. Kitchen, who stood against such scholars as S. R. Driver and H. H. Rowley, the latter's study having been made only in bolder relief by the solid study of Kitchen with many forceful arguments for the authenticity of the book of Daniel.

The general impression to be gathered from this work is that the author's own caution against "hasty or oversimplified conclusions" (p. 82) should perhaps be directed more frequently to his own work.

First of all, to compare DA with a limited number of OA documents may lead to false conclusions. It is necessary to set DA in somewhat broader surroundings than that which is attempted in this work. This point may be illustrated by citing the author's frequent appeal to the syntactic parallel of *šlm* with a verb *hqym* in DA to *nsb<sup>7</sup> zy šm* (KAI 215:1, 20; KAI 202 A:1; KAI 201:1), *nsb<sup>7</sup> zy qm* (KAI 214:1, 14) or *dmwt<sup>7</sup> zy šm* (Fekheriyeh 1). But how strong is this deduction if we in fact find the same expression in Middle Aramaic (MA) inscriptions even more closely analogous than those cited from OA documents? In Petra 1:1 we find the same expression as in DA (*šlm hqym*). Or again in KAI 204:1, 14, *nsb<sup>7</sup>* with *qm* occurs. Likewise in many Palmyrene texts we find *šlm* with *<sup>7</sup>qym* (aphel form). These data have a very significant impact upon the conclusions drawn by this author (cf. pp. 49–50, 101–102, and "Appendix 1").

In the same connection the author has on p. 55 unwittingly attempted to align DA with OA, while differentiating them from 1QapGen, in the usage of *<sup>c</sup>d <sup>c</sup>lm* and *l<sup>c</sup>lmn*. But the fact is that the latter form occurs not only in OA and DA but also in MA as in Mur 20:4; 26:6, Hever Contract B:6, 11, 12, 13, and Nabatean texts. Furthermore *<sup>c</sup>d <sup>c</sup>lm<sup>7</sup>* occurs in DA 2:20. As to *kzy* or *kdy* (p. 57), the author's argument appears inconclusive in the same way as mentioned above, inasmuch as *kdy* occurs also nine times in 1QapGen and once in TgJob.

Likewise his attempt to align OA with DA in reference to the *aleph-he* interchange of the demonstrative pronoun *znh* (*dnh*) is most unconvincing (p. 70) in the light of the total documentation.

Secondly, there are a number of highly questionable arguments. For instance on p. 49 "hyper-archaisms" (like *gdbry<sup>7</sup>* in Dan 3:2) appears to be a mistake, since *gdbry<sup>7</sup>* is not really an archaic form but rather a modernized one. H. H. Schaeder's argument was that the form *gdbry<sup>7</sup>* in Dan 3:2 suggests "a systematic revision" (*Iranische Beiträge* 245). On p. 50 Stefanovic seems mistaken when he alleges that *<sup>7</sup>mrt pmh* (ll. 10, 14) is an expression "explained as a 'Hebraism' in DA." In point of fact this occurs only in Biblical Hebrew, not in DA. On p. 52 the author states that "because of its [*nota accusativi*] occurrence in OA dialects and in early EgA . . . , this argument cannot be valid any longer." Here again the deduction seems questionable. The argument for DA's lateness is based upon inflectional "forms," not upon the fact that the *nota accusativi* is absent from OA or *Reichsaramäisch*. The forms are distinctive in diachronic settings.

On the positive side, however, Stefanovic rightly points out the "inadequacy of hasty or oversimplified conclusions" in reference to the diachronic paradigms of the *pê-nûn* verb by P. W. Coxon (p. 82). My own study (*The Aramaic of Daniel*, 1994) has indicated that the first and third statements made by Coxon regarding nasalization ("Nasalization," *RevQ* 9/34 [1977] 257) need modification.

Typographical errors in the book are minimal: *wlm<sup>7</sup>rk ymh//w<sup>c</sup>rk<sup>h</sup> byyn* should be changed into *wlm<sup>7</sup>rk ywh//w<sup>7</sup>rk<sup>h</sup> byyn* (p. 50; cf. "Appendix 1" where it is correctly typeset); *nsb<sup>7</sup>* to *nsb<sup>7</sup> zy šm* (p. 50); *hd* to *ḥd* (p. 56).

By way of summary, this author has brought out many parallels between OA and DA. But when he attempts to bring DA into a larger setting, his judgment becomes less trustworthy. His apologetic aim to defend the authenticity of Daniel is commendable and even achievable on linguistic grounds. But the scope and the contents of the present work do not measure up to the purpose. Nevertheless, once an author has taken upon himself a noble yet difficult task, demanding both patience and time (the best way to do it seems to employ a computer with a database program), then many similar studies may be undertaken with, it is to be hoped, a wider base of evidence and more precision in detail.

Jongtae Choi  
Korean Covenant Presbyterian Church, Chicago, IL

*From Text to Tradition: A History of Second Temple and Rabbinic Judaism.* By Lawrence H. Schiffman. Hoboken: Ktav, 1991, 299 pp., \$16.95/\$39.50.

