

BOOK REVIEWS

The Language of the New Testament: Classic Essays. Edited by Stanley E. Porter. JSNTS 60. Sheffield: JSOT, 1991, 238 pp., \$47.50.

This anthology brings together what the editor considers to be “classic essays” dealing with a longstanding and much-debated question: What is the character of the Greek of the NT? His goal “is to give some idea of the history and progress of this continuing discussion.”

The collection opens with the editor’s own contribution, “The Greek of the New Testament as a Disputed Area of Research.” Then follow nine essays ranging in date from 1899 to 1980. In choosing these essays the editor has not always included the best-known piece by a contributor, especially if it is easily available elsewhere. Instead he has sought out (with only one exception) incisive complete statements, two of which (those by A. Deissmann and L. Rydbeck) are here available in English for the first time. The selections (with date of initial appearance) include Deissmann, “Hellenistic Greek with Special Consideration of the Greek Bible” (1899); J. H. Moulton, “New Testament Greek in the Light of Modern Discovery” (1909); C. C. Torrey, “The Aramaic of the Gospels” (1942); M. Black, “Aramaic Studies and the Language of Jesus” (1968); J. A. Fitzmyer, “The Languages of Palestine in the First Century AD” (1970; the bibliography has been updated for this edition); H. S. Gehman, “The Hebraic Character of Septuagint Greek” (1951); N. Turner, “The Language of Jesus and His Disciples” (1965); Rydbeck, “On the Question of Linguistic Levels and the Place of the New Testament in the Contemporary Language Milieu” (1967); M. Silva, “Bilingualism and the Character of Palestinian Greek” (1980).

The editor’s contribution is an excellent introduction to the issues involved, and it nicely introduces and summarizes each of the selected essays. The chronological arrangement works well overall, although the essay by Fitzmyer, touching as it does more on the context of the debate than the issues involved, might well have been placed right after the introductory chapter.

Acknowledging the usefulness of the introduction, readers may nonetheless wish that the editor had covered two areas a bit more fully. First, given the way that Silva’s essay raised the important matter of modern linguistics, and in view of the editor’s own expertise in that area (see p. 35 n. 3), a fuller discussion of the implications of linguistics for the future of the debate would have been both welcome and useful. Second, fuller bibliographic guidance to contributions to the topic since 1980 would have increased the utility of the collection. A few more recent items do get mentioned along the way, such as G. H. R. Horsley’s important essay (see p. 17 n. 1), but they tend to be buried in footnotes and thus are easy to overlook. More explicit guidance at this point would have enhanced the usefulness of this volume for students or others new to the matters it surveys.

Overall, this is an excellent and handy collection. Not only has the editor made material readily available that is otherwise widely scattered, but he has, with his skillful introduction, increased our awareness of its significance and context.

Michael W. Holmes
Bethel College, St. Paul, MN

Where Shall Wisdom Be Found? Calvin's Exegesis of Job from Medieval and Modern Perspectives. By Susan E. Schreiner. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1994, 264 pp., \$36.00.

Three groups of readers will wish to take note of this book. (1) Students of Calvin will find interest in Schreiner's exposition of the sermons on Job that he preached in Geneva from February 1554 to March 1555. (2) Historians of exegesis will be provided with a thought-provoking modern paradigm of diachronic interpretation. (3) Students of the Writings will encounter interpretative reflection upon the book of Job itself that merits their critical consideration.

Schreiner centers her study on Calvin's sermons, but she sets forth two lines of Joban interpretation predating Calvin to complement his work. (1) In chap. 1 she explores Gregory the Great's *Moralia in Iob*, "the most influential interpretation of Job's story through the early and high Middle Ages." (2) In chap. 2 Schreiner sets side by side two later works on Job that follow a more literal interpretative vector. Maimonides expounded Job in *The Guide of the Perplexed*, completed by 1190, and Aquinas wrote his *Expositio super Iob ad litteram* around 1261–1264. Then in chaps. 3–4 Schreiner develops Calvin's sermonistic exposition of Job. Finally, in chap. 5 she concludes with a survey of modern readings of Job. Her interest here lies not primarily in commentaries of an historical-critical nature but in a wide spectrum of more literary treatments, including works by Gordis, Terrien, Habel, Good, Jung, Wells, MacLeish, Wiesel and Kafka.

The hermeneutical reasoning pervading this book is the most significant thing about it, for it illustrates the dilemma imposed by modernity upon the exegete and especially the historian of exegesis. Schreiner accepts that the objectivity in exegesis and historiography confidently cherished by previous generations is an illusion. She does not identify herself wholly with radical deconstructionism, but she does negotiate a compromise with it. Forsaking authorial intention as the aim of exegesis, she asserts that Job represents "a multiplicity of meanings" that the history of exegesis provides for modern reflection. Indeed, because authorial intention in the Biblical text is beyond our apprehension and therefore a misplaced concern, the same is true in reading the historical commentaries, so that one may not even use phrases like "according to Gregory" or "according to Calvin." One is left with only the text, with the *intentio operis*, whether in Job or its commentaries. She does draw back from the abyss of relativism, in which a text admits of an infinity of meanings, by affirming that some interpretations are more valid than others. But why this should be so, once interpretative validation has been released from objective criteria, is not as clearly defended as it needs to be. When a certain line of reasoning has dug itself into a deep epistemological hole, bare assertion will not lift it out. Having forfeited the treasure of objectivity, modern thinking must then content itself with the consolation prize of the suggestive power of the autonomous text.

This book is many things at once, which is exactly what makes it intriguing. And it does offer a thoughtful discussion of Joban exegesis from Gregory to Calvin. But sadly, more than anything else, the volume stands as one more landmark on our way toward the accelerating implosion of objective knowledge into merely personal perception, even when such perception is broadened historically.

Raymond C. Ortlund, Jr.
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

Holman Book of Biblical Charts, Maps, and Reconstructions. Edited by Marsha A. Ellis Smith *et al.* Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 1993, 176 pages, \$24.99.

Holman is coming out with an entire line of attractive Bible study helps (e.g. the *Holman Bible Dictionary* and the *Holman Bible Handbook*), and this volume is a worthy addition to the series (its index is even keyed to include the other helps in the series).

The volume contains five sections: "General Charts" (17 charts); "Old Testament Charts" (20); "New Testament Charts" (17); "Maps" (21); "Reconstructions" (21). All are clear and attractively done, in multiple colors.

The charts contain many expected topics (e.g. "Ancient Versions of the Biblical Text"; "Table of Weights and Measures") but also many distinctive topics (e.g. "Denominational Perspectives on Major Doctrines"; "Queens of the Old Testament"; "Doctrinal Emphases in the Letters of Paul"; "Ten Major Sermons in Acts"). The maps are predictable but well done.

The reconstructions include such items as the "Ark of the Covenant," "Eighth-century B.C. Hebrew Home," "Athens of the First Century," "Herod's Temple" and "Roman Siege Tower." This section of the book is the most visually compelling and incorporates illustrations found scattered throughout other reference sources.

The book is produced for individual Bible study and use in small groups. Its spiral binding and hard cover are designed to allow users to prop it upright and then consult their Bibles during their study.

This volume is a good, all-purpose starter work for laypeople. Coupled with the other Holman basic reference works it will be a very helpful tool for laypeople and pastors teaching them.

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

Luke. By Robert H. Stein. NAC 24. Nashville: Broadman, 1992, 642 pp., \$27.99.

A few years ago when I was teaching at a Christian college, one of my colleagues had put together a bibliography on NT commentaries that he would recommend. I noticed that no commentary on the gospel of Luke was listed. I recently told him that he should read Stein's *Luke*, for I was certain that he would be pleased to recommend it. Having read three other books by Stein already, I was well into *Luke* when I was asked to write this review.

At the outset the reader is treated to a forty-page introduction in which Stein considers questions of authorship, date, the Lukan audience, the place of origin, and Luke's sources. The latter is an extremely brief condensation of this issue from Stein's earlier work *The Synoptic Problem*. Stein is an advocate of the priority of Mark, and this is referred to on numerous occasions in the commentary proper. But he does so in a fashion that is quite helpful to the reader in understanding Luke's gospel. Although Stein gives a broad and rather late date for Luke (AD 70-90), he defends his position quite well. (I must admit, however, that I am still not convinced that Luke was written after AD 70.) But the most helpful sections of the introduction consider Luke's purposes (not, as Stein points out, one single purpose) and theological emphases in writing his gospel. References back to these two sections are found throughout the commentary, and this is one of the many useful features about the book. Also, it

is quite refreshing to find a commentary on one of the synoptic gospels whose overriding concern is "to seek to understand what the author of Luke 1:1–24:53 wanted to tell Theophilus" (p. 58). Stein knows that scholarly considerations such as redaction criticism have their place in the study of Luke, but "we must not pay attention simply to what is unique to Luke but to all that Luke sought to teach in his Gospel" (p. 60). In taking this approach Stein reminds us that it is the entire gospel of Luke under consideration, not Q, M, or even L. Throughout the commentary Stein proves himself an evangelical scholar with expertise in synoptic studies, and his scholarly approach to the text of Luke, the other gospels, and the Scriptures as a whole proves his exegetical skill and provides an abundance of insights.

The commentary proper is more than 560 pages long and has several valuable features in addition to Stein's comments on the NIV text. The gospel of Luke is divided into eight sections and more subsections. In each subsection the NIV text is given in boldfaced type, followed by "Context," "Comments" and "The Lukan Message." In "Context" Stein explains the literary context. In "Comments" Stein gives the exposition of Luke from the NIV text with appropriate references to the Greek text and other sources (e.g. LXX, QL). In "The Lukan Message" Stein explains the theological implications of the passage being considered, and he does so for Luke's original audience (Theophilus and others) and for the Church today. For my part, Stein is almost always right on target.

The only negative comment I would offer about Stein's work is that he occasionally takes the critical point of view too seriously. Space only allows for one example. In considering the "great Lukan omission," Stein mentions six interpretations that have been offered to explain why Luke's gospel contains no material found in Mark 6:45–8:26. The second explanation was that Luke lost his place as he followed Mark's gospel, and therefore the omission was an accident. While not favoring any of the six interpretations, Stein correctly comments that Luke 9:1–50 (which replaces the omission) is a cohesive unit involving the twelve disciples and answering Herod's question about Jesus' identity (Luke 9:9), but he rather weakly concludes that "this suggests that the great omission probably was more intentional than accidental" (p. 266). Probably? Surely one of the ways Luke wrote "an orderly account" (Luke 1:3) was to make sure he did not forget anything. As I see it, this viewpoint should have been dismissed out of hand.

But such causes of criticism are few and far between. This is an outstanding commentary. I can hardly imagine a seminary professor teaching a course on Luke or a pastor preparing to preach through Luke without this commentary in hand. The former should use it as a textbook. I must say "Amen" to D. Bock's comment as given on the inside cover jacket: "Robert Stein's *Luke* represents the rich fruit of a veteran evangelical scholar. His skill in discernment is evident on every page. Here is a valuable, user-friendly, theologically sensitive treatment of an often underappreciated Gospel."

Stephen W. Carlson
Baptist Sunday School Board, Nashville, TN

Hagar the Egyptian: The Lost Tradition of the Matriarchs. By Savina J. Teubal. San Francisco: Harper, 1990, xliv + 226 pp., \$19.95 paper.

In this work Teubal examines the figure of Hagar from a feminist perspective. She combines reconstructive scholarship of the Biblical accounts of Sarah and Hagar with

a detailed understanding of the cultural and historical milieu and background of the texts. Teubal studies Hagar's important role in the development of Hebrew culture and her role as mother of the Islamic nations. The author brings to light Hagar's power and influence as a matriarch as opposed to her supposed status as concubine.

The book attempts to peel away layers of patriarchal tradition and interpretation to discover the lost history of Biblical matriarchs. Teubal contends that Hagar was actually the companion of Sarah and participated in an ancient custom of surrogate motherhood. She purports that Hebrew women had the authority over their lineage and sanctioned their own matriarchal heritage. This matriarchal authority was eventually eroded by the establishment of patriarchal power.

Teubal's book is comprised of three sections, with ten chapters total, and 22 black-and-white illustrations and maps. In the first part the author addresses the interpretation of the Biblical texts that deal with the figure of Hagar, beginning with the Genesis 16 and Genesis 21 accounts. In chap. 3 particularly, she interprets Hagar's function and states that she was in fact a *šiphâ* ("handmaid," "maid-servant") of Abraham. Only later was she reduced to becoming an *ʿāmâ* ("concubine," "slave") of Abraham.

Teubal then contends that Hagar's function was to give birth to the son for Sarah in order to carry on her lineage (pp. 50–51). The author notes this is the case as well with the sons of supposed concubines like Bilhah and Zilpah. These sons are heirs of Rachel and Leah, not their own mothers (p. 54). Teubal concludes: "This implies that the women had children for each other and that the function of these women was childbearing for a mother, not concubinage for a master" (pp. 55–56). Teubal seeks to resurrect the lost tradition of women matriarchs and shed new light on Sarah and Hagar as women in their own right. She shows Sarah and Hagar's relationship not as one of hostility as traditionally interpreted but one of feminine bonding. This gives prestige to Sarah and Hagar as mothers of peoples.

In the second section the author reconstructs the Biblical material so as to obtain a clearer picture of the persons and events involved in the stories of Sarah and Hagar. In chap. 8, Teubal specifically studies the Gen 16:7–15 and 21:14–21 accounts. She connects Gen 16:7, 11–14 with 21:14–21 to reconstruct a new reading of these desert narratives. She postulates that in her reconstruction there appears not only the figure of Hagar but also a nameless figure whom she calls "the Desert Matriarch" (pp. 141–155). This other "Desert Matriarch's" story is thus intertwined and interwoven with Hagar's story.

The author's contention of the existence of "the Desert Matriarch's" text as distinct from Hagar's story (pp. 145–146) appears to be speculative. It is questionable how the author arrives at this particular distinction. She employs the documentary hypothesis at this point, which may be problematic for most evangelicals, for it questions the historicity of Biblical texts.

In Teubal's third section she discusses the meaning of the life of Hagar. The matriarchal history of Sarah as mother of the Hebrews and Hagar as mother of the descendants of the Arabic nations must not be obscured. Teubal points out woman's vital function as progenitor of peoples and nations. In chap. 10 she states: "Women controlled every aspect of the propagation of their tribal unit, including the sexual activities of their men. A bonding between the women and the *sh'fahoth*, their companions, facilitated this condition" (p. 193).

In terms of Biblical research, Teubal's thesis is questionable because she draws heavily upon Mesopotamian parallels, some of which cannot be sustained in contemporary Biblical research on the Genesis narratives. Some of the work is speculative, especially her reconstruction of the desert matriarch figure. The work is provocative

and demands a careful reading. Teubal causes the reader to reexamine the figure of Hagar and her meaning and impact in matriarchal history. From a feminist perspective she raises important issues concerning the contributions and interpretation of the figure of Hagar.

Teubal concludes her work: "There is no question that Hagar must be redeemed for Muslim as well as Jewish and Christian women" (p. 200). She challenges readers to see Hagar, mother of Arabic and Islamic nations, not with hostility but with the same respect as Sarah is given in Jewish and Christian circles. For Christians the new interpretation Teubal brings to the relationship between Sarah and Hagar is the most important contribution. Sarah bonded with Hagar for the purpose of lineage. Teubal shows that women made an important contribution to Judeo-Christian history.

JoAnn Ford Watson

Ashland Theological Seminary, Ashland, OH

Gospel Parallels: A Comparison of the Synoptic Gospels. 5th ed. Edited by Burton H. Throckmorton, Jr. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1992, xl + 212 pp., \$19.99.

The first four editions appeared between 1949 and 1979 and printed the RSV. The primary change in the fifth edition is that it employs the NRSV. All five include important variant readings in English translation along with the major textual witnesses supporting them and, in footnotes, parallels in noncanonical gospels and John. There is no attempt to harmonize the gospels. They are simply placed in parallel columns to facilitate comparison. Although it involves some duplication, this is done in such a manner that each gospel can be seen in its own order—a highly desirable feature. There is also a helpful introduction to textual criticism for those who have no knowledge of the subject. It is strange, however, that no mention is made of the fact that many contemporary scholars deny the legitimacy of the Caesarean type and a few that of the Western text. Furthermore λ and ϕ are no longer used to designate families 1 and 13 respectively.

A synopsis is an absolute necessity for studying synoptic relationships, and these relationships are best studied in a Greek synopsis. For the English reader, however, the book is an excellent tool. The only question is whether it is superior to its chief competitor, *Synopsis of the Four Gospels*, edited by K. Aland. The latter is inferior in having no parallels from noncanonical gospels, in presenting few variant readings and giving no evidence for them, and in the way in which it sets forth parallels that are out of the order of their gospel. It is superior in printing Johannine parallels beside the others instead of merely referring to them in a footnote, in using the more literal RSV text, and in costing half as much.

James A. Brooks

Bethel Theological Seminary, St. Paul, MN

Evangelism and Church Growth: A Practical Encyclopedia. Elmer F. Towns, general editor. Ventura: Regal, 1995, 427 pp., n.p.

Towns has provided church leadership with a remarkable compilation of how-to, what-for and where-at information about evangelism and church growth. The articles

are well written and practical. They range from single paragraphs to lengthy presentations. The A-to-Z contributions include pivotal personalities in past and present outreach as well as substantial content essays on such themes as discipleship, church planting and evangelism. I was a little surprised to see an article on stewardship campaigns included, but it is excellent.

The volume best represents the fundamentalist and evangelical family of American Christianity. There are occasional references to cross-cultural, mainline and other denominational leaders and efforts, but too few in my judgment. The brief article on J. R. Mott, thought by some to have been the greatest missionary since the apostle Paul, is inadequate. I regret that J. Edwin Orr was omitted. (His research was referred to in an article.) I also missed mention of E. G. Homrighausen whose *Choose Ye This Day* was a wake-up call to the Presbyterian Church of a half century ago.

Nevertheless this book is a worthy ecumenical presentation of varied ministries of evangelism and church growth.

Perhaps a future edition could index articles by content and not just by letter of the alphabet. This type of index would assist readers to find the subject of their interest more quickly.

Towns has compiled a most useful resource in helping us respond to the great commission. Buy and read the book. It is a practical mine of helpful information.

Clifford V. Anderson
Bethel Theological Seminary West, San Diego, CA

Why Humanae Vitae Was Right: A Reader. Edited by Janet E. Smith. San Francisco: Ignatius, 1993, 567 pp., n.p.

This collection of generally impressive essays is divided into seven parts. Smith includes in the first part contributions by P. Quay, D. von Hildebrand, Pope Paul VI, N. Joyce and G. Anscombe. They addressed the issues of contraception, conjugal love and chastity before the publication of *Humanae Vitae* in 1968. The second part is devoted to the views of Pope John Paul II on self-giving, responsible parenthood, personalism and a theology of the body, all as interpreted in essays by C. Burke, J. Finnis and the editor. A third part contains C. Caffarra's reflections on the sanctity of life and the moral consequences of trivializing life through rationalizations about utility and consensus. J. Kippley and the editor provide theological argument about covenant theology and the concept of "*Munus*" in *Humanae Vitae*, respectively, in the fourth part. Part 5 is given over to four specific issues that have been made problematic in the sequel to the encyclical: R. McNerny arguing about the principle of totality, R. Shaw about infallibility and the ordinary magisterium of the Church, W. May about conscience formation and the teaching of the Church, and H. Smith on the nature of contemporary "population problems." Natural family planning provides the focus for part 6, with J. Boyle and E. Wojcik delineating the philosophical difference between NFP and contraception, the editor writing about the moral use of NFP, and R. Lassater offering a personal testimony about sensible sex. The editor's two essays on *Humanae Vitae* twenty years later and on Pope Paul VI as prophet occupy the seventh part. An appendix containing Smith's translation of *Humanae Vitae* concludes the volume.

The editor has done an impressive job and provided a needed service in assembling and seeing through to publication this series of generally well-argued and often

powerful essays, a few of them previously unpublished. The volume richly rewards a close, thoughtful reading. The reader may well come away from the volume convinced that *Humanae Vitae* was right, that Pope Paul VI was a prophet, that most opposition to the encyclical has been misplaced, and that one is called as a Christian to the practice of greater conjugal virtues than those that flow from the grubby, vitiated principle one has worked out in a compromise with fear and egoism. All of us still alive who passed through the skeptic, antinomian and libertarian frontal assault on standards that goes by the name of “the 60s” have come to see, as Lassater notes, that “sincerity does not undo reality.”