Schiffman has provided a useful survey of historical events and processes from OT (especially Persian period) times down to completion of the Talmud with the goal of tracing the origins and development of the Judaism of the talmudic rabbis. Although written from a Jewish perspective, there is much information of value to students of the NT and the early Church.

The approach of this book is less a history of people than the story of ideas and how those ideas passed through the mill of history and came to be accepted or rejected by talmudic Judaism. Beginning with the HB, Schiffman finds the foundations of rabbinic Judaism in (for example) the Persian period's emphasis on a hermeneutic of Mosaic law permitting application to new circumstances. Though the Hellenistic period led to contact and conflict between Judaism and Greek culture, and considerable assimilation of Hellenistic values among Jews of the Mediterranean world, ultimately Judaism owes less to Hellenistic Judaism, which historically does not survive, than it owes to the Judaism of the Babylonian dispersion in the east that was largely unaffected by Hellenism. It is out of the latter that the Talmud, the most important religious document of post-Biblical Judaism, comes. Sects arose after the Maccabean revolt (Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes, Christians, Qumran), though Schiffman considers them all, including the earliest Christianity, to be sects within Judaism sharing a vast commonality despite differences in interpretation of Jewish law. The Pharisees' concept of the "tradition of the fathers" and the concept of the oral law that grew out of it created a form of Judaism that could adapt to new and varied circumstances that followed the Jewish wars with Rome, a feature that allowed it to survive.

The book concludes with discussions of how Christianity became separate from Judaism, how the synagogue came to replace the temple, prayer came to replace worship via animal sacrifices, and the Babylonian Talmud attained hegemony as legal authority among the Jewish people.

Schiffman's book is clearly written and easy to read. The author is well-versed in talmudic studies and is able to bring this into his discussion at appropriate points. Christians often study the intertestamental period with a view toward the historical development of Christianity. It is refreshing to read the same material examined for the rather different purpose of understanding the origins of rabbinic Judaism. Even so, the background of the NT era is much illuminated. Moreover the author is also a specialist in Qumran studies and is therefore able to employ the QL to a much

greater degree than authors of earlier histories have been. Included in his discussion is a precis of his proposal that the Qumran community's origins are in the Sadducees rather than the Essenes, a thesis he has defended in greater detail elsewhere. His view (p. 173) that during the second Jewish war with Rome (AD 132–135) both Bar Koseba and his high priest Eleazar may have been considered to be messiahs in accord with the expectation of a lay and a priestly messiah at Qumran is an intriguing hypothesis based on the QL.

A major weakness of the book is its almost total lack of documentation for historical sources used to reconstruct the author's history. As a result it is often impossible for a nonspecialist to know the basis of the author's reconstructions. For example, he (p. 76) states that Menelaus rationalized his Hellenization by the supposition that the ancestral God of Israel was simply another manifestation of Baal Shamin and Zeus. How does Schiffman know this? No basis is given. Frequently he refuses to be specific, using phrases such as "various literary sources lead us to believe." Such vagaries and unsupported generalizations may be welcomed by the undergraduate reader, but it is very frustrating to the scholar.

Other problems: Schiffman's statement (p. 92) that Torah, Prophets, and Writings originally reflect descending degrees of inspiration is a retrojection of the author's talmudic theology. His denial that Jesus was born in Bethlehem, his statement that the notion of the divinity of Jesus was a second-century innovation, and his view that the NT "demonizes" the Jewish people as a whole are readings of the NT marred by his theological prejudices.

J. M. Sprinkle

Toccoa Falls College, Toccoa Falls, GA

*The Gospel of Luke.* By Luke Timothy Johnson. Sacra Pagina 3. Collegeville: Liturgical, 1991, 466 pp., \$30.00.

This book heralds the advent of a new type of commentary, it is to be hoped, which (1) accepts the text as a given and listens to it and (2) is sensitive to discourse structure and development. I let Johnson speak for himself (pp. xi–xii): "My concern is only with what Luke is saying and how he goes about saying it. I have tried to provide a sense of Luke's compositional techniques—how he accomplishes his effects and creates his themes. Above all, I have tried to overcome the inherent atomism of the commentary form by giving a sense of narrative development, including some grasp of how each part fits into the whole."

Johnson finds Luke a master of Hellenistic style with a commendable variety in his Greek. As he puts it (p. 6): "If we excerpted and compared the Greek of his Gospel Prologue, the infancy accounts, Peter's Pentecost sermon, and Paul's defense speeches we might think that they were from four different writers." He explains this as Luke's skillful adaptation of his style to the character and circumstances. Above all he praises Luke as a gifted storyteller. Thus in the gospel he cites the stories of the prodigal son, the good Samaritan and the Emmaus road encounter as gems of storytelling while at the same time he emphasizes the placement of such short narratives in the plan and scope of the whole. He mentions Luke's deftness as a narrator in respect to his use of summaries, speeches, travel narratives (e.g. Luke 9–19) and parallelism of both big and small sections—as in Luke 15 (pp. 13–14).

One important point that Johnson makes throughout the volume is the narrative unity of Luke-Acts, that the two books together constitute an account not only of the origins of Christianity but an extension of OT Biblical history as well. Conse-

quently there is a running comparison between the gospel and Acts—e.g., in respect to the Holy Spirit hovering over Mary and filling John and Jesus early in the gospel and the coming of the Spirit on the community in the early chapters of Acts.