Yet there are issues that one wishes were more adequately addressed. Two may be sketched out here. The first has to do with “overpopulation.” It can readily be argued that Malthus was basically right: In the absence of misery, vice or self-restraint there is a disharmony between the population growth of the human species and its means of subsistence. H. Smith does indeed tip his hat to Malthus toward the end of his essay, suggesting that he was right to warn us of impending population problems. But the present population problem is glossed over by somewhat illogical conclusions drawn from a division of the world into areas suffering from imminent overpopulation and others threatened by declining birthrates. Smith’s essay relies on an utterly uncritical view of the consequences of the “green revolution,” a soteriological view of the “Billings method,” a coopted insider’s view of the great Ponzi game played out between population growth and social security, an almost unbelievably utopian view of city life, and a Gilderian view of the Promethean possibilities of population growth. Apropos the last two points, Smith notes, for instance, that “human resources are the key to unlocking all resources” and that in the real world the burgeoning population is fashioning “the materials to build a dream. People flock to the cities because they sense this, and some experience it.” A telling last clause, that. Whose dream is Detroit? Brooklyn? Los Angeles? Rio de Janeiro? One suspects that “unlocking” is not precisely the proper verb here, and that “dream” is grossly misused. People “flock” (revealing verb) to the cities as often as not because they are driven off the land by the demands of capital-intensive agriculture, assisted by government policies and, at times, by natural disasters. Thus are peasants made paupers. We ride the tiger of technology and cannot let go. This is the stuff of which nightmares are made.

The ligature between population growth and the contraception-NFP issue is clear. Although not generally “consequentialists” in ethics, defenders of NFP (and opponents of contracepted conjugation) know that they must show that the world is not overpopulated and will not be if ethically licit means of family planning were followed. Hence the hoop-jumping and contortions of many articles arguing that overpopulation is not an issue. Yet one knows as one holds one’s infant son in one’s arms today that tomorrow he must go to fight the Chinese, or Japanese, or Brazilians over limited resources and limited futures. (Yes, it ever was so. But the stakes grow increasingly higher, the means increasingly lethal.) And in the meantime he will in all likelihood work at a job that will significantly constrict the repertoire of human functions of the human person, a job forced upon him by the increasing division of labor that population growth necessitates.

What has happened to the classical ideal of autonomy or to the Catholic social principle of subsidiarity?

The necessary restrictions of a review allow for only the briefest mention of the second issue. By what principle is it morally licit to treat the natural time of gestation as a “fact” that “bears no moral significance” while the specific periodicity of a woman’s cycle of fertility is “God given”? (The examples are from von Hildebrand’s essay.) Twelve years ago or so I asked J. Smith if it would be morally permissible to use

a drug, if such were to be developed, that limited a woman's fertility to a few days each year. She honestly replied, as is her wont, that she would have to think about that. Circumstances have prohibited us from continuing our conversations, but in the meantime we have been given Norplant—most notoriously used, at great expense to taxpayers, to “inoculate” sexually active young women at certain urban public schools (part of the dream that is being built, of course).

This reviewer must conclude that *Humanae Vitae* was basically right, that the world is overpopulated, and that an urban nightmare is being prepared for most of us. What then?

Fiat justitia, ruat coeli.

John Lyon
Bayfield, WI

Metaphysics and the Idea of God. By Wolfhart Pannenberg. Translated by Philip Clayton. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990, 170 pp., n.p.

According to Pannenberg, over the past two centuries the dominant philosophical viewpoint is that the age of metaphysics has come to an end. At the same time, although presupposing metaphysical foundations in their method, Protestant theologians have not reflected methodologically on the role of metaphysics in their theology. Pannenberg argues that theology and metaphysics have an inseparable relationship. He asserts: “More than anything else, theological discourse about God requires a relationship to metaphysical reflection if its claim to truth is to be valid. For talk of God is dependent on a concept of the world, which can be established only through metaphysical reflection. Christian theology must therefore wish for and welcome the fact that philosophy should begin, once again, to take its metaphysical tradition seriously as a task for contemporary thought. Unfortunately, theologians today rarely concede this dependence upon metaphysics. Nevertheless, the dependence is only too clear: a theological doctrine of God that lacks metaphysics as its discussion partner falls into either a kerygmatic subjectivism or a thoroughgoing demythologization—and frequently into both at the same time” (p. 6).

In these eight essays, Pannenberg presents both a defense of his thesis that there is a vital relationship between theology and metaphysics, and an insightful demonstration of the healthy convergence of the two. The book is also useful as an introduction to metaphysical reflection on God. Pannenberg begins each essay with contemporary metaphysical challenges to the idea of the Christian God and then engages in dialogue with two thousand years of philosophical reflections in order to defend the idea of God.

The book is divided into two parts. In the first, “The Idea of God,” five essays address “The End of Metaphysics and the Idea of God,” “The Problem of the Absolute,” “Self-Consciousness and Subjectivity,” “Being and Time,” and “Concept and Anticipation.” These essays form the body of the original published edition (*Metaphysik und Gottesgedanke*, 1988). Part 2, “Metaphysics and Theology,” contains three essays: “Atomism, Duration, Form: Difficulties with Process Philosophy,” “Theology and the Categories ‘Whole’ and ‘Part,’” and “Meaning, Religion, and the Question of God.”

This is a valuable work for several reasons. First, it serves as a helpful introduction to Pannenberg's idea of God, a complement to his other works, particularly *Systematic Theology*. Second, this volume is a clear and readable presentation of the

vital relationship between theology and metaphysics. His warnings about the dangers of attempting to separate the two certainly should be heeded. Third, Pannenberg has provided a brief yet constructive overview of the history of the correlation between theology and metaphysics. Fourth, his critique of process philosophy, specifically the philosophy of Whitehead, is extremely instructive and worthy of inclusion in introductory courses on theology and philosophy. Fifth, in the concluding essay, "Meaning, Religion, and the Question of God," Pannenberg addresses the difficulty theologians face in discussing meaning and truth in a contemporary context in which the possibility of a meaningful life is no longer taken for granted. He concludes that "the question of meaning, correctly understood, is inseparable from the question of truth" (p. 169). Finally, he notes: "The connection of the Old Testament concept of the divine Word with the Greek notion of *logos* means nothing less than that the context of meaning which encompasses the entire creation and its history up through the eschatological completion has been made manifest in Jesus Christ" (p. 170).

This book is a valuable addition to the corpus of Pannenberg's works available in English. It is recommended as an introduction to his thought and to all those who have an interest in the idea of God.

Glenn R. Kreider
Dallas Theological Seminary, Dallas, TX

Thomas Müntzer: Apocalyptic Mystic and Revolutionary. By Hans-Jürgen Goertz. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1993, 229 pp., n.p.

Goertz's biography of Thomas Müntzer is a welcome addition to the spate of Müntzeriana coming out of the 500th anniversary of his birth. Goertz attempts to discover the true Müntzer. Was he an apocalyptic mystic who drew his ideas from such medieval figures as Tauler or was he a revolutionary figure with primarily political motivations in mind? Goertz notes that Müntzer was often seen as a hero in the former East Germany because of his advocacy of the peasants' cause and the Marxist interpretation of his revolutionary spirit, while he was typically ignored in West Germany due to a lack of interest in such issues. Goertz also notes a tension in the relationship between Müntzer's theology and his social conscience. Goertz's desire is to resolve this tension by emphasizing the best of both in the context of Müntzer's own life.

Biographical work on figures such as Müntzer is extremely difficult given the fragmentary nature of the historical data. It is difficult to put together the details of his early career and education with any degree of accuracy. Only the years 1519–25 can properly be documented with his correspondence. In addition, Müntzer left behind relatively few written essays. He wrote only three major theological treatises and although he composed some shorter works, few copies are extant, showing the limited impact of his work during his lifetime.

Most of the recent literature has focused on Müntzer's theology and revolutionary spirit. Goertz rejects the Marxist view that Müntzer's most important goal was to bring about social transformation. He is also critical of traditional interpretations of some Lutherans, such as E. Gritsch, who view Müntzer as a misguided, religious fanatic. Goertz sees even the subtitle of Gritsch's book, "Reformer without a Church," as inaccurate, arguing that Müntzer always worked within the confines of the local church.

Goertz notes three elements of Müntzer's thought. First, he reflected the anti-clericalism characteristic of his era, a frame of mind that paved the way for Luther as

well. He expressed disdain at the clergy's lack of personal spiritual commitment and experience and he elevated the concept of the priesthood of all believers to the point that the elect layman became dominant over ecclesiastical and political structures. Second, Müntzer exhibited a mystical piety reminiscent of late-medieval mystics such as Tauler. Third, he combined this mysticism with an emphasis on apocalyptic imagery. He argued that the antichrist still rules the world, but soon the elect will conquer and rule. Here Müntzer was not afraid to use the sword in bringing about such a turn of events. He argued that any institution that diverted one from complete commitment to Christ should be abolished. Once such structures were overturned, the kingdom of God could be established on earth. In overturning both the ecclesiastical and secular orders, Müntzer was indeed a revolutionary and it is not surprising that the magisterial reformers joined with the Roman Catholic and political leaders in opposing him.

The combination of these three elements provided a powerful message that threatened to bring down not only the religious establishment, but the political order as well. Suffering was a key element for Müntzer, not coming as a result of faith as Luther would have it, but as a preparation for true faith. This emphasis on suffering was an essential element in Müntzer's ability to rouse the peasants to revolt in 1525.

Müntzer was a wayfarer who spent time in a number of cities such as Zwickau, Prague, Erfurt, Nordhausen, Halle, and Allstedt before being asked to leave or leaving on his own. At Allstedt, Müntzer emphasized that the liturgy should belong to the people rather than to the clergy alone. Consequently he became the father of the evangelical service that included hymn singing. He did not introduce adult baptism at Allstedt, but he did lend the idea significant support when he commented that baptism should lead to the inward reality of salvation and that the person being baptized should internalize the meaning of the sacrament. This, of course, would be impossible for an infant.

In addition, Müntzer elaborated on the concept of extra-biblical revelation, arguing that the Holy Spirit is of higher authority than Scripture and that dreams and visions can be comforting in times of pain and persecution. He did caution against an excessive reliance on such revelation, arguing that it should be the exception rather than the rule in order to prevent Satanic influences from gaining hold.

Goertz convincingly makes the case that Müntzer was both an apocalyptic mystic and a revolutionary. His account is well documented and brings fresh insights into the many recent discussions of the true nature of Müntzer's ministry. Müntzer's attempt to bring the kingdom of God to physical fruition on earth entailed rebellion against the prevailing authorities of his era and was doomed to failure. His anti-clericalism combined with apocalyptic mysticism aroused a significant following among the peasant classes, who suffered so severely in the Frankenhausen massacre.

Martin I. Klauber
Barat College, Lake Forest, IL

John Courtney Murray and the Dilemma of Religious Toleration. By Keith Pavlischek. Kirksville: Thomas Jefferson University, 1994, 260 pp., \$58.00/\$22.50.

The "dilemma" articulated by Pavlischek is a timely if unnoticed one: how can a non-relativist argue for religious liberty in an intellectual climate of "anti-foundationalism" (read post-modernism) in which truth claims have largely been relegated to matters of style, taste, or preference? His choice of examining J. C. Murray's

thought in trying to answer that question is a provocative one. As Pavlischek comments (p. 4), Murray's thoughts were so wide-ranging and attractive that both liberal and conservative Catholic theologians claim him as their own. Hence Murray's importance as a twentieth-century thinker transcends denominational lines. His works ought to be required reading for any Protestant wishing to enter the discussion over the emergence of any sort of public philosophy and its bearing on religious liberty.

Pavlischek frames the debate as between the "moral esperantists" and those advocating a *modus vivendi* approach to tolerating and defending religious liberty. The former are idealistic in their belief that religious liberty can and ought to be defended by a common "Archimedean point" of a universal "language" (Esperanto) of rationality that is independent of any group or self-interest. The esperantists are also guilty of relying on an outdated epistemology and of all too often distorting the amount of historical agreement on rationality (p. 17).

Those advocating the *modus vivendi* approach scoff at any such myth of universal rationality and base their defense on a lowest common denominator of rationality from people and groups forced to co-exist in a pluralistic society (pp. 9–10). However, Pavlischek points out that this group is criticized by its non-moral defense of religious liberty (falling into either simple pragmatism or utilitarianism), driving toward an unstable political order, and its too thin theory of the good: there is an undermining of true community.

Can Murray do any better? Pavlischek argues that Murray's own position is "seriously ambiguous" in its attempt at a *via media* (p. 8). Murray, of course, was working in complexities that do not fetter secular thinkers. Until quite recently, the Catholic Church considered itself the one true Church, and religious liberty was only required "given the current state of religious pluralism" (p. 175). For a long time, traditional Roman Catholic teaching stressed the community and fraternity of humanity, buttressed by God's one true ecclesiastical voice on earth. Religious unity and truth were primary; religious plurality and diversity were secondary. Despite Murray's recognition of the changing times, does he reverse those priorities? As Pavlischek points out, Murray himself weaves dangerously between moral Esperanto and the traditional *modus vivendi* approaches to defending religious liberty. In the end, however, lasting tensions within Murray's thought explain not only why both conservative and liberal Catholic thinkers claim him as their patron, but also why the problem of religious tolerance endures. Although no easy read, this book deserves a place in the literature of public philosophy.

Michael McKenzie
Northwest College, Kirkland, WA

The Person and Work of the Holy Spirit: The Holy Spirit Effects in Us What Christ Has Done for Us. By Donald T. Williams. Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 1994, 242 pp., \$17.99 paper.

Since the advent of the charismatic movement, it can no longer be said that the Holy Spirit is "the forgotten person of the Trinity." Unfortunately, much of the literature on the Holy Spirit has been either sensational or polemical; little systematic theology has been attempted. Consequently, the Church suffers from a myopic vision of the Holy Spirit that sees him mainly in relation to the controversial. Williams' book addresses the need of the contemporary evangelical church for an understanding of

the person and work of the Holy Spirit that is both theologically comprehensive and personally stimulating.

Drawing upon the Johannine teaching that the work of the Holy Spirit is to glorify Jesus, Williams' thesis is: "[The Holy Spirit] is the personal Agent and Representative of Jesus Christ who acts for Him to glorify His name by making Him real in our lives" (p. 2). He develops this by formulating the doctrine of the Holy Spirit with respect to most of the topics of systematic theology. In each case he attempts to show how the Holy Spirit's person and work relate to Jesus Christ. In the doctrine of the Trinity, the Spirit is both distinct from and equal to the Father and the Son, yet functionally subordinate to both. In the doctrine of inspiration, the Spirit is the means by which the Scriptures, which testify to Jesus Christ, are written. In the doctrine of salvation, the Spirit personally applies the objective benefits of Christ's redemption to believers. There is no new theological ground broken here. The uniqueness of Williams' work is his exposition of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit with respect to the topics of systematic theology and the clarity with which he draws out the relationship between the Holy Spirit and Christ.

Williams' soteriology is thoroughly Reformed. He emphasizes the doctrine of sanctification and highlights the use the Spirit makes of the means of grace (which he calls "means of growth") to cause it. He is appreciative, but not uncritical, of Wesley's contribution to our understanding of sanctification; Wesley asked the right questions but came up with inadequate answers. Although he repudiates cessationism, Williams severely criticizes the Pentecostal and charismatic movements on their understanding of Spirit baptism and tongues (unfortunately, his critique does not interact with any of their theologians).

Williams has written an excellent textbook for undergraduate or adult education classes on the Holy Spirit. The questions at the end of each chapter stimulate helpful review and reflection and model good theological method. Pastors can learn much from Williams' exposition about the wholesome but lost art of doctrinal preaching. Academic theologians will do well to ponder and articulate the relationship between the Holy Spirit and Jesus Christ as Williams has systematically done. His poetry might also motivate them to make their theology sing.

John Mackett
Elmbrook Christian Study Center, Brookfield, WI

Evangelicals and Catholics Together: Toward a Common Mission. Edited by Charles Colson and Richard John Neuhaus. Word: Dallas, 1995, n.p.

This symposium marks an effort by conveners of the March 29, 1994, statement "Evangelicals and Catholics Together: The Christian Mission in the Third Millennium" to move ahead "Toward a Common Mission" approximating "a common good" not dissimilar to that advanced a generation ago by J. Maritain and other Catholic scholars promotive of natural law.

The Catholic voices in addition to Neuhaus, one-time Missouri Synod Lutheran pastor later ordained a Jesuit, include G. Weigel and A. Dulles. Evangelical contributors besides Colson are M. Noll and J. I. Packer.

Colson stresses that many thousands consider the ECT statement a divine achievement, and views his 1992 book *The Body: Being Light in Darkness* as in some respects anticipatory of it. Critics complain the ECT committee was theologically

weighted by Catholic scholars and in fact was assisted anonymously in the drafting process by Dulles, while few technical theologians were engaged on the evangelical side. Future unofficial conversations are projected, which might leave the statement's final religious value unsure. ECT participants insisted that they spoke for themselves only, yet institutional identifications were attached and the impression almost inevitably given of extensive organizational enthusiasm. Because of this ambiguity some key Southern Baptist participants withdrew their signatures.

The statement was endorsed prior to release by a broad theological spectrum, including evangelicals Bill Bright, N. Hatch, R. Mouw, T. Oden, Packer, P. Robertson, J. Rogers and O. Guinness.

In the present volume Colson provides a stirring critique of contemporary society's rejection of Judeo-Christian assumptions. He reflects the shared dismay of signatories over prevalent cultural blasphemy and violence, sexual promiscuity, and abortion clinics employed as a means of population control. He calls for a united stand "on the common ground of Scripture and the ancient confessions" through a new ecumenism mindful of doctrinal differences.

ECT evoked criticism by some Reformed scholars, most notably R. C. Sproul in his volume *Faith Alone* (1995), which contends that ECT blurred the doctrine of divine justification by faith alone. Others contend that editorial ambiguity allows for divergent theological interpretations.

Still others contend that it is unclear whether ECT was intended to legitimate a merely political alliance or, as some hold, that such a separation of metaphysics and politics imposes an artificial restriction on human nature.

Packer's essay is less an effort to provide a normative interpretation than a justification of various stages at which he has divergently deplored and approved the document.

As emphasis accelerates on a "common mission" and a "common good" the issue of natural law is likely to gain attention. Contrary to the usual understanding, some evangelical Reformed scholars profess to find natural law in Calvin's *Institutes*, while Lutheran scholars oppose natural law in the interest of a creation-ethic.

There can be little doubt that Catholics and evangelicals affirm a distinctive theology that undergirds political positions. Their agreements and disagreements in this arena are likely to surface as practical public consequences of ECT are affirmed. No less important is the question of what warrants are to be adduced in promoting legislative positions in a pluralistic society—that is, whether an express appeal is to be made to special revelation or rather to prudential considerations only.

Carl F. H. Henry
Watertown, WI

Evangelism: A Concise History. By John Mark Terry. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1994, 210 pp., n.p.

Although many books on the history of missions have been written, "writers have produced surprisingly few books on the history of evangelism," writes John Mark Terry, Associate Professor of Missions and Evangelism at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. Terry writes his succinct history of evangelism with college and seminary students in mind.

This book briefly surveys evangelism from the life of Jesus to the twentieth century. Toward the end of his book, Terry devotes a significant amount of space to

revivalism, youth evangelism, personal evangelism, and media evangelism. Each chapter is divided into quite-readable sections, which cover (1) how evangelism was carried out in a particular era (e.g., itinerant evangelists in the early Church, large group conversions sparked by the conversion of a ruler in the Middle Ages, small-group evangelism during the Pietistic movement); (2) summary statements about why Christianity spread in that era; (3) "interpretation and application" regarding evangelism in these periods and how they relate to the Christian today; and (4) study questions to close off each chapter.

Although Terry's summaries about the distinctives of each age's evangelistic methods are quite informative, the first few chapters do not offer much more than a concise history of missions from the New Testament Church onward. (In fact, it would have been helpful for the author formally to differentiate between "evangelism" and "missions.")

I believe that the chapters at the end of the book are the most instructive in light of contemporary evangelistic methods and programs. During the 1800s, revival became the standard evangelistic method used by churches. An unfortunate side effect was that the one to two revival meetings each year seemed to become a substitute for everyday relational evangelism. Terry devotes significant space to the four key evangelists of the last two centuries—Finney, Moody, Sunday (whose reputation was somewhat checkered), and Graham. Regarding the efforts of Graham, Terry remarks that "crusade evangelism" has not been as effective at promoting church growth and reaching the unchurched as some might believe (p. 170). For example, sixty percent of those who respond at Graham's crusades are already church members, and a relatively small percentage of those who go forward end up joining a local church (p. 170).

"Youth evangelism," a relatively recent phenomenon in Church history, has primarily been a parachurch effort that has not had as close a linkage to local churches as perhaps it could. Writes Terry: "No doubt these organizations did much good, but they also left some with the impression that local churches were ineffective in evangelizing youth. It remains to be seen if the churches can recapture the initiative or if they will surrender responsibility to parachurch organizations" (p. 183).

"Media evangelism" is the last chapter. In my view the chapter on personal evangelism should have been last because this is where the Church's evangelistic emphasis should lie. Televangelists (and radio evangelists) are generally watched (and listened to) by church people, and their programs are generally ineffective at reaching non-Christians due to their lack of personal contact or interesting subject matter (p. 84). Impersonal evangelistic campaigns (like Campus Crusade's "Here's Life" program) bring very few people into the Church because they lack the context of caring, trusting relationships. Personal evangelism, in which believers take the time to build relationships in order credibly to communicate the gospel, is the kind of evangelism churches should promote. Because a very high proportion of Christians commit themselves to Christ through a believing friend or relative—people whom they have come to know and trust—experience itself should remind us of where our evangelistic priorities should lie.

In the latter chapters, Terry's book could have devoted more discussion to a non-North American evangelism. The book, however, does an adequate job of outlining some of the key figures, main events, and historical emphases in evangelism—not to mention making helpful recommendations about evangelism for our own day.

Paul Copan
First Presbyterian Church, Schenectady, NY

Life and Death After Hippocrates. By Nigel M. de S. Cameron. Wheaton: Crossway, 1991, 187 pp., \$11.95 paper.

Cameron is concerned with medicine's abandonment of the Hippocratic Oath and illustrates his concern by examining where the profession of medicine has been, where it is now, and where it might go. This by necessity leads into a discussion of the *purpose* of medicine and its long reliance on the Hippocratic tradition.

In an excellent historical section, Cameron drives home two points: (1) that the Hippocratic tradition began as a reforming movement in ancient Greece; and (2) that the western religions, especially Christianity, found the tradition especially amenable to its own tradition, and hence helped to form a new vision of medicine as "calling."

In the medicine of Greek antiquity, abortion, infanticide, and euthanasia were practiced with regularity. The physicians were not mere spectators in these experiences; they were willing participants. The birth of the Hippocratic tradition was a break with such practices. It introduced and codified the twin concepts of the physician as healer and the sanctity of all life, thereby expressly condemning both abortion and euthanasia.

Cameron utilizes the horrors of "Nazi medicine" as the paradigmatic example of what happens when doctors lose their moral compass, becoming mere technicians in the service of a political philosophy. Some of the more sobering aspects of this section are the fully-documented parallels that he draws between the doctors in Nazi Germany and current examples of fetal experimentation.

In a particularly devastating critique of the philosopher Peter Singer, Cameron demonstrates that, in Singer's thought, the ugly specter of "race-hygiene" has once again raised its ugly head (p. 122). This is ironic, because Singer has been quick to accuse those of us who place humanity—all of humanity regardless of I.Q. or other abilities—above the animal kingdom as being "speciesist," which is analogous to being racist. But Singer's insistence that certain characteristics must be present in the human being before he or she can be thought of as morally superior to other animals (i.e., that some human beings are more human than others), is virtually identical to the thought of such notables as Joseph Goebbels and Heinrich Himmler. As Cameron rightly points out, "The only objective basis for assigning moral status to other human beings lies in recognizing who they are," that is, members of the *human race* (p. 122). Consequently, Cameron is also right to label "Singerism" as the depths to which bioethical thought has sunk.

But what lies ahead for medicine? As the world becomes less friendly to an institutionalized Christianity, those beliefs and traditions that depended so much on a friendly "public square" will have an increasingly hard time of it. If much of the world (including doctors) has rejected the very word of God, why should they tremble at Hippocrates?

Nevertheless, Cameron is right to point out that the original reforming power of the Hippocratic tradition illustrates "the power of an idea" (p. 59). It remains to be seen, however, whether this higher calling of medicine can once again reform a tradition which—in so far as having a covenantal commitment both to healing and to the patient—is truly moribund. It is one thing for the Hippocratic tradition to have won out in the context of ancient Greek polytheism; it is entirely another to see if it can win in the sterile, cynical world of post-modern unbelief.

Whatever the future holds for the medical profession, I heartily recommend this book—both for personal reading and to give to one's personal physician. It is a provocative and necessary work for those at all concerned with health care issues today.

Michael McKenzie
Northwest College, Kirkland, WA

Creation and Time: A Biblical and Scientific Perspective on the Creation-Date Controversy. By Hugh Ross. Colorado Springs: Navpress, 1994, 187 pp., \$10.00 paper.

When one reads the following statements made by certain noted young-universe creationists, one is not surprised at the stereotypes formed by naturalistic scientists about "creationists": the "compelling Biblical . . . direct testimony from the Creator is the *only* way to *know* the age of the earth [which is less than 10,000 years old]"; those Christians who hold to an old-earth view knowledgeably—which is an assertion of man's authority over God's—should "abandon their compromise of Scripture"; "[young-earth] creationism *should be* made a requirement for Christian leadership." No wonder an atheist with whom I have been corresponding wrote to me in pejorative ignorance, "I prefer uncertainty [about the universe's origins] to the story in Genesis of creation in 4225 BC." The notion that young-universe creationism is the orthodox Christian position is unfortunate and misguided—and needs to be disabused.

Thankfully, H. Ross, astrophysicist and author of *The Creator and the Cosmos*, in his popular-level *Creation and Time* irenically marshals convincing theological and scientific evidence for an old universe. He attempts to show that the Christian can hold a position that is fair both to Scripture and to the findings of modern science.

He begins by citing Church fathers like Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Augustine, and Basil of Caesarea, who maintained that the "days" of Genesis 1 are different from a 24-hour day. He also rehearses the history of the unnecessary rift between Christian beliefs about the age of the universe and those of geologists and astrophysicists. For instance, Bishop Ussher's 4004-BC creation date was eventually viewed by Christians to be virtually divinely authoritative; when subsequent geological discoveries revealed a very old earth, they inevitably clashed with the entrenched "biblical" Ussherian date.

Ross makes a good case for long creation days (i.e., epochs) from the Genesis text: the word "day" (*yôm*) has an elastic usage in the Old Testament (e.g., Genesis 2:4; Hosea 6:2); the sixth day included far too much activity to reasonably fit into a 24-hour period of time (Adam's sinlessness, furthermore, does *not* imply that he could function with greater speed and intelligence when, say, naming animals any more than the incarnate Christ did in his work as a carpenter); Adam's exclamation "At last!" (Genesis 2:23) connotes an extensive wait for a suitable companion; the seventh day has no "morning" or "evening," indicating that it is an epoch extending to this day, which suggests that the other six days could also be epochs.

At times, however, Ross presses biblical language too far to support his point. For example, he calculates the number of stars as being 100 billion "as a minimum"—derived from the fact that Abraham's children would be as "countless" as the stars, which would indicate "tens of billions."

Young-universe creationists, beginning with Philip Gosse in 1857, frequently maintain that God created the universe with an "appearance of age" so that God, for example, created light beams to instantly appear on the earth. But such a view implies that God is a deceiver and that we cannot discover truth in God's creation. Ross correctly maintains that there is an integrity between the facts of nature and the facts of Scripture. He points to three primary indications of the universe's antiquity: (1) the rate of the universe's expansion, (2) stellar burning, and (3) the abundance of radioactive elements (which are produced by supernovae), all of which point to a universe that is 14–15 billion years old. The commonly-used responses by young-universe creationists—"astronomers are wrong about the distance of stars and galaxies" or "light may have traveled faster a few thousand years ago"—are weak and lacking in scientific support.

Perhaps one of the most helpful chapters is the tenth, "Is There Scientific Evidence for a Young Universe?" Ross contends that the plentiful arguments cited by young-universe adherents are essentially based on (1) faulty assumptions, (2) faulty data,

(3) misapplication of principles, laws, and equations, and (4) failure to consider the opposing evidence. He examines a number of them and finds them wanting. Let me cite two oft-used cases. First, H. Pettersson (in the 1950s) estimated that space dust on the moon would be 145 feet deep if the universe were billions of years old, basing this on the amount of space dust that settles on the earth every year. Subsequent refinements in measuring space dust have shown that this geophysicist's calculations were grossly inaccurate—to the difference of 14 million tons versus a more modest 23,000 tons per year. Second, the allegation that the sun burns by gravitational contraction and must thus be young is incorrect. By measuring the sun's characteristics—its effective temperature, luminosity, spectra, radius, mass, and out-flow of neutrinos—we know that the sun burns by nuclear fusion; so its radius remains fairly constant.

All in all, Ross' book is a fine, non-technical resource to pass on to those who have questions about the young-universe creationist position and its relationship to modern scientific discovery. What becomes clear as one reads this book is that a scientist will never become convinced of a young-universe position based strictly on the available scientific data. Ross asks, "Is it any wonder that individuals trained in the sciences, especially those with little or no Christian background, find it difficult to make their way into the churches?" Apart from the book's scientific and biblical support for an old universe, hopefully it will minimize the barriers for such scientists as well as gain a hearing and promote greater tolerance among the young-universe creationists.

Paul Copan

First Presbyterian Church, Schenectady, NY

Jonathan Edwards: An Annotated Bibliography, 1979–1993. Compiled by M. X. Lesser. Westport: Greenwood, 1994, 189 pp., \$65.00.

Lesser has accounted for virtually every published work concerning Edwards from 1979 to 1993, and all in less than 200 pages. Every relevant book, article, dissertation and festschrift has been annotated. Where appropriate, each entry is cross-referenced with any reprint. For example, an article printed in 1979 and reprinted in 1983 and included in a festschrift in 1993 is tracked by year, title and author via a very simple numbering system that follows that of his previous Edwards bibliography. This compilation is supplemented by a highly serviceable index that makes the entire database hum with life.

Festschriften have extensive article-by-article annotations. A classic example is entry 17, page 99: *Jonathan Edwards and the American Experience*, edited by Hatch and Stout. First there is a brief summary regarding the book's purpose and layout followed by fifteen single-paragraph annotations, one for each article and its contributor.

Doctoral dissertations are noted and receive the same brief but careful annotation given a work that has gone to press. If the dissertation makes it into print, Lesser's database tracks it. If you know the year it was penned and its author's name, flip to that year's section in the book and look for the name. Should you want to track the writer by name, consult the index. The index will track a writer's entire publishing history regarding Edwards within the specified fifteen years. Whether you track by year, by author, or serially, this volume allows you to trace any facet of any bit of recent Edwardsiana as easily as looking at your watch.

If all this leaves you unmoved, sit for an hour with Lesser's heartily written Introduction. Hear the grand tale of Edwards studies and struggles covering the last fifteen years. You will hear the arguments and counterarguments; you will sense the

joys of discovery and the burning desire for the knowledge that no true scholar can live without. You will get to know all of the players, even if only briefly. I must say, Lesser's work is a joy to read.

John M. Turner
Chicago, IL

Dietrich Bonhoeffer: A Spoke in the Wheel. By Renate Wind. Translated by John Bowden. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992, 182 pp., \$14.95. *The Cup of Wrath: The Story of Dietrich Bonhoeffer's Resistance to Hitler.* By Mary Glazener. Savannah: Frederic C. Beil, 1992, 447 pp., \$29.95.

Taken together, these two works give a faithful and stirring entrance into the life of Dietrich Bonhoeffer. As biography, Wind's work surveys Bonhoeffer's life as a whole. As historical fiction, Glazener's captures the intensity of his years in political resistance until his execution.

Renate Wind is a German pastor and teacher at the Bonhoeffer school in Weinheim, Germany. Her background may account for an outstanding strength in this biography: how the complexity of Bonhoeffer's personal development is revealed against the backdrop of Germany's cultural and historical circumstances during the Weimar Republic and National Socialism. One would expect that a small biography would lack such depth and nuance. Yet while handling the factual material efficiently, Wind laces it with insightful comments informed by her familiarity with German cultural, political, social and religious history. To this she adds her thorough knowledge of Bonhoeffer's life and thought as well as the most recent research among Bonhoeffer scholars.

A typical example of this sensitivity to the facts is the way she covers Bonhoeffer's family upbringing. The privileges and duties of traditional aristocracy had to be harmonized with Bonhoeffer's growing sense of solidarity with the victims of fascism. As Wind puts it: "Inner conflicts remained with him all his life. Dietrich continually tried to reconcile the two sides; readiness for sacrifice and a bent for the good life; voluntary renunciation and the enjoyment of life; a longing for death and an affirmation of life" (p. 17). Even his decision to study theology becomes clearer in terms of "his conflict with his family and particularly with his father. Dietrich had found a way of being something of his own, something special. But above all he was taking the first step in departing from his father's world" (p. 24). Tension, then, is the "riddle of his life," so much so that "Dietrich was never completely integrated; in search of his own standpoint, he wandered between two worlds" (p. 27). Wind does not consider this conflict a point of weakness, however, but as something that Bonhoeffer eventually was able to "make fruitful in his theology" (p. 36). This was possible because Bonhoeffer "linked the theology which he was developing to the discovery of his own identity and his personal questions about existence" (p. 37).

What was this identity that Bonhoeffer longed to find but also struggled against? In the end it revealed itself as being "a spoke in the wheel." Bonhoeffer had used this image as early as 1933 in a lecture to an unreceptive group of Berlin pastors. It pictured the last resort of the Church on behalf of victims of state injustice. Bonhoeffer lived to see the Church reject the responsibility of taking on that role, but he died in taking it on himself. In doing so he arrived at the identity that God had intended him to find. In doing so he arrived at peace.

Mary Glazener's novel is one of the best treatments of Bonhoeffer's life to date as historical fiction. Many years of research have gone into its writing, but more

importantly she has conferred with some of the key characters still living. Consulting them helps validate a biographical genre that is at one and the same time risky but potentially more penetrating of the inner truth of the life and events. These possibilities become acute when she ventures into Bonhoeffer's psychological struggles, romantic interests, or other events where concern for privacy limits the historical data with which to work. An example where she makes this venture is her reconstruction of Bonhoeffer's early romantic interest with a woman who was a serious theologian and partner in the Confessing Church struggle. Because of the uncertainty of the times the relationship was ended and her identity has never been well known. Glazener respects that wish by identifying the woman with one of only two pseudonyms in the novel. She does, however, go on to give far more detail about the relationship and its dissolution than previously attempted. Another example is Glazener's portrayal of Bonhoeffer's personal confession of sin and weakness to a few close friends like E. Bethge. This practice in theory had been initiated in the Finkenwalde preachers' seminary and is encouraged in Bonhoeffer's book *Living Together*, but without Glazener's creative retelling based on her skill at characterization we would have no way to imagine the substance of such an important turning point in the story.

With Bethge's definitive biography of Bonhoeffer currently out of print in English, these two works, which complement each other nicely by their different approaches, are a welcome addition. They not only offer an excellent introduction to those unfamiliar with the life of Bonhoeffer but also renew the sense of admiration among those who know the story well and have been challenged by it in the past.

Robert G. Umidi
Kitchell Memorial Presbyterian Church, East Hanover, NJ

Answers for Atheists, Agnostics, and Other Thoughtful Skeptics: Dialogs about Christian Faith and Life. By E. Calvin Beisner. Wheaton: Crossway, 1993, 191 pp., n.p. paper. *Miracles and the Modern Mind: A Defense of Biblical Miracles.* By Norman L. Geisler. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992, 163 pp., n.p. paper. *Faith and Reason from Plato to Plantinga: An Introduction to Reformed Epistemology.* By Dewey J. Hoitenga, Jr. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991, 263 pp., \$19.95 paper. *Testing Christianity's Truth Claims: Approaches to Christian Apologetics.* By Gordon R. Lewis. Lanham: University Press of America, 1990, 363 pp., n.p. paper.

Beisner presents a fine piece on apologetic evangelism. In the preface he mentions two temptations that he desires to avoid: (1) He does not want to simplify the objections of the skeptics; (2) he does not want to water down the demands of the gospel. He avoids both temptations. In chapters 1–3 he deals with questions concerning the existence of God. He confronts the questions of science and the problem of evil. Chapters 4–6 deal with the person of Christ, the historical evidences for the person of Jesus, his deity, the resurrection and Old Testament prophecies. In chapter 7 Beisner deals with the issue of Hell versus the love of God. Chapter 8 deals with the reliability of the Bible. Chapters 9–10 deal with conversion and growth in the faith. The author concludes with an appendix in which he recommends books on apologetics and the Christian life. The book is good for those who are non-believers as well as new believers who are seeking answers to the tough questions being presented to them by non-believers.

Geisler's volume is a revised and updated version of his *Miracles and Modern Thought* published in 1982. It serves as a fine introduction to the defining and defend-

ing of miracles in light of modern objections. In the first three chapters Geisler deals with the philosophical objections raised against miracles. Chapters 4–5 deal with the “scientific” objections to miracles. Chapters 6–7 confront those theories that present miracles as mythological or non-existent. In chapter 8 he deals with those who believe that miracles are unnecessary (or even possibly harmful). Chapters 9–11 deal with defining what biblically constitutes a miracle and what does not. Geisler details the difference between miracles and nature, magic, psychological healing and the demonic. In chapter 12 Geisler defends the reliability of the New Testament and its authors. He concludes with two appendices and a bibliography.

Hoitenga traces the rich heritage of Reformed epistemology from Abraham and Plato to Alvin Plantinga. The book is not intended to be an exhaustive treatment of Reformed thinkers. In chapter 1 he presents Plato’s theories of knowledge. In chapter 2 Hoitenga presents Abraham and Paul as paradigms of faith in God. Chapters 3–5 explore Augustine’s epistemological theme of “faith seeking understanding.” These chapters alone make this book tremendous. One gets to view the strands that Augustine intertwined in order to formulate his epistemology. Chapter 6 deals with Calvin’s epistemology. In chapter 7 the author presents Plantinga’s epistemology of “properly basic beliefs.” In chapter 8 Hoitenga deals with the issue of apologetics and Reformed epistemology. He concludes with a summary of the argument of the book. This volume is well written and well argued. I highly recommend it to philosophers and theologians alike.

In his book Lewis presents orthodox and evangelical apologists who have attempted to offer a systematic defense of Christianity. In approaching these authors he uses five criteria: (1) logical starting point (presuppositions), (2) common ground with non-Christians, (3) test for truth, (4) role of reasoning and (5) basis of faith in God, Christ and Scripture.

Chapter 1 deals with the role of apologetics within the Christian faith. Lewis confronts the arguments of those who object to the use of apologetics and refutes them. In chapters 2–6 he deals with the systems of J. Buswell, Jr., S. Hackett, G. Clark, C. Van Til and E. Barrett. He presents the strengths and weaknesses of these systems. Chapters 7–10 deal with the apologetic work of E. Carnell. Lewis’ analysis is clear, precise and insightful. One attains a clear picture of the multi-faceted system of Carnell. Carnell sought to present a unified apologetic by dealing with the issues of epistemology, ethics and psychology.

In an appendix Lewis briefly deals with apologists who, for one reason or another, never presented a system of apologetics. He deals with authors like C. S. Lewis, J. McDowell and F. Schaeffer. The book concludes with a glossary that explains the technical terms used in the book. This volume is a valuable introduction to the apologetic systems of the mid-twentieth century.

Jorge Crespo
West New York, NJ

Christian Theology: An Introduction. By Alister E. McGrath. Cambridge: Blackwell, 1994, 503 pp., \$59.95.

The title and introductory materials of this book are misleading. Both suggest that the work is a primer in theology. The preface even claims that the work is “comprehensive” in its task of introducing the neophyte into the theological discipline. Everything that the beginner needs to begin the study of theology is found here (p. xvii). Not so. At best, what McGrath has done is give a descriptive analysis of a

single branch of Christian theology: the history of Christian dogmatics. And it is not a “comprehensive” summary of the history of dogmatics.

The book is divided into three parts. The first is a rather scruffy and piecemeal survey of the history of dogmatics. Part 2 takes up prolegomenal and methodological concerns, and the third appears to be intended as an introduction to systematics.