Johnson effectively makes various further points (e.g. Luke's cosmopolitanism and generally benign attitude toward the Roman Empire and its representatives, and his taking Jerusalem as pivotal in both the gospel and Acts). He presents Christ not only as Savior and as a prophet like Moses but also as a philosopher who discourses at meals in proper Hellenistic fashion.

I note in passing that Johnson's commentary, measured by ETS standards of Scriptural inerrancy, leaves something to be desired. Thus while he generally approves of Luke as a competent Hellenistic historian he defaults him in certain particulars—e.g., in regard to the Roman census taking place "when Quirinius was governor of Syria" (Luke 2:2), in regard to which Johnson says "Luke simply had the facts wrong" (pp. 7, 49).

Nevertheless, I commend Johnson for his interpretation of Luke-Acts as literature with a plot structure, a sense of an emerging problem and its resolution, and his holistic accounting for details.

Robert E. Longacre  
Summer Institute of Linguistics, Dallas, TX

*These Things Have Been Written—Studies on the Fourth Gospel.* By Raymond F. Collins. Louvain: Peeters, 1990; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991, xiii + 256 pp., n.p.

This book represents a collection of twelve essays on the fourth gospel. They were originally published between 1976 and 1989 in various journals. The book's title, imitating typical Johannine style, alludes both to the familiar phrase of the fourth evangelist and to the fact that Collins' work represents in fact a reissue of previously published writings.

Collins' central contention is that the fourth gospel originated as a series of homilies that were designed to strengthen the faith of the members of the Johannine community. Following J. L. Martyn's now classic work *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel* (1968; rev. ed. 1979), Collins contends: "Indeed we really ought to read John's gospel on two levels. At one level, it is a narrative tale. It tells in a simple way . . . the remembered tale of Jesus of Nazareth. . . . On another level, the gospel of John is a symbolic tale. It tells the story of the Johannine community, its faith and its struggles."

In the lead article Collins seeks to show that each original homily selected a particular individual as a type of faith, or lack thereof, in Jesus. Of the fifteen figures he identifies, some fit this pattern better than others. Does only Philip represent "the disciple who misunderstands" in the fourth gospel? Is it accurate to consider Mary as the one who "symbolizes the one who faithfully awaits the messianic times"? It appears that Collins does not tie these contentions sufficiently to the text of John's gospel itself.

In the second part of the collection Collins deals with the genre of the fourth gospel and its relationship to the synoptics. It is there that the author's rather low view of the fourth gospel's final text comes to light when he refers to "the present, somewhat confused state of the Gospel of John" and calls the fourth gospel "the earliest commentary on the gospel" rather than a gospel in its own right.

Collins' collection brings to mind similar efforts by D. M. Smith, M. de Jonge or R. E. Brown. While the essays do not all possess the same depth of insight, they pro-

vide some food for thought for the Johannine scholar. The two best articles in my judgment are also the two earliest—"Representative Figures" and "'He Came to Dwell Among Us' (John 1:14)"—both originally published in 1976. Though somewhat dated they still make good reading for students of Johannine theology.

It is certainly possible to benefit from some of Collins' detailed observations. His overall interpretational grid of the fourth gospel, however, appears to be on shakier ground. Collins has fully embraced Martyn's version of the Johannine community hypothesis with its hermeneutical entailments. Today, however, even many of Martyn's followers express certain reservations regarding the specific details of his reconstruction, not to mention the recent massive assault launched on the entire hypothesis by M. Hengel (*Die johanneische Frage*, 1993). Collins' essays may therefore soon be regarded more as dated artifacts of a certain species of redaction-critical study in the post-Martyn era than as enduring contributions to the study of John's gospel.

Andreas J. Köstenberger  
Briercrest Bible College, Caronport, SK

*The Environment and the Christian: What Can We Learn From the New Testament?*  
Edited by Calvin B. DeWitt. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1991, 156 pp., n.p.

DeWitt's book has an ambitious goal: to focus on the NT for environmental guidance, stressing God's involvement with the world—especially through the incarnation. It is a compilation of eight essays, each of which attempts to lay hold of various NT themes, such as the life and resurrection of Jesus, and apply them to the Christian's responsibility toward creation.

Positively, the book reminds us that the creation—even marred by sin—is still good. Some branches of Christianity have been all too ready to divorce themselves from taking care of the earth, focusing solely on otherworldly concerns. One of this work's consistent themes is to criticize any such notion of Christian escapism. Also, the authors are quick to remind their readers of the ever-present human tendency toward greed. This tendency is indeed often a threat to the environment.

Unfortunately the work has several acute flaws that seriously undermine its usefulness for Christians wanting a reflective work on the environment. First, it adopts uncritically the current popular apocalyptic vision of environmental doom. Like many secular writers DeWitt simply accepts that our planet is plunging headlong into ecological disaster. On the issue of global warming, for instance, DeWitt seems unaware of climatologists, such as P. Michaels and R. Balling, and their criticisms