Problems abound with McGrath’s project. Part 1 is a hidebound and formulaic treatment of historical theology. The history of Christian thought is broken down into four periods, and each is treated under standardized headings such as key terms, theologians and themes. Hardly “comprehensive”—but worse, pedagogically pedantic. Part 2 (“Sources and Methods”) is made up of short essays dealing with a number of prolegomenal issues. Some good stuff here, but it is as dry as toast to read, and nothing holds the individual parts together except the chapter titles. It is not merely a matter of a lack of style but a failure of organic approach or an overarching framework. Part 3 is really a replay of the historical section (part 1) forced through the grid of the classical theological loci. Again, it is piecemeal and devoid of vision. One of the most disconcerting aspects of the book is the unwarranted and tedious repetition created by McGrath’s wooden systematization of theology into three parts. Whole discussions from one section are simply replayed in later sections, sometimes almost verbatim. All in all, McGrath’s work is less than the sum of its parts.

The three parts could be construed respectively as historical, philosophical, and systematic theology, but as the third section is little more than an expansion of the first, historical theology seems to be what McGrath has in mind when he speaks of Christian theology.

What is most obviously lacking here is any concerted attention upon Scripture and Biblical theology. Telling the Christian story via its heritage of great thinkers is a worthy exercise, but the great theologians attend to the text. McGrath has not done as they did and do. He has merely reported their theological conclusions. Any project that calls itself Christian theology and lacks a clear and consistent focus upon Scripture is, in my estimation, less than honest packaging, for it is something other than theology.

This is not to say that a recounting of the doctrinal heritage of the Church is not a noble enterprise. Listening to the Church’s past struggles with its faith and with its detractors powerfully subverts all notions of theology as a static thing, as something that exists in Scripture simply awaiting our discovery. Such an exercise also disabuses us (or should disabuse us) of any objectivistic notions that human beings and their thoughts exist outside an historical matrix. Attending to our theological constructs and to the historical circumstances that give rise to our theologies forces us to admit that we too are historically and culturally conditioned.

A conversation with the wisdom of the ages is basic to and prior to a faithful contextualization of the gospel today, but Scripture is prior to tradition—no matter whether one understands tradition as either creed or ecclesiastical heritage—for tradition must always be ready to listen to the critique of Scripture. A Church that attends only to its historical heritage and thinks that that heritage is the sum total of its doctrinal concern will have nothing to guard itself against confessionalism (the absolutization of a particular community’s articulation of the gospel teaching.)

In claiming to be theologically comprehensive, McGrath leaves his readers with the sense that the study of the history of Christian thought is the study of theology and that that history is all there is to theology. Surely most people who have taken a battery of courses in theology have taken at least one course in which the focus was not historical theology. Aside from ignoring the vast and crucial fields of Biblical and systematic theology, presenting historical theology as the sum of theological concern further suggests that theology is locked up in the past.

I wish I could say that the work fails as a comprehensive treatment of the breadth of theological study but nevertheless serves well to introduce the student to the field of historical theology. But the book falls short here as well.

H. Berkhof, for example, believes that a purely descriptive approach to theology is grossly inadequate. One never moves beyond describing the beliefs of others. Berkhof insists that he as a Christian theologian must add his own belief, for only then is he involved in the theological enterprise. To do less is a failure of nerve. Writing in the very same volume (M. Bauman, *Roundtable: Conversations with European Theologians*), McGrath seems to agree. He also bemoans the arid, allegedly neutral, descriptive theology of the university. Positively, the theologian's role is one of profession. He is called to profess Christ. Critically, the theologian is called to call a lie a lie, to discern what is contrary to Christ and name it by its true name. In short, the theologian is an advocate for the gospel, an active participant in the Christian tradition.

Unfortunately, in the work before us McGrath settles for the descriptive approach that he seems to criticize the modern university for propagating. He consciously steers away from prescribing what the believers should believe and aims instead to explain what has been believed so that the reader can then make up his or her own mind (p. xv). I appreciate the concern. McGrath does not want to dictate to his reader. His purpose is rather to introduce the student to the theological discussion. Yet McGrath never does any theology here. He merely records the theologies of others. Our theology cannot merely repeat the content of the past. Considering the Biblical norm, the history of theological construction, and the present context, a responsible Christian theology is what we must say to our generation on the basis of God's revelation and its historical interpretation.

McGrath believes that he is enabling his readers to build their own theologies by providing them with historical examples that then operate as options for present theological construction. Under each major locus McGrath presents models, ways in which different thinkers have understood the Holy Spirit, or Christ, or what have you. While he does point out strengths and weaknesses of the models, the approach is still purely descriptive. There is precious little to recommend the theology of Calvin over that of Schleiermacher or, I should say, Calvin's understanding of the Trinity over that of Schleiermacher. McGrath's loci division has a way of carving a theologian's thought into discrete themes that can be placed alongside another person's statements on the same theme. This loci method is counterproductive for contextual and historical analysis. Three-fifths of the book is given over to this ahistorical methodology for studying historical theology. This is not to say that historical theology cannot be done thematically. It most certainly can. But the historian of theology must work very carefully when using such devices. Extra care must be given to historical context, relationships and influences—care that McGrath does not invest here.

The modeling approach also creates the idea that doing theology is like visiting a mall and purchasing whatever suits your fancy. The student is provided with a series of models under the doctrine of God, Trinity, person of Christ, soteriology, human nature, and so on, and he is invited to mix and match his designer theology any way he sees fit. To change the metaphor, theology is like putting together a giant puzzle. But nothing in McGrath's approach stops the reader from putting together pieces from very different puzzles, or even suggests that there might be any danger in such an approach. It is all a multiple-choice quiz in which every answer appears to be equally valid.

A colleague of mine is using *Christian Theology* as a textbook in an introductory historical theology course. While he admits that the modeling approach is weak and notes that the book is historiographically simplistic, he maintains that there is a clear strength in the book. Because the work has no clear sustained argument, it

functions as a resource that does not get in the way of the professor's lecture. In other words, students will read little that the professor will have to unteach them. From someone of Alister McGrath's reputation we should expect far more.

McGrath has developed a collection of lecture notes and descriptive introductions into theological themes. Unfortunately his readers will not be taught or shown how to think theologically.

Michael Williams
Dordt College, Sioux Center, IA

The New Genesis: Theology and the Genetic Revolution. By Ronald Cole-Turner. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1993, 127 pp., n.p.

We are in the midst of a Copernican revolution in biology. While it was once thought that human identity and destiny revolved around the nonmaterial soul, many today, including the author of *The New Genesis*, believe that the human genome is the center of an individual's universe. Cole-Turner, Associate Professor of Theology at Memphis Theological Seminary, has outlined this revolution in this brief, readable, and troubling book.

The New Genesis is not merely about genetics. It is "intended as a contribution to Christian theology's understanding of science and technology, especially in the areas of genetics and genetic engineering" (p. 12). Furthermore, Cole-Turner hopes this volume will assist Christian theology to be "more adequate to the challenge that scientists themselves are putting to it, namely, to help in steering the future of our technologically advanced civilization" (p. 12). Indeed, the book is very future-oriented. There is an undertone of triumphalism—genetic-evolutionary triumphalism—throughout its six chapters.

Chapter 1, "The Age of Genetic Engineering," is a brief survey of the development of genetics and genetic engineering from Mendel to the Human Genome Project (HGP). In 1989 the National Institutes of Health and the Department of Energy officially began a jointly-sponsored initiative, the HGP, with a goal of identifying and creating a physical map of the 3 billion base pairs of DNA that make up the genetic blueprint (the "genome") of a human being. The ultimate goal is the potential treatment and cure for more than 4,000 genetically linked disorders such as cystic fibrosis, Down's syndrome, Huntington's chorea, Alzheimer's disease, diabetes, and perhaps some forms of mental illness. Funded by U.S. tax dollars, the HGP is a 15-year, \$3 billion science project. For the first time in a major government-funded project, a percentage of the HGP budget (3–5% for the first five years) has been devoted to the examination of the ethical, legal, and social implications of genetic engineering.

In Chapter 2, Cole-Turner argues that the genetics revolution presents us with the possibility of "conscious, reflective intentionality" (p. 42) in our biological and technological evolution. Just as through agriculture "human moral choice acted on evolution by *altering the processes of selection*" (p. 42), so Cole-Turner believes genetic engineering will "contribute something new" (p. 50), even if very small, to human evolution. It needs to be said at this point that Cole-Turner's entire argument is built on an evolutionary hypothesis.

The aim of "conscious intentionality" is taken up in Chapter 3. Cole-Turner concludes that genetic engineering clearly will benefit some of humanity, perhaps cooperate with nature's progress and purposes, and should definitely be used "in the service of God" (pp. 60 ff.). Cole-Turner takes seriously questions concerning who shall

benefit and at what costs. There are many critical implications of manipulating human, animal, and plant genes that we simply cannot know at this point. Sadly, we may not know what we have done until after the fact. Cole-Turner concludes that "genetic engineering, when legitimated and limited by Christian faith, would be used primarily to serve the needs of the weak, the sick, and the poor" (p. 62).

After summarizing the views of six theologians (K. Rahner, P. Ramsey, R. Brungs, R. Shinn, J. Nelson, and H. Schwartz) and several ecumenical and denominational statements on genetics in Chapter 4, the author begins his own theological reflection in Chapter 5, where his work is most troubling. Space permits reference to three concerns.

First, Cole-Turner reinterprets the fall of humanity. He is willing to grant that nature, including human nature, is "good yet disordered" (p. 84), but is unwilling to acknowledge such disorder is a result of the sin in the garden of Eden. "The *explanation* of disorder as the result of a fall of angels and of the first human beings, however, is not needed by contemporary Christian theology or for our argument" (p. 82). "I want to argue that in addition to human sin, and even prior to human sin, creation is good yet disordered" (p. 86). Thus, for Cole-Turner, the disorder of nature and humanity is due to the incomplete process of evolution: "both the good and the disorder would be seen as the cumulative by-product of countless events in the evolutionary history of life on earth" (p. 89). Few readers of this *Journal* will be willing to accept that conclusion.

Second, Cole-Turner gives only grudging accommodation, if that, to the supernatural. Thus, not only does he challenge the miraculous nature of Jesus' healings as merely the view of Jesus' followers, but he refuses to grant the existence of a nonmaterial human soul. "There is no nongenetic or nonorganic soul, subsisting in an ethereal or spiritual substance" (p. 88). "The soul," he says, "subsists in the brain, and whatever way our genes have structured our brain, they have also given us the substratum of our soul" (p. 88).

The upshot of this view is a salvific individualism grounded in our unique genetic fingerprint. "Our inclinations to selfishness and sin are also uniquely our own. . . . Even more importantly, the Christian message of grace and salvation will need to be individually contoured" (p. 89).

Third, in keeping with his naturalistic and materialistic interpretation of human nature, Cole-Turner argues that humans, especially geneticists, participate with God in *Creatio continua*. Creation did not occur once; it is a continuing evolutionary process in which humans participate as co-creators. Through genetics, "God now has more ways to create, to redeem, and to bring the creation to fulfillment and harmony" (p. 108). At this point his genetic-evolutionary triumphalism is at its nadir: "We are in the midst of this creative and redemptive passage from creation in the beginning to the consummation of all things in the new creation. We ourselves are being created and redeemed, for we are destined to be part of the new creation God is making. But we are more than passive observers, for God has called us to participate in this creative and redemptive transformation of the creation" (p. 109). Together with God, "through billions of years of creation" (p. 109), we will usher in the new creation through technology, especially genetics.

Lastly, one of the bothersome aspects of the HGP and the funding of research on the ethical, legal, and social implications of genetic technology is the problem of conflict of interest. That is, it is highly unlikely, given how bureaucracy works, that the government would fund research critical of the HGP. Interestingly, Cole-Turner acknowledges at the beginning of the book that his views were developed "in conversations leading to a grant application made to the National Institutes of Health

Office for Human Genome Research" (p. 7). This is not to say that Cole-Turner necessarily sought the "deep pockets" of government grants and, so, developed an apology for the HGP. But it is to affirm that such a temptation is very real.

For these and other reasons, *The New Genesis* cannot be recommended to evangelicals as a particularly useful volume. We still await a volume that will adequately explore the theological implications of genetics for our brave new world.

C. Ben Mitchell

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

The Mormon Concept of God. By Francis J. Beckwith and Stephen E. Parrish. Lewiston: Mellen, 1991, 145 pp., n.p.

After describing classical theism and answering Mormon objections to the same, Beckwith and Parrish critically examine the Mormon concept of finite theism. They first show how the Mormon god is a corporeal being, limited in power and knowledge, and subject to change.

Holding to the doctrine of "eternal progression," Mormons believe there was a time when their god did not possess his present attributes. He has evolved to become the foremost being in the universe. Despite his elevated status, he is not omniscient, omnipotent, omnipresent or immutable. He is a created being who is ever-changing. Because there are worlds where he does not exist, he is not a logically necessary being.

Applying the laws of logic, the authors discuss some of the philosophical difficulties with the Mormon concept of God. For example, they show that the "eternal progression" doctrine points to a finite past. Yet Mormon theology is built upon the foundation of an infinite past. Such a contradiction in logic makes the doctrine of "eternal progression" incoherent.

Beckwith and Parrish analyze the Mormon philosophical argument that the design of the universe, which includes evil and suffering, more consistently supports finitism than classical theism. They show why such a position is based on faulty logic, and conclude that finitism is more akin to mythological polytheism than to reality.

The main reason Mormons embrace an illogical view of God is their unqualified belief that the writings of Joseph Smith are inspired. With such an irrational starting point, the theology of Mormonism is doomed to ongoing inconsistencies.

The concluding chapter shows how the biblical picture of God's nature accurately corresponds to classical theism and diametrically opposes Mormon finitism.

R. Alan Streett

Trinity Evangelical Church, Dallas, TX

Modern Christian Revivals. Edited by Edith L. Blumhofer and Randall Balmer. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois, 1993, xvi + 232 pp., \$39.95/\$14.95.

At first blush, the notion of academics applying political, sociological, and economic categories to examine Christian revivals, rather than employing Biblical or theological ones, seems oddly out of synch with the point of it all, rather like performing a chemical analysis on a "No Smoking" sign to determine its true meaning. But *Modern Christian Revivals* is not another devotional parenthesis like *Why Revival Tarries*; rather, for the most part, the book contains sophisticated, scholarly analyses of the varied phenomena of revivalism.

Most prominent in this collection of studies is an apologetic function aimed at combatting the prevailing academic myths of the “noble savage,” e.g., that Christian missions impose destructive moralism on free indigenous peoples living in peaceful harmony with their environment, as, for example, the case of the Native Americans and their pagan, environmentally correct, nature religion, a state idealized these days by academics and the media elite. With the possible exception of G. Rawlyk’s article, most essays in this volume are particularly adept at countering the Marxist variant of this myth, that religion is the “opiate of the masses,” impeding meaningful social progress: that evangelical Christianity typically preserves the repressive racial, social, and economic status quo. J. Boles’s outstanding study on revivalism in the American old South shows, *inter alia*, that evangelical revivalism was not protective of slavery as is often charged, but ameliorated its conditions. R. Carwardine argues that in the early decades of the 19th century revivals both in Britain and America served as “catalysts of progressive humanitarian and moral reform.” Similarly, E. Wilson notes that in Latin America social scientists are beginning to grasp that evangelicals have become “effective agents of social change.”

While the tone of these articles is positive, revival agents or movements do not escape criticism, however, as in studies of revivals in China by D. Bays, on modern media evangelists by D. Harrell, Jr., or G. Rawlyk’s “Marxian” critique of Canadian/North American revivals. Rawlyk argues that evangelical capitulation to consumerism and identification with the middle class culture has muted its prophetic voice. This latter critique may not deserve its radical-chic designation, “Marxian,” since all the quite legitimate criticisms Rawlyk makes have a New Testament grounding—ironically, the source for much Marxist doctrine.

While this volume covers the early Pentecostal movement in an interesting piece by E. Blumhofer, it is odd that easily the largest and, arguably, the most significant revival in Christian history is not treated directly in this book, *viz.*, the late 20th century Pentecostal/charismatic explosion, which is approaching a half *billion* adherents worldwide. Nevertheless, considering its focus, this work represents the most outstanding analysis of Christian revivals available. It should be the first choice text for upper-level undergraduate courses and graduate level programs in this subject area.

Jon Ruthven
Regent University School of Divinity, Virginia Beach, VA

God for Us: The Trinity & Christian Life. By Catherine Mowry LaCugna. San Francisco: Harper, 1993, 434 pp., \$18.00 paper.

The average Christian has often asked: “Why the Trinity? What has the teaching of a three-in-one God to do with ordinary Christian life?” Such a Christian might desire only a practical, workable answer, but LaCugna knows that every feasible, effective solution needs an ultimate theological foundation. This the Notre Dame theologian admirably provides in a book whose title truly describes its focus, content, and force: *God for Us*.

The first Christian theologians intuited that God had made himself available to the whole world in Jesus Christ. For the first Christians God meant God the Father, and for the sake of the economy of salvation—being reconciled to the Father—the subordinate roles of Son and Spirit were not scandalous or heretical. Still, the Church did not yet have a developed doctrine of the Trinity. That changed in the aftermath of

the Council of Nicaea, with its firm declaration of the Son's consubstantiality with the Father. Economic subordinationism was overcome at Nicaea, but in LaCugna's handling the price was too high, because the Trinity became increasingly detached from salvation history and went its own way as the most important of all theological curiosities, but a stranger to Christian devotion and ethics. The Cappadocian Fathers in the East and Augustine in the West started this process, and the Latin Thomas Aquinas and Greek Gregory Palamas refined it. Augustine's Trinity is a dynamism of love, but for LaCugna it is primarily an intradivine dynamism, not engaging the world sufficiently. Aquinas, as is well known, is guilty of esteeming the treatise on the one God (*De Deo Uno*) ahead of the treatise on the triune God (*De Deo Trino*).

This style of argumentation, if not especially new, manages to be compelling, largely owing to LaCugna's formulaic stating of the problem: *theologia* (God in himself) gradually overcomes and almost extinguishes *oikonomia* (God for us). Others have recognized this dilemma. Karl Rahner tried to solve it by postulating the equality of the immanent and the economic Trinity. LaCugna follows Rahner's lead but extends it. She wishes to abandon as misleading the designations economic and immanent Trinity (p. 223). *Theologia* and the immanent Trinity are nothing other than the great mystery of God's love for us displayed in the economy. Because we can know *theologia* only through *oikonomia*, salvation history is the proper emphasis of trinitarian theology, and not abstract metaphysics. In arguing thus, LaCugna is not emptying *theologia* of all content, but is rather refilling it with its proper Biblical, creedal, and ante-Nicene meaning. In her programmatic statement, "*theologia* is fully revealed and bestowed in *oikonomia*, and *oikonomia* truly expresses the ineffable mystery of *theologia*" (p. 221).

The only sort of universe that can sustain LaCugna's vision is one structured relationally, not substantively. Her ethics accordingly accent the personal, which means highlighting what promotes the personal while denouncing what destroys it. Hence feminist and liberationist perspectives are valuable for living life triunely. Salvation must lead to deification, although LaCugna is never very clear as to what this means. Theology must end in doxology. Ethics, salvation, and the praise of God form their own sort of triadic pattern, for "the doctrine of the Trinity is ultimately a practical doctrine with radical consequences for Christian life" (p. 377).

God for Us will be widely read, and deserves to be. It is that rare theology book with sophisticated reasoning and popular appeal. It is ecumenical (although LaCugna does not sufficiently appreciate Protestant trinitarians like Barth and Moltmann) and preachable. Some will be put off by LaCugna's redundancy and her consistent and contentious use of "Godself," and many will find LaCugna's brand of Christian ethics entirely too liberal. For promoting a relational metaphysics, some may think her a pantheist, and some may think her locating *theologia* in *oikonomia* negates rather than accentuates God's mystery. Some may think her too subjective, reducing the divine Trinity to a merely functional one of salvation history. The person of Jesus Christ cannot be reduced to the work of Jesus Christ, but LaCugna's Trinity seemingly collapses who God is into what God does. These charges all have greater or lesser validity, depending on who makes them and why. Yet every criticism must somehow find a better way of stating what *God for Us* does so often and with such passion, namely, that "God is unalterably oriented toward us in love" (p. 245).

Roderick T. Leupp
Asia-Pacific Nazarene Theological Seminary, Metro Manila, Philippines

The One, The Three and the Many. By Colin E. Gunton. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1993, xiv + 248 pp., n.p.

In the last few years, several books have appeared that present a critique of modernity or post-modernity. Gunton adds to that list, but he does so with a much different emphasis. This book is the written presentation of the 1992 Bampton Lectures. Its principal thrust is that only in a trinitarian model is there found the answer to "true transcendentals" and that those transcendentals are demonstrated through "being in relation" (p. 230).

Gunton has arranged the book in a chiasmic framework divided into two parts. Part One includes four chapters under the heading "The Displacement of God" and Part Two "Rethinking Createdness." The first four chapters present the problems that he will attempt to resolve in the reverse order of the second part of the book. These are: (1) the problem of the one and the many in modern life and thought; (2) the problem of the particular in modern life and thought; (3) the problem of relatedness in modern life and thought; and (4) the problem of meaning and truth in modern life and thought.

His purpose is to present trinitarian theology as the correct paradigm in answer to the trend toward a homogeneity of modern culture, a culture that speaks of pluralism but actually wraps itself in monistic garb. For this purpose, he draws on Samuel Taylor Coleridge's concept of *idea*, of which Coleridge believed the Trinity to be the most profound expression. Challenging the bold face of modernity, Gunton shows instead its paradoxes and, consequently, its failure. This failure results from disengagement, and Gunton attempts in the second part of the book to develop those ideas that will assist in reengagement, thus giving resolution to the four problems set forth earlier.

Gunton begins by developing the concept of the "one" and the "many" and uses the models of the philosophers Heraclitus and Parmenides, the former identified with plurality and motion and the second with the One. God, to Gunton, is both, and he has sharp criticism for Western theology, which emphasizes the Oneness of God to the denigration of the plurality. Gunton contends that the Western displacement of God was, in part, a protest "against bad theology" (p. 210), though he notes that "its displacement of the divine has been catastrophic in its effects." That is the problem of modern life. In tracing this concept, the reader is led through a forest of history's most influential philosophers and theologians, Gunton adroitly demonstrating both their positive contribution as well as the negative.

In the last chapter, Gunton brings to a sharp focus Coleridge's idea of the Trinity, positing that only the trinitarian concepts present the being of God in a way that will rebuild the disengagement of contemporary society. Two "open transcendentals" pave the way for this reengagement: (1) perichoresis, a unity of a plural rather than a unit; (2) substantiality, that "the many are truly many because everything is created by God to be what it is and not another thing." This leads to genuine *koinonia*, or the concept of shared, relational being.

Gunton's work is not easy reading, but it does stimulate thinking about modernity and post-modernity in a new paradigm. He calls for response to our Creator with full recognition of Father, Son and Holy Spirit. The record of these lectures is a valuable addition to the growing body of literature related to the dilemma of modern society, but it also presents clear theological thinking. The book includes both a complete bibliography and index.

Richard I. McNeely
Christus Collegium, Bozeman, MT

Systematic Theology (vol. 1). By Wolfhart Pannenberg. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991, 473 pp., \$39.99.

The Christian Church in the last quarter of the twentieth century is again seeing the publication of a number of systematic theologies. While a number of these are excellent works and worthy of attention, few are truly ground-breaking. The first volume of Wolfhart Pannenberg's projected three-volume *Systematische Theologie*, translated by Geoffrey Bromiley, is at the forefront of such works. After decades of rich and provocative theological-philosophical writing, Pannenberg has given the latter part of his career to synthesizing, clarifying and bringing systematic wholeness to his historical-eschatological theological program. But this volume is no mere rehash of what has already been said. Pannenberg is no mere Hegelian, as he is often characterized. Indeed he is often critical of Hegel's thought for falling short of the historical Christian theological position. He does make critical, careful use of Hegel, as well as Descartes, Schleiermacher, Athanasius, Luther and many others, but his desire is to demonstrate the truth of God, the God who is the God of history, the God revealed in the incarnate person of Jesus Christ, and ultimately in the eschatological consummation. Against all privatized faith of our day, Pannenberg is working to show the open and universal truth of God, which will clarify all life and knowledge in the world. He is preeminently concerned with knowledge of God as God has disclosed himself in history, which participates and anticipates the fullness of the end. Yet Pannenberg is vitally aware of and sensitive to the modern mind to which he brings both criticism and affirmation.

Through the introductory issues and the doctrine of God of this first volume, Pannenberg makes clear that God is the object of every area of theology and central to all of the usual theological topics. Pannenberg is very careful not to present a mere series of theological *loci* and call it a "system." He is saying that if the God witnessed to in the Scriptures is truly God, then God has and will demonstrate his deity and his lordship in history, above all in Jesus, the fullness of which will be self-demonstrated only in the eschaton. Pannenberg is concerned that the truth of God's historical self-demonstration in the religious history of Israel and in the person, work and words of Jesus Christ be presented in ways that overcome past theological shortcomings while adequately addressing and answering cogent philosophical criticisms of Christian theology. This concern is reflected consistently throughout Pannenberg's expression of the theological task, the concept of "God," the self-demonstration of God among the gods, the concept and nature of revelation, the trinitarian God, and the unity and attributes of God.

While Pannenberg's whole theological project promises to be one of the most significant, fruitful and insightful of this century, certain aspects of Pannenberg's thought in volume one stand out. Pannenberg's consistent emphasis upon the demonstrated truth of God, and hence the truth of Christian doctrine, is not only profound, but unique when compared to similar theological discussions, especially over the last two hundred years. His analysis of human religion and the gods, the nature of God's universality and lordship, and his relation to the religions is both instructive and provocative. But Pannenberg's analysis, discussion and presentation of the trinitarian God stands out above all other chapters. Importantly, like Thomas Torrance, Pannenberg follows more closely the Eastern tradition in beginning with the Trinity and then moving to the unity and attributes of God. God is understood in the light of the living, dynamic light of the trinitarian, self-disclosing God. The Western Church has erred and caused itself many woes by beginning with the oneness of God, trying then to make some coherent statement of Trinity and attributes. In light of the trin-

itarian God, the old problematic dichotomies are brought to clarity. Pannenberg's discussion of the relation of the three Persons and of the role of the Spirit both in relation to the trinitarian Persons and to the world is in many ways an advance in the Church's discussion and understanding.

Yet there are still concerns with this first volume, which hopefully will be answered more fully in volumes two and three. Pannenberg regularly seeks to unfold the biblical witness to crucial theological issues, yet some significant related biblical issues are largely avoided. For example, one needs to know by what authority Pannenberg says these things. This is not clear. How and why is the "biblical witness" useful, and how is it actually connected in some way to the self-demonstration of the truth and deity of God? 2 Timothy 3:16 is only mentioned in a negative context regarding Origen's viewpoint. Pannenberg's understanding of the demonstrated universality of God and of God's self-disclosure in the religions, however partial and fragmentary in comparison, to the history of Israel and to the life of Jesus, may leave many concerned—though one must see this in light of his larger theological purpose. The idea of the Infinite is said to be implicitly present in human religious history but only shown as the "true Infinite" in God's embracing of the finite in his reconciliation and redemption.

It may also be briefly mentioned that the (translated) sentences are sometimes unclear, or ideas are given in so succinct a way that the meaning is not immediately clear. Yet even here, if one presses on, the intent of the particular statement is soon clarified in relation to the larger discussion.

This work is must reading and shall be very useful for many years.

John D. Morrison
Liberty University, Lynchburg, VA

Telling Tales: Making Sense of Christian and Judaic Nonsense. By Jacob Neusner. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1993, 170 pp., n.p. paper.

Interfaith dialogue between Christians and Jews has been going on since the days of Jesus and his earliest followers. For over one hundred years dialogue between the faiths has been conducted by Americans in good faith, from both sides. Neusner, a committed Jew, maintains that while adherents of the two religions have been talking with each other, true dialogue has yet to take place. We have apparently been talking past each other without really communicating. Attempts to discuss common issues and to bridge the gap between Judaism and Christianity, while conducted with good intentions, have, in Neusner's words, been "clumsy and inexperienced." True dialogue, always difficult over the centuries, has been complicated in modern times by the Holocaust. What is urgently needed, Neusner asserts, is a change of attitude on the part of both religions; otherwise we will continue to have no substantial dialogue taking place, as has been the case since the inception of Christianity.

How do committed Jews and Christians begin truly to communicate with each other? Neusner argues that authentic mutual comprehension leading to deep consciousness of the other's perspective begins with two steps: "(1) making sense of the other in one's own framework, yet (2) making sense of the other so that the other will recognize that sense too" (p. 23). Past attempts at dialogue, he maintains, have been characterized by wrong-headed, distorted understandings of what the other faith believed or practiced. Only when the other side is depicted in terminology that is understandable to one's own faith first, but in ways that clearly capture the essence

of the other in words and concepts acceptable to followers of the other system, can true dialogue be possible. Neusner's effort in this book, part of an ongoing attempt through several related volumes, to foster understanding between Judaism and Christianity, centers on the ability of religious stories to bridge communication gaps. He suggests that if both sides want to move past "dual monologues" to true dialogue the place to start is with our stories. He models examples of storytelling and interpretation from both faiths and explains how this method fosters dialogue.

What will be the expected outcome of interfaith dialogue between Christians and Jews, according to Neusner? Mutual understanding will be the result, not persuasion of the truth of one religion or efforts to prove the falsity of the other. "Dialogue yields understanding; the condition of dialogue is autonomy, mutual and reciprocal respect" (p. 128).

What is the bottom line in this mutual dialogue? "Judaism cannot concede that Jesus Christ is what the Christians say, and any other judgment upon Jesus Christ is simply beside the point," writes Neusner. Conversely, he argues, "Christianity may concede that we retain our covenanted relationship with God, but it cannot then admit that converts to Judaism have taken the right route to salvation. So all that Christianity concedes is that Judaism is right for Jews, a concession to be sure, but of no vast consequence" (p. 105). Almost all Jews in modern times have conceded that Christianity is a viable road to truth for non-Jews. They want Christians to concede that Judaism is the system of salvation for Jews.

Storytelling and mutual respect for the other's beliefs, but never efforts to prove the doctrines or practices of the other to be wrong, is what Neusner seeks. In a concluding epilogue, he even broadens the discussion to include Muslims, who also believe in the One True God. Dismissing the naive relativism that says it does not matter what we believe just so we believe in something, he limits salvation to believers in the One God, whichever road they may be on.

While every effort should be made to understand the faith of Jews (and Muslims), and while it can be admitted that stories usually get at the deep mysteries that form the core of each religion better than do doctrinal formulations, Neusner's limited inclusiveness fails to deal with the exclusive nature of the Christian gospel as articulated by its founder, who clearly stated, "I am the way, the truth and the life; no one comes to the Father (the One God) except through me." The truth or falsity of this statement is of "vast consequence."

Daniel J. Eavearitt
Toccoa Falls College, Toccoa Falls, GA

Reformed Reader: A Sourcebook in Christian Theology. Volume I: Classical Beginnings 1519-1799. Edited by William Stacy Johnson and John H. Leith. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1993, 397 pp., \$30.00.

In this anthology editors Johnson and Leith have set themselves the goal of addressing our theological amnesia: "In a time such as ours, characterized by widespread ignorance of the historic Christian faith and by the lack of a common spiritual language or shared interpretive paradigm, one of the most urgent tasks faced by the church in the West is the recovery of a common Christian memory."

This collection succeeds in hitting its target, if it does not score a bull's eye. To be truly successful an anthology must reflect well that corpus of literature it is supposed to represent and attract attention to the original sources, whetting the reader's appetite for more. On the whole, the texts are well chosen, organized and presented. They do whet the reader's appetite for more.

Happily, the editors seem to have taken the work of Richard Muller to heart. They do not attempt to relate the whole of the Reformed tradition only to Calvin. In the headwaters of the Reformed tradition they count such often neglected but significant figures as Peter Martyr Vermigli and Wolfgang Musculus, showing appreciation for Reformed scholasticism. They acknowledge that Reformed theology was "not only catholic but also Protestant" (p. xxi) and that "Reformed theology also has a particular way in which it puts together justification by faith and sanctification" (p. xxiv). Their handling of Zwingli's doctrine of the Lord's Supper is unusually thoughtful (p. 313).

The editors have drawn attention to themselves by, for example, appearing to tone down the pre-Enlightenment doctrine of Scripture of the Westminster Confession of Faith. They acknowledge the confession's undeniably high view of Scripture but contend that it "sets forth no particular theory of how inspiration occurs or the precise meaning of the term 'infallibility.'" They suggest that the framers were deliberately vague, thus "inviting the allegiance of all those who hold a high view of scriptural authority" (pp. 27-28). This view seems to credit the divines with more prescience of later disputes than can reasonably be expected.

The editors also argue that no one has the authority to say who is and is not Reformed and that the "Reformers themselves rejected any one pattern of reform that would be normative, as well as any normative book of confessions." On this basis, they have included material by several challengers to Reformed orthodoxy, including Hugo Grotius, Pierre Bayle, Moises Amyraut and Jacob Arminius.

This is perhaps a semantic problem. Who is Reformed? In several instances, the editors quite fairly note that, for example, the challengers of Reformed orthodoxy broke sharply from the Reformed tradition at several key points. That tradition was codified in confessions. Thus if confessional and doctrinal conformity is a test of whether one is Reformed, then these challengers should be treated in a separate volume.

Neither has this anthology succeeded entirely in avoiding the danger of a history-of-ideas "fly-over," landing for a moment, and then jetting off to another time, place, and figure, for another quotation under the same locus. Though the editors explicitly reject this sort of methodology, they have, in fact, selected material from such a broad period (from the early Reformation to the early Enlightenment) that they are virtually forced into this mode. It would be profitable in future editions to add a biographical sketch of each contributor to help anchor the various theologians within their respective historical contexts. Perhaps this space presently devoted to hymns (which are widely available) could be replaced with biography and history.

The bibliographies are brief but usually judicious. Nevertheless, the bibliographies of Calvin's doctrine of Scripture and natural theology and the development of Reformed federalism are too brief. The volume is well bound and printed on acid-free paper. Among the minor errors which should be corrected, James L. Good (p. 30) should be James I. Good; Zanchi's Christian name is usually spelled Girolamo (pp. 78-79).

This is a useful, accessible introduction to the Reformed tradition. I share the wish that this work might stimulate readers to return *ad fontes*, to the "firsthand mastery of classical texts" (p. xvii).

Scott Clark
Wheaton College, Wheaton, IL

The Liberating Spirit: Toward an Hispanic American Pentecostal Social Ethic. By Eldin Villafañe. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993, 257 pp., \$14.99 paper.

In his introduction Villafañe informs us that his book has a precise audience, location, denomination and message: It is aimed at Hispanic American Pentecostals living in the northeastern part of the United States. The message is the development of a social ethic for that community.

In chapter one Villafañe expounds upon the cultural heritage of Hispanic Americans. He looks at three cultures that have influenced the Hispanic mind-set: the Spanish, Amerindian and African. Hispanics inherited particular traits from these cultures as well as traits that stemmed from the formation of this unity.

Chapter two is a brief history of the Hispanic community within the Roman Catholic Church, the Protestant Church and especially within the Pentecostal movement. The author takes a broad look at Hispanic spirituality and then focuses in on Pentecostal theology and spirituality, thereby revealing the deep religiosity of the Hispanic people. Religion is incorporated into every aspect of their existence. Chapter three continues to explore Pentecostal spirituality. Villafañe looks at Hispanic spirituality within its social context. One of his basic assumptions in this study is the "understanding of religion as grounded in the Ultimate (God) and thus not reduced to final psycho-social and/or cultural-economic explanations" (p. 133). But this does not exclude the fact that religion exists within a social context. Villafañe employs three socio-hermeneutical paradigms that stress the economic, communal and evangelistic elements of the Hispanic religious community.

Chapters one through three establish the groundwork for Villafañe's thesis. In chapter four he presents a "pneumatological" paradigm, for which he derives the framework from Scripture, theology and ethics.

Villafañe recognizes the emphasis that Hispanic Pentecostals place upon individualism. His book seeks to help them on their pilgrimage toward a holistic spirituality, holistic in that it encompasses social ethics as well as personal spirituality. Chapter five is the summation of the book. It defines and encourages a social ethic based on love and justice.

Villafañe's book confronts the ideas that oppose as well as those that encourage the development of an Hispanic American Pentecostal social ethic. It offers a vision to the Hispanic American Pentecostal community, a vision to expand their theology and spirituality so as to encompass the whole world. I recommend the book to those Hispanics who hold leadership positions.

Jorge Crespo
West New York, NJ

Yes, God of the Gentiles Too: The Missionary Message of the Old Testament. By David Filbeck. Wheaton: The Billy Graham Center, 1994, 228 pp., n.p. paper.

The subject matter covered by this volume certainly fills an enormous gap in the theological study of missions based on the OT. Except for a smattering of journal articles and an occasional thesis on some aspect of the OT in missiological studies, the field has been noticeably unoccupied in this century. If for no other reason, Filbeck is to be commended for raising our sensitivities to this vacuum.

While there are many extraordinarily helpful insights in this study, one or two recurring matters handicap the overall argumentation of Filbeck's main thesis in this work. For example, by drawing on his background in the structuralism of linguistics and social anthropology, Filbeck insists that "the whole [of the biblical text] actually adds up to more than what the individual parts suggest. That is, there is a meaning to the whole that is not apparent in its parts separately" (p. 10; see also p. 213). One wonders from whence this whole derives its authority, for if it is not to be found in the *graphē* (i.e. the writings) of the parts, where is it located? This weakens Filbeck's case seriously.

Another oddity is his explanation as to why the NT writers were able to derive missiological commands from what Filbeck regards as OT texts that "contain[ed] no such command[s]" (p. 17). Filbeck's solution is to posit two senses: the original sense which can be derived from *exegesis*; the real sense, however, is the modern sense and is obtainable from *hermeneutics* (p. 17). These two techniques represent two steps, but each delivers a separate sense/meaning: exegesis yields a historically intended meaning and hermeneutics renders a theological sense! Such a distinction ends up making the Bible a mere waxen nose that can be twisted wherever the reader wishes it to go.

According to Filbeck, William Carey saw the need for this distinction between exegesis and hermeneutics as he tried in 1792 to convince Christians that the Great Commission was addressed to that generation as well as to the early disciples (p. 32). But this distinction as applied to Matthew's text is incorrect. On the contrary, it was Carey's *exegesis* that carried the day as he defused his objectors' excuses from missionary service by observing that the Great Commission was addressed to more than those first disciples of Jesus, for it ended with "And lo I am with you always, even to the end of the world." The original twelve disciples would need to have lived much longer than most if they were the only ones who were commanded to go into all the world, for they would be aided in this endeavor until the end of the world/age!

Filbeck corrects an often overlooked point when he observes that the Great Commission is based on the OT's mandate for missions primarily announced in Gen 12:3 (p. 36). That has always been God's plan for the nations of the earth. But this happened not, as Filbeck incorrectly alleges, by having a supposed hermeneutical method triumph over an exegesis of these texts! Nor was the passive form of the verb "be blessed" in Gen 12:3 the result of hermeneutics (p. 63), while exegesis only yielded a reflexive meaning of the same verb ("bless themselves"). O. T. Allis' 1927 article in the *Princeton Theological Review* entitled "The Blessing of Abraham" contained such irrefutable linguistic and exegetical evidence for the passive rendering of the *Niphal* form of the Hebrew verb *brk* "to bless" that it has never been answered by anyone.

A number of OT passages are missing from this study that could have strengthened the case made here. For example, one would have expected an in-depth study of a number of Isaianic passages such as the "Servant of the Lord" texts, or the Servant's/Israel's mission to be a "light to the nations." Nevertheless, Filbeck has pioneered in an area where the Church must quickly act in order to get her bearings once again. Let the Church neglect any aspect of biblical truth (as she has done to the topic of missions in the OT) and that very area will either be the seedbed for tomorrow's heresy or in God's grace an area for a parachurch ministry.

Walter C. Kaiser, Jr.

Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, South Hamilton, MA

Hermeneutics as Theological Prolegomena: A Canonical Approach. By Charles J. Scalise. Studies in American Biblical Hermeneutics 8. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1994, xiv + 155 pp., \$16.99.

As one can surmise from the rather esoteric title of this book, the author has aimed at a theologically sophisticated reader. Scalise, who was an assistant professor of Church History at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville as well as the managing editor for *Review and Expositor*, has provided scholars with a challenging yet rewarding work. Of the eight titles released in Mercer's hermeneutics series thus far, only Scalise is writing from an evangelical viewpoint and it is a tribute to his scholarly acumen that his work has earned its way into this series. His training at Princeton, Yale and Oxford has prepared him well for dialoguing with nonevangelicals regarding both hermeneutics and theology, and it appears that this book, an outgrowth of his Ph.D. dissertation at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary on Childs' canonical hermeneutics (1987), is in fact addressing primarily those outside of evangelicalism. No doubt conservatives will contest particular aspects of the book, yet he has proven himself a worthy spokesman for evangelicals, demonstrating how a high view of Scripture can be combined with impressive knowledge of critical and postcritical, nonevangelical views.

He begins by discussing the crisis that exists in modern theology stemming from the plurality of views regarding revelation, observing that "the days when the historical-critical paradigm dominated the whole field of biblical scholarship are at an end" (p. 13). He proposes that "A carefully nuanced understanding of canonical hermeneutics can serve as the central theme of prolegomena to a postcritical evangelical theology" (p. 15), a modified implementation of Childs' canonical method. Drawing insights from a wide variety of sources (Wittgenstein, Gadamer, Ricoeur, *et al.*), he concludes that "[w]ithin evangelical theology canon may be understood as the norm for language games related to Christian forms of life" (p. 40).

He answers several chief criticisms of Childs' work. To the charge that canonical hermeneutics necessitates an open-ended canon, Scalise asserts that a distinction between the process of canon formation and the ongoing reflection upon the final forms is of critical importance (pp. 78–79). He reconnects postcritical interpretation to pre-critical, while rejecting the latter's allegorizing excesses, noting that "typology" was not an exegesis of the texts themselves, but rather an interpretation of the events" (p. 82). The fatal flaw of contemporary historical-criticism is "overidentification of Scripture and history," exemplified in the *Heilsgeschichte* school.

Scalise's work is valuable in viewing the text of Scripture as a unity, in legitimating insights gained from modern literary-critical hermeneutics, in maintaining the authority of Scripture and in providing a pattern for evangelicals to follow in dialoguing with those outside their camp.

Scalise's work will not be happily received by all evangelicals, however. His statement that "[f]or evangelical Christians in a postcritical era the authority of Scripture lies in its use, rather than in some foundationalist theory of its inspiration" (p. 94) does not accurately reflect a consensus opinion of those he claims to represent. Others will contest his view that "the theological meaning of the creation narratives of Genesis does not hinge upon debates over their historicity" (p. 97). Even those granting his argument *prima facie* may be concerned with its consequences. His position that "the canon has a 'firm core' and a rather 'blurred circumference'" is problematic (Which books are firm? Which are on the "circumference"? By what criteria does one distinguish? Is the canon fixed? etc.).

Granting, however, that his intended audience is not evangelicals, these positions may be the negotiating chips he is willing to risk in order to gain rapprochement with

and impact upon nonevangelicals. His book is certainly stimulating and provocative reading, regardless of whether one adopts all his views.

Ray Lubeck
Multnomah Bible College, Portland, OR

A History of Israelite Religion in the Old Testament Period. Vol. I: *From the Beginnings to the End of the Monarchy.* Vol. II: *From the Exile to the Maccabees.* By Rainer Albertz. Translated by John Bowden. OTL. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1992, xvi + 740 pp. (combined), n.p.

While OT theologies have rolled off the presses in a steady stream in the past fifty years, attempts at histories of Israelite religion have been relatively rare. Claiming that the value of past theological efforts has been diminished by Christian demands for systematic structures and the frustrating inability of OT theologians to agree on a "theological center," Albertz finds in the history of religion a "more meaningful comprehensive Old Testament discipline." In the present two-volume set he publishes the results of two decades of intensive labor, synthesizing insights contributed by exegetical, theological, historical, archaeological and sociological disciplines.

Following a brief introduction in which he surveys the field and sets forth seven postulates considered crucial for any history of Israelite religion (pp. 11–12), Albertz launches into his subject. The broad structure of the study derives from the four major phases in the evolution of Israelite religion recognized by the author: (1) the period before the state of Israel, (2) the era of the monarchy, (3) the exilic period, (4) the post-exilic period. Demonstrating the seriousness of his conviction that the exilic and post-exilic periods have not received adequate respect in past histories of Israelite religion (a problem attributed to anti-Judaistic Christian prejudices), Albertz devotes almost one half of his attention to these decisive periods. Readers are aided by lengthy bibliographies at the beginning of each major section, and copious content and reference notes at the back of each volume. The second volume concludes with a fifty-page, triple-column biblical reference index and a helpful subject index.

It is difficult to know where to begin commenting on a work as impressive as this. Both the thoroughness of Albertz' work and the perceptiveness of his analysis are astounding. Perhaps his most significant contribution to our understanding of the history of Israelite religion is found in his discussions of personal and family piety in each period. Since most of the textual evidence reflects the views of official religion, this is where past studies have concentrated their efforts. While evidence for personal religion is often meager, Albertz has synthesized the extant data to create images of vital personal religion in each phase.

Many readers of *JETS* will find some encouragement in the author's rediscovery of Moses. After being repressed by a century of critical scholarship, in this volume Moses reemerges, not as the founder of Israelite religion, but as "the indispensable mediator of the oracle of Yahweh," who sets in motion the process of liberation from Egypt of an exodus group. But the Moses recognized here is still nothing like the towering figure portrayed in the Pentateuch in its present form. One of the dominant threads in the tapestry of Israelite religion during the monarchy is the need to buttress royal ideology, specifically the Davidic right to rule. According to Albertz' revisionist reading of the texts, men like Absalom and Jeroboam are admired, and David becomes the problem. As noted above, for the author the exile represents the decisive period in the history of Israel's religion. This was the period when, absent from the land and without a king, the religious leaders were forced to reconstruct the faith of

the nation from the ground up. The fundamental issue in the post-exilic period was the problem of failed prophecies of salvation for the nation, which forced the new "eschatologizing" of previous pronouncements. Meanwhile the citizens of the new commonwealth in Jerusalem struggled to find a new identity. Albertz paints a depressing picture of religion in Judah as the OT draws to a close in the second century BC. The pressure of Hellenism has left the people spiritually and culturally fractured.

Albertz' work will undoubtedly become the standard work in the history of Israelite religion and will probably remain so for a long time. It represents the most thorough analysis of the subject available. His interpretation is often brilliant, his analysis clever. However, his entire structure depends upon a speculative reconstruction of the history of the biblical texts. Relying heavily on the work of E. Blum, he rejects much of classical source criticism, but his alternative is no more satisfactory. He still dates Deuteronomy to the Josianic era. His analysis of the theology of the book is extraordinary, but he seems unaware of the work of Thompson, Craigie, Kitchen and McConville on this book and on ancient treaties in general. Where classical documentarians had dated the JE sources in the ninth-eighth centuries BC, this material, identified generally as K^D, derives from the Persian period. The pre-priestly Pentateuch is credited to the council of elders or lay commission deriving from it, who were heavily influenced by Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomists (Eldad and Medad are presented as code names for this commission!). The priestly Pentateuch (K^P) represents a response by professional theologians to the lay theological Torah. The author's dating of the latter overlooks completely the linguistic evidence for the priority of P *vis-à-vis* Ezekiel, as established by Hurvitz and Rooker. In addition to his atomistic treatment of the biblical texts, many will recognize blatant selectivity in the use of evidence. Whereas the book of Judges is relied upon heavily to reconstruct the picture of religion in Israel prior to the monarchy, the book of Joshua is not taken seriously as an historical document.

This short review cannot do justice to a significant work like the present set, either in recognizing the remarkable positive contributions the author has made to our understanding of the history of Israelite religion or the significant difficulties which his method and conclusions pose for anyone who does not follow him in these. Whether one agrees with him or not, Albertz has established a new standard by which histories of the religion of Israel will be evaluated. At the same time the publication of these two volumes reinforces the desperate need for a history of Israelite religion of the same magnitude and thoroughness from a more conservative hermeneutical perspective.

Daniel I. Block
Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, KY

Introduction to Old Testament Theology. By John H. Sailhamer. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1995, 327 pp., \$19.99.

Old Testament theology has largely been defined as a historical discipline that seeks to describe Israel's faith as expressed in the OT Scriptures, begins Sailhamer, but it is increasingly clear that it intends to do much more. What that "more" consists of is still uncertain, but Sailhamer wants to clear up the ambiguity by making a new proposal.

How is this discipline, which has defied any agreed-upon definition, to be defined by Sailhamer? In this way: "Old Testament theology is the study and presentation of

what is revealed in the Old Testament" (p. 17). But how much of what is revealed should be included? And what sort of study is it? Is it a study that is purely descriptive or normative, or does it include elements of both? And if both, in what proportions? The definition does not specify at this point; however, the four options he introduces in the succeeding chapters begin to fill in the picture of a more complete definition.

In an attempt to sort out the various methodological assumptions that are used to *do* OT theology, Sailhamer borrows from the field of linguistics what is called *feature analysis* or *componential analysis*. To do this, he sets forth four options that will help address the question of method in OT theology: (1) What is the focus of OT theology? The *text* or *event* option. (2) Do we attempt to construct an OT theology on the basis of the text as we have it or shall we attempt to read the OT according to the form the documents may have had in an earlier stage? The *critical* or *canonical* option. (3) Do we approach the OT like we approach any other book or do we do so with a special hermeneutic and method of interpretation? The *descriptive* or *confessional* option. (4) How do we represent OT theology? In terms of its parts, i.e., *diachronically*, or viewing it as a whole, *synchronically*?

The value of feature or componential analysis, it is claimed, is that its approach is modular, allowing the treatment of the various elements of theology to be treated individually and interchanged in various combinations.

Sailhamer tackles the text or event option first by citing Hans Frei's classification of biblical scholars into three groups: (1) those who focus on the text of Scripture as the locus of meaning (the pre-critical); (2) those who focus on external historical events as the locus (the empirical); and (3) those who focus on ideas embodied in the text of Scripture (the idealistic). Sailhamer believes that modern evangelicalism holds virtually the same position as the pre-critical. But evangelicals have not always been consistent, argues Sailhamer, for they have sometimes treated the text as merely a means of getting at another locus—now wrongly called the *real* locus—the events in the history of Israel or the religious ideals that lie behind the text. It is this thesis, more than any other, that forms the heart of the distinctive contribution that Sailhamer makes to OT theology. It is distinctly this description of the pre-critical view of history and textuality that Sailhamer finds to be helpful and valuable in Hans Frei's work.

Of course, the term "history" can signify a record of past events or the actual events in the world itself. But it is precisely at this point, Sailhamer alleges, that many contemporary evangelical scholars confuse their categories. When their discussions of "revelation in history" use "history" so that it points not to the text of Scripture, but to the events themselves, the perspective has changed and God's revelation has been abandoned. For example, G. Vos is a classical example of such a mixture of text and event seen in many evangelical salvation-history approaches. Thus Vos speaks of a *biblical* theology already in the Garden of Eden. But, protests Sailhamer, how can this be? Does Vos think that Adam and Eve had a Bible? Vos has failed to make a distinction between God's special revelation in history, the human heart, and his revelation of his will in the inspired Scriptures. Vos' understanding of biblical theology includes any form of special revelation from the time before the Fall to the time of Christ (pp. 67–68). Just how nontextual Vos' definition of biblical theology could be is seen in his definition of the same: "[Biblical Theology is] the study of the actual self-disclosures of God in time and space which lie back of even the first committal to writing of any Biblical document, and which for a long time continued to run alongside of the inscription of revealed material." It is this blurring of distinctions that Sailhamer views as detrimental to the construction of an adequate biblical theology.

Ever since the time of Karl A. G. Keil's Latin treatise on historical interpretation and his 1810 textbook on hermeneutics, the hallmark of evangelical theology has

been the grammatico-historical interpretation of the biblical text. "Grammatico" approximated what we would understand by the term "literal" and "historical" referred to that sense which was demanded by a careful consideration of the time and circumstances in which the author wrote the words and concepts he used in order to replicate the writer's thought.

How has this played out in the last third of the twentieth century? There is no doubt that OT theology has had to put up with an over-historicized text and descriptive methodology for much of both this and the preceding centuries. The answer, of course, was not to relegate all historical questions about the events in the real world, whether alluded to in the text or not, to the disciplines of apologetics and OT introduction. But neither has Sailhamer suggested that all historical questions be leveraged to those two disciplines. Only the *res gestae* (i.e., things which happened in the real world which the narratives mentioned) alluded to by the writers of Scripture and which play no determinative part in the exegetical interpretation of the text should be referred to the disciplines of apologetics and introduction. Sailhamer agrees with Keil, and others before him, that the "historico" part of the "grammatico-historico" interpretation relates to the meaning of the "grammatico" part in its particular historical context. Sailhamer is clear that words and ideas have meaning only within particular historical situations and contexts.

Granting this agreement on our focus on the aspect of historical as it relates to the writer's use of words, there is still a good deal more to think about in Sailhamer's charges about the abuse that occurs when events in the text suddenly become the focus of attention to the neglect of the message and meaning that the author was trying to get across. I enthusiastically welcome Sailhamer's focus on the text and on what the author intended. Sailhamer rightly gives the text precedence over tradition, later so-called NT re-interpretations of the OT, so-called *sensus plenior* interpretations, NT types, and even "inter-textual" interpretations. This is most commendable and counter-cultural, especially in light of the sad drifting of current evangelical hermeneutical theory.

Is Sailhamer's approach, then, to be linked to somehow buying into a completely new literary paradigm? In a time when historical models are being replaced with the story model, one must be careful that we do not avoid one problem only to fall into the ditch on the other side of the road. Can events, as used by authors, be viewed solely from their locations as contributors to the literary scene? And do not events, as events, come with meanings attached to them, as W. Pannenberg argues?

Sailhamer once again steadfastly denies that his approach should in any way be identified with a literary paradigm. On the contrary, he is arguing against it. Instead, his view of "biblical realism" demands that the events recorded in Scripture be understood as real events—even to the point of asserting without qualification, for example, that when the text describes the Nile River as turning into "blood," it was nothing less than "blood"—not red algae or the like.

And what of the question of truth? Is the distinction between text and events in itself an admission that the historical meaning of an event in a biblical text is of a different order of truth from the meaning it might have in the real world? If so, would this not yield the case to pluralism and multiple meanings of the same events? If that is conceded, what would happen to the doctrine of *special* providence?

But again, Sailhamer's discussion of "biblical realism" comes down on the side that there is only one order of truth in the Bible. The events recorded are about real events in a real world. There can be no difference in meaning between what is recorded in the text and what is true in the real world. There is only one reality and one meaning of that reality, which biblical view of reality is indeed linked to "special providence."

The fact of the matter is that the search for the biblical author's meaning in the context in which he wrote is our first and primary goal. Listening patiently to the author of Scripture is not a separate, or distinctly different task, from the exegeting the meaning of that same event that appears in the real world, so long as the event is not abstracted from the written context as that event was employed and intended by the author in his own text.

The discipline of OT theology has been given a giant step forward in John Sailhamer's *Introduction to Old Testament Theology*. It is a pleasure to recommend it for students and scholars who wish to be informed as to where some of the leading thinking and work is being done in this field. This work should also drive another stake in the academic landscape that announces that evangelical scholarship does not always need to follow the leadership set by other scholarly traditions, but it can and will also be taking the vanguard position more and more as the emerging generation of biblical scholars continue to do research and to share their results with the wider publics of the academy and the Church.

Walter C. Kaiser, Jr.

Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, South Hamilton, MA

Faith, Tradition, and History: Old Testament Historiography in Its Near Eastern Context. Edited by A. R. Millard, James K. Hoffmeier, and David W. Baker. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1994, xiv + 354 pp., \$34.50.

D. I. Block points out in his essay in this volume that "the advances made in the study of Old Testament historiography in the past fifteen or twenty years have been breathtaking" (p. 229). As is so often the case in biblical scholarship, however, most of these advances have been made by scholars of nonevangelical traditions. Notable exceptions to this have been the recent works by K. L. Younger, Jr. (*Ancient Conquest Accounts: A Study in Ancient Near Eastern and Biblical History Writing* [JSOTSup 98; Sheffield: JSOT, 1990]) and especially V. Philips Long (*The Art of Biblical History* [Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994]), both of whom have contributed to the work under review. This collection of essays, along with these two books, largely redresses the lack of evangelical output in this area and, for the most part, does so in a competent, satisfying way.

It is impossible to present detailed reviews here of each of the eighteen essays, so the following comments of necessity are selective and somewhat arbitrary.

The contribution of E. Yamauchi, "The Current State of Old Testament Historiography," is somewhat disappointing in its overall strategy and organization. It is disjointed or *ad hoc*, lacking coherence and any clear sense of overarching objective. The result is a good deal of repetition, especially in the discussion of the conquest (pp. 14–21) and contemporary historiographical studies (pp. 21–25). On the other hand, Yamauchi provides a highly creative and helpful list of thirteen general observations about modern methods and their relevance to OT historiography (pp. 25–36), a list that provides entrée to the problem of text-based as opposed to non-literary historical documentation.

D. W. Baker, in his "Scribes as Transmitters of Tradition," provides a lucid and convincing case for the development of the scribe from a mere copier of texts to a shaper of the material that came to him. He may however over-press the analogies between scribes of the ancient Near East in general and those of the OT, particularly when he allows that the latter were prone to "airbrush" their portrayals of biblical figures or events to put them in a better light. Thus he explains the Chronicler's

portrayal of David, suggesting the scribe (author?) had his own political and ideological agenda (p. 75). One wonders what room is left for divine input in the process.

M. Chavalas ("Genealogical History as 'Charter': A Study of Old Babylonian Period Historiography and the Old Testament") presents in succinct but comprehensive form an outline of some major ancient Near Eastern "genealogies," but gives short shrift to the OT materials (two pages on the narratives of David's rise to kingship). His comment that "What is important is not the event or 'fact' mentioned in [a] text, but the narration itself" (p. 106) may lead to conclusions about biblical facticity that are not intended.

In one of the better articles, "The Weidner Chronicle and the Idea of History in Israel and Mesopotamia," B. T. Arnold, summarizing the ideologies of ancient Near Eastern historiography, correctly emphasizes the uniqueness of history writing in the OT (pp. 144–145). Where he discusses the view of Evans that 1 Kings 13 is a *vaticinium ex eventu* (p. 139), Arnold perhaps should have offered his response to this idea.

J. K. Hoffmeier ("The Structure of Joshua 1–11 and the Annals of Thutmose III") demonstrates strong parallels between these texts (p. 176) and is especially persuasive in drawing comparisons between early portions of the Deuteronomistic History and Late Bronze Age (as well as Neo-Assyrian) times.

J. H. Walton ("Joshua 10:12–15 and Mesopotamian Celestial Omen Texts") offers a fresh insight into the long-day episode but, in our opinion, still does not adequately account for this day being unlike any before or after it (Josh 10:14). His view that its uniqueness lay in the fact that God responded to the appeal of a man regarding celestial matters (pp. 182–183) does not take into account such an example as the "retarded sundial" of Hezekiah (2 Kgs 20:8–11).

In his "Judges 1 in Its Near Eastern Literary Context," K. L. Younger, Jr. argues for the historical authenticity of Judges 1 and its compatibility with Joshua 15–19 when properly understood. His analysis of the rhetoric of the passage is especially instructive.

One of the more creative contributions is that by D. I. Block on "Deborah among the Judges: The Perspective of the Hebrew Historian." Block "puts her in her place" in a positive and affirming way by suggesting Deborah's true role. One might quibble, incidentally, with his view that the *ʔēlohîm* witnessed by the witch of Endor was Samuel as "the *alter ego* of God" (p. 250). This ignores the common and more likely rendering of *ʔēlohîm* as "a mighty one" or the like.

The excellent essay by R. P. Gordon ("Who Made the Kingmaker? Reflections on Samuel and the Institution of the Monarchy") is a delight to read, not least because of his witty style. By way of a technical criticism, Gordon's observation that Hannah was chary of subjecting her son Samuel to the razor because of Samson's unhappy experience (p. 265) overlooks the fact that Samuel was born some years before that hair-raising episode of Samson took place.

V. P. Long ("How Did Saul Become King? Literary Reading and Historical Reconstruction") could have strengthened an already superb piece by entertaining the possibility that 1 Sam 10:8 (a text crucial to much of his argument) is grammatically conditional, thus further alleviating the narrative and historical tension Long has rightly pointed out (see already Keil and Delitzsch, *Samuel*, 101–103).

E. A. Martens concludes with an excellent study of "The Oscillating Fortunes of 'History' within Old Testament Theology." He makes the point over and over again that the two—history and theology alike—are crucial to any appropriate OT theology but that they must be held in proper tension and relationship.

Other chapters are A. R. Millard, "Story, History, and Theology"; R. E. Averbeck, "The Sumerian Historiographic Tradition and Its Implications for Genesis 1–11"; G. McMahon, "History and Legend in Early Hittite Historiography"; H. M. Wolf, "The

Historical Reliability of the Hittite Annals"; R. S. Hess, "Asking Historical Questions of Joshua 13–19: Recent Discussion Concerning the Date of the Boundary Lists"; and J. J. Niehaus, "The Warrior and His God: The Covenant Foundation of History and Historiography." In addition, R. P. Gordon contributed a second essay, "In Search of David: The David Tradition in Recent Study."

On the whole, *Faith, Tradition, and History* is an exemplary compilation, one to which this reviewer will regularly turn for insight and information. Eisenbrauns has produced a valuable and attractive volume.

Eugene H. Merrill
Dallas Theological Seminary, Dallas, TX

The Art of Biblical History. By V. Philips Long. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994, 247 pp., \$17.99 paper.

Evangelicals have characteristically championed the cause of the Bible's historicity—and rightly so—but at the same time have sadly given little or no attention to it as a work of history, that is, as literature recounting historical events. Where serious reflection on the matter has taken place it has tended to result either in the view that the sacred record is coextensive with history, i.e., the Bible *is* a history book; or the judgment that Scripture's message transcends history and/or relegates it to the periphery, i.e. the Bible is "only" a theology book. Some evangelicals more recently have become uncomfortable with this bifurcation and have attempted to find a *via media* that retains the Bible as a vehicle of both history and theology, one that articulates the timeless message of redemptive grace in particular historiographical form(s) that must be understood and appreciated if the saving message is itself to achieve its intended effect.

Of all such efforts, none has succeeded as admirably as this work by Long, an erudite and sophisticated analysis of the OT as history writing that will for years provide the point of departure for similar efforts. Unflinchingly committed to evangelical faith, Long at the same time is conversant with the wide-ranging thought and literature that provides a foil against and a platform upon which conservative scholars must do their work in these areas of contemporary interpretation. He writes in a lively and engaging style, peppering much of the profundity of his analyses and arguments with imagery and illustrations that immediately clarify the points in question. The book is a model of the art of making the complex easy, thanks to the literary garb in which it is clothed.

The author deals successively with the genres of the Bible (Is the Bible a history book?), history and fiction, history and truth, history and modern scholarship, history and hermeneutics, and with an extended example of an historical narrative: the rise of Saul to kingship. It is obvious from this list that all the major implications of the Bible/history relationship receive attention, if only briefly.

As for the Bible being a history book as that genre is generally defined, Long offers a yes-and-no answer. It is not history, he says, "if what is in view is the essential character of the Bible" (p. 57). But he is quick to add that "a historical impulse runs throughout the Bible" (p. 57), whether or not one chooses to accept its historical witness.

This leads to the question of history and fiction. That is, is it possible for history to be couched in fictitious terms? To this question Long gives qualified assent, provided both fiction and history be properly defined. By this he means, among other things, that history writing requires the historian not only to "reproduce the past"

but to contribute to the record his own point of view and his own aesthetic choices. The example he offers is that of the synoptic accounts of Samuel-Kings and Chronicles. Their differences do not vitiate their historicity or trustworthiness but reflect merely their respective creative interpretations. One could wish that a term other than “fiction” could be used to speak of this creativity, for despite Long’s best efforts “fiction” will continue to be viewed as something different from (or even contradictory to) “fact.”

Arguably the most important part of Long’s discussion is his response to the question “Is historicity important?” After reviewing briefly the arguments of some who suggest that the truth of the Bible can be divorced from its factuality, he focuses on the importance of history for Christian faith, a history consisting of events that actually happened. But he does not simplistically evade the difficult matter of determining what, indeed, did happen. He insists that any valid method—whether historical-critical, social-scientific, or literary—that properly appreciates the theological, historical, and literary impulses of the Bible can heuristically lead to a correct assessment of the Bible as a legitimate record of history.

The author’s lengthy illustration of an historical narrative—the rise of Saul to kingship—provides an excellent example of the integration of different (and some scholars say, conflicting) traditions in such a way as to yield coherence and good sense when viewed holistically. The lesson to be learned, among others, is that the Bible must be read on its own terms and not those of its readers. When this happens, it withstands the most rigid scrutiny as to its essential historicity.

It is a pleasure to be able to endorse this fine piece of work and to do so with a minimum of reservation. Long has placed us in his debt for having addressed the weighty issue of biblical truth and history and for having done so with devotion and integrity.

Eugene H. Merrill
Dallas Theological Seminary, Dallas, TX

Gender, Power, and Promise: The Subject of the Bible’s First Story. By Danna Nolan Fewell and David M. Gunn. Nashville: Abingdon, 1993, 208 pp., \$14.95 paper.

The title of Fewell’s and Gunn’s recent book says a lot. By “the Bible’s First Story,” Fewell and Gunn mean the lengthy, connected narrative stretching from Genesis to Kings—what others have referred to as the “Primary History.” By “Subject” they mean not the content *per se* but the dominating “subjectivity” of the narrative, i.e. that class of people—in this instance, Israelite adult males—who control the construction of the narrative and whose interests it is created to serve. By “Promise” they allude to the “story of promise,” as the story of Israel’s patriarchs and their descendants is sometimes called—a story they find anything but promising as regards the “Others” in the story (i.e. all who are not Israelite adult males: women, children, aliens). By “Gender” and “Power” they reveal the larger issues that drive their readings or, as they expressly put it, their “counter-readings” (see, e.g., p. 177).

What Fewell and Gunn offer, then, in *Gender, Power, and Promise* is a selective “reading against the grain” of some of the Bible’s most familiar stories. By focusing on the “Others” and subjecting the Bible’s male characters (including its “male” God) to “critical scrutiny” (p. 18), they come up with interpretations that are anything but familiar, as is their intent. For example, of the Bible’s first “Other” they write: “Though Eve’s behavior is condemned by God and berated by centuries of readers, she

emerges as a character with initiative and courage" (p. 38). Perhaps even more unusual is the authors' attempted rehabilitation of Queen Jezebel as a woman condemned in the Bible not so much because of her wickedness but because she was "a woman of strength . . . a woman acting independently of the king . . . a woman exercising power over the king" (p. 166). When Fewell and Gunn go on to liken the vilification of Jezebel in the Bible to the vilification of Hillary Rodham Clinton in our own time, one has to wonder whether Mrs. Clinton would be very much complimented.

Fewell and Gunn write with verve, which means that their interpretations are seldom if ever boring. But sometimes one feels that they get carried away by their own rhetoric, as when they describe the devouring of Jezebel's body and the drinking of Ahab's blood as "a different kind of eucharist" (p. 171). Christian readers are likely to find such analogies neither seemly nor compelling. One might also wish that prejudicial language such as "homophobia" and "conventional heterosexist interpretation" (e.g. pp. 15, 148–149) could have been avoided, but the authors forewarn their readers that they [the authors] find it "difficult to avoid anger and irreverence in the face of violence against women which permeates these texts" (p. 19).

Whatever criticism may be made of *Gender, Power, and Promise*, Fewell and Gunn are to be commended on at least two grounds. The first is the candor with which they state their own position as ideological readers: "The primary concern we [Fewell and Gunn] bring as contemporary readers of this ancient story is a commitment to see a radical reformation in gender relations in our own society" (p. 13). Thus motivated by an agenda external to the pages of the texts they interpret (at least in terms of how they envisage the desired reformation), the authors feel free (1) to by-pass the "ostensible topic" of the texts, (2) to defy the "apparent disposition of text" (p. 18), (3) to dismiss the intended meanings of the "patriarchal narrator" and (4) to counter-read so as to discover "meanings perhaps precisely not intended, and precisely, therefore, of particular interest." But why should "precisely not intended" meanings be of interest? Because, according to the authors, "they represent for our time, for women and men struggling to reconceive our relationships in equity, the liberating meaning of scripture" (p. 177). The ease with which the authors equate the "liberating meaning of scripture" with precisely that which Scripture does not intend is indicative of their commitment to a deconstructionist hermeneutic (see e.g. p. 16) and a relativist worldview.

Fewell's and Gunn's commitment to counter-readings finds expression not only in their literary interpretation but also in their occasional theological pronouncements. For instance, citing the constant refrain in Genesis 1, "And God saw that it was good," Fewell and Gunn conclude that "this creator God is plainly not, as Christian theology would have it, omniscient" (p. 24). And it is not only God's *omniscience*, among his putative attributes, that is subjected to revision or rebuttal. Also tossed aside are his *holiness* and *integrity* ("the serpent 'symbolizes a side of God [the tempter; good and evil] he refuses to recognize'" [p. 30, citing Francis Landy]); his *sovereignty* ("God, too, bears responsibility [for what is classically referred to as the Fall] and God is not capable of fixing up the mess" [p. 38]); his *goodness* ("YHWH's action is deeply compromised. . . . Where YHWH, the judge of all the earth, might fit on the grid of innocent and evil is no less problematic a question than it is in respect to Abraham the family sacrificer" [p. 67]); and even *monotheism* itself ("Monotheism becomes the ultimate symbolic expression of and justification for men's control of women, women's bodies, and especially women's sexuality" [p. 169]). As curious as are their literary counter-readings, Fewell and Gunn's cavalier theological revisions are breath-taking!

Even apparently woman-friendly texts such as Deut 24:5 are subjected to a cynical reading (if I understand Fewell and Gunn correctly). The verse states that a

newly married man should be free of military duty “for one year to pleasure [*sic*] his wife whom he has taken.” According to Fewell’s and Gunn’s construal, “Deut 24:5 recognizes that one way of controlling a woman’s sexuality is to keep her sexually satisfied” (p. 105). But is the reason that a loving husband might wish to please his wife (sexually or otherwise) really nothing more than a desire to control her?

In other instances as well, the authors’ ideological commitments lead them to strained readings. Referring to the woman raped by the mob in Judges 19, the authors comment: “Abandoned by her father, betrayed by her husband, raped and tortured by a mob, the woman is trapped in a world of men” (p. 134). This suggests that men, pure and simple, are the problem. But if one takes the context into consideration, the point is not the gender of the perpetrators *per se*, but the godless, anarchic character of the time period. Two pages after the above comment, the authors admit as much when they acknowledge “that ‘in those days there was no king in Israel’—not even YHWH was sovereign—‘and all the people did what was right in their own eyes’” (p. 136), but this comes only after their ideological agenda has been served.

As regards ideological commitments, it would, of course, be disingenuous or simply naive to deny that all interpreters are influenced by them. But this raises at least two questions: (1) what is the source of these commitments? and (2) what or who has the power to correct them? Is Scripture viewed as the corrective authority of ideology, or are the interests of some segment of contemporary culture determinative? These are the kinds of questions that the discriminating reader of *Gender, Power, and Promise* will need to ask. While many will not wish to share Fewell’s and Gunn’s ideological commitments to radical feminism and deconstructionist criticism, the authors must at least be given credit for their candor.

But I said that Fewell and Gunn are to be commended on at least two grounds. In addition to their candor, they are to be commended for the clarity with which they see and describe the real issues at stake in the feminist challenge to traditional biblical faith. They recognize, for example, that “we can tinker with official translations, turn patently androcentric language into inclusive language as the NRSV does, yet be doing no more than masking the extent of the problem” (p. 19). They understand that feminism does not only challenge the OT, but the New as well, for “the New Testament is rife with the fruits of patriarchy no less than Genesis-Kings” (p. 20). In short, they rightly acknowledge that “the problems feminist criticism raises for traditional notions of revelation and biblical authority are immense.” And, though they remark, “we do not know where our own reading takes us” (p. 20), they seem clear enough as to how it affects their view of the Bible and the God depicted in its pages.

Viewing the latter as “a key manifestation of the male Subject,” they suggest that to worship *that* God would be idolatrous: “The notion that the figure of God in the biblical text is actually God who is worshipped by Jewish and Christian believers seems to us to be, ironically, a form of idolatry such as biblical voices constantly warn against. Why a visual image should be qualitatively worse than a verbal one is not immediately apparent, though no doubt an erudite case can be made in support of crucial difference” (pp. 18–19). No doubt, indeed, and one wonders where, if not in the pages of Scripture, the God of Jewish and Christian believers is to be found?

As for the Bible, Fewell and Gunn ask simply, “Do we really want our children to read this story? We wish at this point that we could more confidently answer, Yes. Of one thing we are very sure: we need to teach our daughters and sons to read the Bible differently” (p. 20).

Do I, as a reviewer, really want others to read *Gender, Power, and Promise*? I wish that I could more confidently answer, Yes. Of one thing I am sure: for those whose feminist leanings have perhaps gradually caused them to begin reading the Bible

differently, it may be a salutary experience to read such thoroughly different readings as Fewell and Gunn offer, and to ask themselves if this is the path they wish to follow.

V. Philips Long
Covenant Theological Seminary, St. Louis, MO

Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible. By Emanuel Tov. Minneapolis: Augsburg/Fortress, 1992, xl + 456 pp., \$40.00.

At last English readers have access to Tov's masterful treatment of textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible. His earlier Hebrew work was published in 1989, but this English edition represents a revised and updated version of that earlier work. Readers will find Tov's book to be very well written and well organized. They will greatly benefit from the lucid text, the more than 40 charts, the numerous discussions of text-critical examples, and especially the good selection of photographs of ancient manuscripts and editions included at the end of the volume.

Chapter 1 ("Introduction") begins by describing in very clear terms the need for textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible. It is necessary, according to Tov, because of the many differences that exist between various ancient manuscripts and even modern printed editions. It is also required because many of these "differences" have arisen because ancient texts were "corrupted" as they were copied. Tov further asserts that textual criticism is needed because of the differences that exist between parallel texts within the masoretic tradition. While I agree with Tov's assessment in general, I would like to have seen a more nuanced treatment of the phenomenon of parallel texts. While some of the differences between parallel texts may be "text-critically" originated, others may represent authorial or editorial differences, not simply variant readings. Tov also discusses in chapter 1 the impact of the Qumran discoveries on textual criticism. "In our opinion," he writes, "the new discoveries have not only added new data which are of major importance, but have also necessitated a new approach to the texts that were known before 1947" (p. 15). The section on "Definitions and Concepts" (Section D) is an excellent feature of Tov's introduction. It is much more developed than a typical glossary, and its position in the introduction is invaluable to the reader.

Chapter 2 ("Textual Witnesses of the Bible") is the most extensive of the book. It is divided into two main parts and deals with the Hebrew Witnesses and the Ancient Translations. It is here, in my opinion, that the book's greatest strengths lie. Tov's discussion of the Qumran biblical scrolls is superb and represents an advance over any earlier treatments of the material. Previous discussions had focused on three groups (families) of Qumran biblical scrolls, but Tov presents evidence for five groups that is based on his own personal involvement with the Qumran documents. These five groups include proto-Masoretic texts, pre-Samaritan texts (note not *proto*-Samaritan, as in other discussions), texts close to the presumed source of the Septuagint, Qumran Practice texts, and non-aligned texts. A second major strength of Tov's treatment in chapter 2 is the attention given to the use of ancient translations in the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible. Here the reader will find the kind of material that the author developed in an earlier work, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*. Tov's development of the topic is essential for anyone who would use the Septuagint as a tool in the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible.

Chapter 3 ("The History of the Biblical Text") could perhaps be more appropriately titled "The History of the Study of the Textual Witnesses." In the first section Tov deals

with the way scholars have viewed the relation between the textual witnesses. In the light of the Qumran finds he rejects the use of the terms "recension" and "text-type." He prefers to speak of "texts" and, as developed in chapter 2, the five "groups" of texts that are in evidence in the Qumran biblical scrolls. In section two, "The Original Shape of the Biblical Text," Tov focuses on the work of de Lagarde and Kahle and the important question of the existence of *one* original text or more than one. I agree with his statement that "one's inability to decide between different readings should not be confused with the question of the original form of the biblical text" (p. 174). I disagree, however, with Tov's acceptance of long complicated processes in the production of most Old Testament books. Such terms as "deuteronomistic revisions" are completely hypothetical and do not rest on evidence that is either ancient or textual. In the final section, Tov rejects the theory of three geographically distinct text families that resulted from the work of Albright and Cross. In its place Tov offers the previously developed textual plurality of Qumran (the five "groups" of texts). He assigns these five groups to one or another of two "principal textual approaches," i.e., non-vulgar texts or vulgar texts (pp. 192–194).

Chapter 4 ("The Copying and Transmitting of the Biblical Text") deals with scribal practice and scribal errors. The section on scribal practice is very extensive and includes an excellent discussion of ancient writing materials and ancient scripts. In my opinion, Tov is correct when he states that early biblical texts were written with word division indicated, but that this division was not always indicated well (p. 209). This understanding allows for the occasional scribal error resulting from mistakenly dividing a word or incorrectly combining two crowded words without holding that ancient biblical scrolls were copied in continuous writing. Given his statements on p. 209, I was puzzled to read his later comments on p. 252 where he seems to accept the possibility of the use of continuous writing in the original production of the OT writings. Tov's discussion of scribal errors is excellent and attested with a multitude of examples. His statement (p. 235) regarding the possibility that a given textual error can very often be explained in more than one way is very helpful.

Chapter 5 ("The Aim and Procedures of Textual Criticism") is very brief, but critical to Tov's work. After contrasting textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible with textual criticism in general, the author states that the aim of the former is "a reconstruction of elements included in the original text of the Bible, as defined in different ways by various scholars" (p. 290). Tov distinguishes between "textual criticism proper" and conjectural criticism. Textual criticism proper includes two stages: first, the collection of variants, and second, their evaluation.

Chapter 6 ("The Evaluation of Readings") develops the second stage of textual criticism proper. Tov rejects the use of external criteria for evaluating variants (pp. 298–302), and he also raises serious questions about the use of the usual internal criteria ("the more difficult reading is to be preferred," etc.). His position regarding the evaluation of readings is expressed as follows: "it is the choice of the contextually most appropriate reading that is the main task of the textual critic." He recognizes that "this procedure is as subjective as subjective can be" and that "common sense is the main guide, although abstract rules are often also helpful" (p. 310).

Chapter 7 ("Textual Criticism and Literary Criticism") deals with major differences between, for example, the Masoretic text of Jeremiah and the Septuagint version of the same book. Tov, rightly in my opinion, sees these differences as outside of the arena of textual criticism *per se*. In addition to the case of Jeremiah, Tov also discusses the books of Joshua and Ezekiel and portions of Proverbs, Genesis, Kings, 1 Samuel, Judges, and Deuteronomy. The issues are complex in regard to these Old Testament books (or portions), but Tov is surely right when he stresses that the differ-

ences between, say, MT and LXX Jeremiah are principally related to compositional questions rather than textual matters as normally defined.

Chapter 8 ("Conjectural Emendation") discusses the situation when no textual witness contains "a reading which . . . is appropriate to the context" (p. 352). Tov justifies the need for conjectural emendation by observing that only a small proportion of the many readings generated through the long transmission of the text is known to modern scholarship. He qualifies emending the text as "one of the most subjective aspects of textual criticism." I would simply express it as the single most subjective area of textual criticism. Tov speaks approvingly of the present reticence to emend, especially as compared with the prevailing tendency of earlier scholarship, and I concur. He further speaks of three major types of emendation: contextual emendations, linguistic emendations, and emendations for metrical reasons. I personally view the last type as the most subjective and take it to be based on largely circular reasoning. (Our understanding of Hebrew poetry is based on an inductive study of the examples of that poetry in the Hebrew Bible. If we begin to emend that poetry for metric reasons, we are changing the presumed base of our understanding of Hebrew meter.) I would have appreciated a clearer statement from Tov of his evaluation of the use of emendation for metric reasons.

Chapter 9 ("Critical Editions") discusses critical editions in general and *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* and the in-progress edition published by the Hebrew University Bible Project in particular. Tov's criticisms of *BHS* are valid, but given the current incompleteness of the Hebrew University Bible, scholars and students will continue to use the Stuttgart Bible for the foreseeable future.

In a general sense, there is no question but that Tov's work should be the book of choice for anyone who is involved in serious text-critical work. It should certainly be the main textbook for any course in textual criticism for advanced students. I question, however, its usefulness as an introductory book for textual criticism. The back cover of the dust jacket states that "a wide range of readers, from beginning students to research scholars, will find this book accessible and indispensable." I have no argument if advanced students are in view, but the book, though valuable, strikes me as too advanced for beginning students.

Ellis R. Brotzman

Tyndale Theological Seminary, The Netherlands

Old Testament Textual Criticism: A Practical Introduction. By Ellis R. Brotzman. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994, 208 pp., \$10.99 paper.

Brotzmann has written a fine introduction covering the two main concerns of OT text criticism: the history of transmission through Hebrew and the ancient versions (chaps. 1-4), and the principles and procedures of textual criticism (chaps. 5-8). Chapters 1-4 cover the following material: (1) Writing in the Ancient Near East, (2) Transmission of the Old Testament in Hebrew, (3) Ancient Versions of the Old Testament, and (4) The Dead Sea Scrolls.

Brotzman gives four reasons for granting the LXX text-critical primacy after the MT itself: it represents the earliest transition of the OT; it is well-attested by large numbers of manuscripts; it contains the entire text of the OT; and it reflects more important variants than all other textual witnesses combined, which E. Tov also cites as a reason for the importance of the LXX. Brotzman shows good balance here, cautioning against "wholesale changes in the Old Testament text" but noting that the LXX should be "examined on a case-by-case basis" (p. 79).

Brotzman follows Tov in speaking of five rather than three text families at Qumran: (1) proto-Masoretic texts (60% of the texts at Qumran); (2) pre-Samaritan texts, which Tov describes as representing that text-type but without its ideological changes (5% of texts); (3) texts that are close to the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX (5% of texts); (4) nonaligned (i.e., mixed text-type); and (5) texts reflecting the “Qumran practice,” which Tov describes as a free approach to the text, with adaptations of unusual forms, frequent errors and corrections, and a sometimes negligent script (Brotzman, pp. 43, 92–93). Tov thinks only this last group was actually produced at Qumran. Brotzman emphasizes textual unity in the manner of the Lagarde-Cross approach, which traces “recensions” back to “a postulated proto-Hebrew text of the Bible” (p. 84); Brotzman does not follow the Kahle-Tov approach, which emphasizes textual diversity and would generally rather speak of “texts” than “recensions.” As Brotzman noted, Tov does speak of five groups, but Tov says they actually point to “textual multiplicity,” indeed to “an unlimited number of texts” (Tov, *Textual Criticism* 161).

Brotzman displays two weaknesses in this section: First, he makes over-drawn conclusions from contrasts drawn between the multiplicity of the Qumran texts (third to first century BC) and the generally Masoretic text found at Wadi Murabba^c at (AD 135). He concludes from this that “the multiplicity of text types evident at Qumran between the third and first centuries BC was replaced by a single authoritative text type by AD 135 at the latest” (pp. 43–44). Second, he dismisses the difference between the MT and the LXX of Jeremiah as a matter for “higher criticism,” rather than dealing with it as an example of how higher and lower criticism go hand-in-hand because of the multiplicity of texts behind our present Hebrew Bible, as the Septuagint-like Hebrew text of Jeremiah at Qumran showed us (p. 121, n. 36, cf. Tov, *Textual Criticism* 313–350, esp. 319–326).

Chapter 5 provides an “Introduction to *BHS*,” using sample pages marked with call-outs to detail the main features of the Masoretic text and *BHS* apparatus. He augments this with a table of “Symbols Used in *BHS*” and an appendix that provides “An English Key to *BHS*,” which spells out the *BHS* abbreviations for the Bible books and gives an English key to the *BHS* Latin abbreviations. I would still suggest the use of W. Scott for help on these matters (*A Simplified Guide to BHS* [Berkeley: BIBAL, 1987]).

Chapters 6–8 turn to the principles and practice of OT text criticism. Chapter 6 deals with scribal errors, which Brotzman classifies as unintentional errors and intentional changes. In the former class Brotzman describes and illustrates possible occasions of (1) errors relating to the manuscript being copied (homoeoteleuton, homoeoarkton, confusion of similar letters, wrong assignment of vowels, and wrong word division—because of crowding rather than *scriptio continua* [p. 111]); (2) errors relating to the scribe’s fallibility (haplography, dittography, and metathesis); (3) errors relating to faulty hearing or diction; and (4) errors in the scribe’s judgment (copying from faulty memory, misguided harmonization with parallel passages, and mistaken incorporation of marginal readings). Then Brotzman summarizes the intentional changes, the *tiqqune sopherim* (emendations of the scribes), the *itture sopherim* (omissions of the scribes), and possible explanatory glosses. He believes that the latter are rare: “The obvious aim of all biblical writers was to communicate with their readers. . . . At least some phrases that are said to be glosses may in fact have been a part of the original text of the Old Testament” (p. 119).

Chapters 7–8 turn to the principles and practice of textual criticism. Brotzman spells out the principles in a four-step process: (1) collect the variants, (2) group and evaluate them by internal and external criteria, (3) select the best reading, and sometimes (4) make a conjectural emendation (chap. 7). Then he drafts a textual commentary that explicitly applies this process to Ruth (chap. 8).

I did note a few weaknesses and mistakes. First, his table of old script letters that are frequently confused gives only a handful of examples, whereas a full chart of the different forms of the Hebrew alphabet would have been beneficial (e.g. E. Würthwein, *The Text of the Old Testament*, p. 217). Second, for a book published as recently as 1994, the references to computer resources are surprisingly dated. For example, he mentions the computer-aligned MT and LXX and the morphologically tagged LXX, but he fails to mention the morphologically tagged MT or any of the many fine programs that search all these texts. Third, I found two errors: the reference to Ruth 3:5, 7 should refer instead to Ruth 3:5, 17 (p. 199), and the Hebrew of *καίτε* is *וְאֵל* rather than *וְאֵל* (p. 74).

Brotzman provides the college and seminary classroom with a fine introduction to textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible. This, along with Scott and Würthwein, will provide students with the materials to begin learning text criticism of the Hebrew Bible. Now if students only enjoyed access to a textual commentary on the Hebrew Bible like Metzger's on the New Testament!

Dale A. Brueggemann
Springfield, MO

On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators. By Anneli Aejmelaeus. Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1993, 199 pp., \$29.25 paper.

Those interested in the study of the translation technique of the Septuagint version of the Old Testament will find this volume very helpful. It presents a collection of eight of the author's previously published papers along with a newly written introductory essay, a previously unpublished paper ("The Septuagint of 1 Samuel"), and the author's inaugural address given at Georg-August-Universität in Göttingen ("Übersetzung als Schlüssel zum Original").

In the introductory essay ("On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators") Aejmelaeus first deals with the basic issue of how we should define translation technique. She states that "the crucial point is whether translation technique is regarded as the object of study or as a question of method" (p. 1). The author clearly argues for the latter option. The former understanding of translation technique as the object of study, though not without some validity, can all too easily lead to a misuse of the "percentages of literalness" that are often the product of such studies. Aejmelaeus holds that a proper study of translation technique will include a nuanced appreciation for the very human factors involved in any translation activity, the translator himself (or herself), and the two languages that are involved, the language of the original text and the target language.

The remainder of the introductory essay is given to a few words of explanation regarding the separate essays that are included in the book. The first three papers all deal with the relation between translation and syntax. Their purpose is to contrast the syntax of the Septuagint with that of "genuine Greek." The article included as an appendix ("The Function and Interpretation of *וְ* in Biblical Hebrew") belongs in the context of the first three articles. It would thus have made better sense to have included that article directly after the first three papers than to have relegated it to the end of the book. The fourth paper ("The Significance of Clause Connectors in the Syntactical and Translation-Technical Study of the Septuagint") is devoted to the question of the definition of translation technique, briefly discussed in the beginning of the introductory essay. The paper "What Can We Know about the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Septuagint?" deals with the use of the Septuagint in textual criticism. This

paper is the best of the volume in the reviewer's opinion. It emphasizes the interdependence between the textual study of the Septuagint, the study of translation technique, and the use of the LXX as an aid in the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible. Since the author's address "Übersetzung als Schlüssel zum Original" deals with similar issues, it might have been better located immediately after the paper "What Can We Know?" The intervening articles also deal with translation technique and textual criticism, but from a slightly different perspective.

Kok Pharos is to be congratulated for making this series of very fine essays available. Institutional libraries will want to purchase the volume for reference, and teachers of courses in OT textual criticism or the Septuagint will want to include readings from this volume. This volume suffers slightly from a lack of unity (the author herself recognizes that this is so on p. 4), but this is usual for a book of this nature. The previously published papers were written separately over a span of eight years. Readers might suggest a different order for the various chapters, but this detracts only slightly from the book's usefulness.

Ellis R. Brotzman

Tyndale Theological Seminary, The Netherlands

Translation Technique in the Peshitta to Job: A Model for Evaluating a Text with Documentation from the Peshitta to Job. By Heidi M. Szpek. SBLDS 137. Atlanta: Scholars, 1992, xv + 329 pp., n.p.

It is a pleasure to have available Heidi Szpek's helpful treatment of the Peshitta text of the Book of Job. This careful volume was originally a University of Wisconsin (Madison) Ph.D. dissertation completed under the direction of Michael V. Fox. Szpek's work is thorough (although the volume actually presents only selected examples, numerous though they be, of her findings). It is based upon the Leiden edition of the Peshitta text of Job, edited by L. G. Rignell in 1982. This edition is a diplomatic one based upon the sixth- or seventh-century Ambrosian codex (MS 7a1) whenever it has the support of at least two of the other early manuscripts. That Szpek was able to base her work upon this edition gives her a decided advantage over earlier studies of the Syriac text of Job.

Szpek's goal is to provide a model for evaluating translation technique in an ancient version, and then to test this model by applying it to the Peshitta of Job. Her approach is based upon a fourfold process which she views as inherent to the task of translation. Szpek applies the model by first identifying the particular element of translation (e.g. grammar, syntax, semantics, or style). She then evaluates the nature of adjustment in the target language (e.g. addition, omission, substitution, harmonization or clarification). Next is the evaluation of motivation (e.g. language difference, linguistic interference). Finally, there is the effect on meaning with regard to reader, translator, or evaluator (in terms of clarity, confusion, synonymy, antithesis and innovation).

Overall the process works reasonably well. It has the advantage of providing specific categories for the data and a coherent system for moving from the data to an understanding of their significance. Szpek's paradigm is adaptable to other applications as well. In other words, if one were studying a book other than Job, while many of the categories would remain the same, the paradigm can be easily adjusted to the requirements of a different situation. I commend her model for evaluating translation technique as one that, *mutatis mutandis*, will be helpful in the analysis of other books of the Peshitta or other biblical versions as well.

The work is not without certain limitations, however. The following concerns may be briefly mentioned. (1) In her focus on translation technique in the Peshitta (P) of Job, Szpek appears to minimize unduly issues related to the *Vorlage* of P. Can we assume, for example, that differences between P and MT are necessarily due to translation technique? In many instances this is no doubt the case, and where that is so Szpek's model provides us with a helpful means of cataloging and evaluating these variations. But there are also many instances where the translation of P will be suggestive of a *Vorlage* different from that of MT, and it is these differences that are of paramount importance for improving MT. Yet Szpek seems to minimize this possibility, not taking seriously enough the fact that in places P is perhaps preserving a text preferable on text-critical grounds to that of MT. (2) It is obvious that some of the differences between P and MT are due to a different understanding of the vocalization of the then as-yet unpointed Hebrew text. Here Szpek seems to show a bias in preference of MT. Repeatedly she speaks of P as "misunderstanding" the vocalization of the Hebrew text. No doubt this is often the case. But we must also be alert to the possibility that in places the vocalization presupposed by P is in fact preferable to that of MT. In other words, is it not also the case that on occasion the Masoretes themselves misunderstood the vocalization of the Hebrew text? A more neutral stance would have been better here. (3) It is curious to find the Hebrew grammars of Seow and Lambdin cited for documentation of certain points. While these are excellent beginning grammars, they are not intended to be reference grammars. Better for this purpose are GKC, Joüon, Bergsträsser, or Bauer-Leander. (4) There are several minor errors, either factual or typographical, in the book. Aphrahat, for example, dates to the fourth century AD, not to the fifth as indicated on p. 1. Something seems to be missing in the transition from p. 13 to p. 14; as it stands, the sentence does not make sense. The Syriac words of Job 9:17 are out of order on p. 162. And Jan Joosten is male, not female as assumed on p. 42, n. 44. (5) Greater attention could have been paid to certain matters of form. For example, needless repetition throughout the footnotes could have been avoided by the use of "Ibid." There are also numerous inconsistencies in form for works cited, particularly in the bibliography.

But these are minor points. Szpek has provided us with a helpful analysis of translation technique in the Peshitta of Job. A further desideratum of contemporary Syriac scholarship is careful study of the other books of the Peshitta with a goal of not only evaluating their adequacy as translations, but also the role that they should rightfully play in the text-critical process for the Hebrew Bible.

Richard A. Taylor
Dallas Theological Seminary, Dallas, TX

Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew. Edited by Walter R. Bodine. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1992, x + 285 pp., \$34.50.

Whatever else it is, the Bible is a collection of texts, a series of written statements expressed in the medium of human languages. Biblical interpreters have long recognized the necessity of possessing a firm grasp of the original languages in order to understand the biblical texts. As persons interested in human language and texts, biblical interpreters share common ground with linguists. This mutual interest provides a natural motive for scholars of both disciplines to undertake joint ventures that investigate and interact with the canonical biblical language texts. W. Bodine's

well-edited work represents the first volume published by a recognized American biblical studies press to survey this significant interdisciplinary field.

In some ways Bodine's volume is a reflection of the times. The present generation of OT scholars is decidedly less interested in diachronic investigations of hypothetical Hebrew texts than the previous two generations were. Much to the delight of evangelicals, the dominant trend today is to focus on some aspect of the final form of the text. This increased emphasis on the canonical text has created an environment favorable to the development of several new interdisciplinary approaches to the Bible. In fact, many different departments within the university—English, sociology, anthropology and linguistics, to name four of the most significant so far—have joined forces with their religious studies colleagues down the hall to produce new categories of biblical studies.

In an attempt to give OT scholars "an introduction to major types of linguistic analysis" and "provide samples of how such analysis might be carried out in the text of the Hebrew Bible" (p. 2), Bodine has assembled a collection of sixteen articles dealing with eight different varieties of linguistic inquiry. The design of the book is a good and useful one for its intended purpose. Two articles are devoted to each of the eight areas. The first article orients the reader to the functions and purposes of the linguistic discipline. The second is a study of some aspect of Biblical Hebrew using the interpretive grid of the given linguistic field.

Bodine's assemblage is broad and impressive; nevertheless, linguistics is a large discipline, incorporating more than the eight types of inquiry showcased in Bodine's book. Omitted from the book, for example, are discussions of sociolinguistics and psycholinguistics. In spite of the book's (admittedly necessary) selectivity, the areas that are treated are diverse and indicative of the kinds of contributions that linguistics can be expected to make in the realm of Biblical Hebrew studies.

Bodine's selection of linguistic subdisciplines includes two that deal centrally with the aural dimension of language: structural phonology and generative phonology. The articles by E. J. Revell and G. Emos that apply the disciplines to Biblical Hebrew present explanations for vowel melodies within segholate nouns and considerations regarding the original pronunciation of certain consonants.

Semantics explores the concept of "meaning" in words. J. Barr's article on Hebrew lexicography provides a particularly valuable set of reflections regarding the task of constructing the ideal lexicon of Biblical Hebrew.

Sections on morphology, syntax and discourse analysis deal with language at different levels of organization. G. A. Rendsburg suggests that morphological peculiarities in the text point to the inclusion of more than one dialect of Biblical Hebrew in the canonical texts. B. L. Bandstra explores the significance of statistically unusual information patterns in Hebrew sentences. R. E. Longacre concludes that the employment of Biblical Hebrew verbs can only be understood when due consideration is given to a text's genre.

Historical/comparative linguistics examines language in its diachronic dimension. In this regard J. Huehnergard proposes a complex phonological prehistory for the Pi^cel stem of Biblical Hebrew.

Graphemics deals with the various aspects of writing systems. S. Lieberman provides the reader with a useful discussion of the Tiberian Masoretic notation system. He concludes, among other things, that *BHS* omitted some essential features of the information preserved by the Masoretes.

The book concludes with a valuable bibliography prepared by Bodine. The 423 entries listed in the section provide the reader with a good sense of what has been done prior to 1992 in this interdisciplinary field.

Careful reading of this book will make the reader more appreciative of the contributions and promise that linguistics holds for biblical studies, particularly in the area of Biblical Hebrew.

Robert D. Bergen
Hannibal-LaGrange College, Hannibal, MO

Peoples of the Old Testament World. Edited by Alfred J. Hoerth, Gerald L. Mattingly, and Edwin M. Yamauchi. Foreword by Alan R. Millard. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994, 400 pp., \$29.99.

Ofttimes the beauty and effect of a splendid picture is enhanced and shown off by a matching frame. And the Old Testament never fails to gain in vividness and immediacy by being viewed in its own proper world, the ancient Near East. Some 22 years ago, D. J. Wiseman edited *Peoples of Old Testament Times*, which gave useful surveys of peoples of the biblical world. The present volume derives from the 1989 Wheaton Archaeology Conference on this theme and has been planned and issued as a successor to the Wiseman volume. In 20 years, an updated treatment of the subject seemed timely. The older volume included the Hebrews (but more the [K]h]apiru than the biblical Hebrews), Hurrians, and (ancient) Arabians, with a side-glance at Ethiopia. By contrast, the new volume has instead a full chapter on the Sumerians, now indispensable in dealing with the Mesopotamian and Syrian background to the Old Testament.

So much for the "prehistory" of the volume. Its peoples are grouped in three grand divisions. *Part 1 Mesopotamia* has Sumerians, Babylonians, Assyrians and Persians as its Eastern Bloc. Then, *Part 2 Anatolia, Syria-Palestine and Egypt* goes from the northwest to the southwest, via the Hittites, Canaanites and Amorites, Phoenicians, Aramaeans, Philistines and Egyptians. Then finally, *Part 3 Transjordan* covers the south-central Ammonites, Moabites and Edomites. Thus, there is a sensible geographical cohesion in the organization of this volume. In each essay, the basic scheme is a general introduction (on origins, or the geographical locus and limits of the people concerned), then an outline history. Often, separate sections are devoted to the culture, religion, source-materials, etc., as appropriate. Each has a compact reading-list. We may now turn to the individual essays.

Sumerians is by W. R. Bodine. An excellent historical outline runs from the Protoliterate Period (before 3000 BC) to the Isin-Larsa period (after 2000 BC), when the Sumerians were absorbed into the Semitic (Babylonian) populace of southern Iraq, leaving only their literary and cultural legacy—but a legacy which (through the Babylonians) reached all over the biblical world. Due mention is made in passing to various products of Sumerian literature. A fuller review of its wealth and variety might have been helpful, with its poetical and other usages, precursors to what we find in later literatures, including biblical.

Babylonians by B. T. Arnold ably continues the story, from the Kingdom of Akkad (late 3rd millennium BC) to that of Nebuchadnezzar II's dynasty. Cultural phenomena get separate treatment (literature, science, religion, etc.). The wide outreach of cuneiform (p. 67) is rightly stressed. As for Babylonian stories of creation and flood (cf. p. 68 and n. 88), it should perhaps have been made clear that the oldest flood-story in Akkadian is that in Atrakhasis (early 2nd millennium BC), borrowed by the compiler of Gilgamesh; *Enuma Elish* is (as Arnold notes) later than these.

Assyrians by W. C. Gwaltney introduces the land and the people, then gives a clear, concise outline of Assyrian history, neatly linking it into that of Israel and Judah

from the 9th century BC onwards. For the land/people section, D. Oates' *Studies in the Ancient History of Northern Iraq* (London: Oxford, 1968) should have been included. As regards the Sennacherib/Taharqa/Hezekiah confrontation of 701 BC, it is astonishing that Gwaltney is totally ignorant of the definitive treatment of the matter by me in 1973 (updated in 1986) and sketched as far back as 1966. There was *no* second campaign of Sennacherib; this idea rests on a failure to read the Biblical text to its end. See K. A. Kitchen, *Third Intermediate Period in Egypt* (Warminster: Aris & Philips, 2nd ed., 1986) 383–386 nn. 823 and 824, following on pp. 154–160, 164–172, and complemented by pp. 550–559; no competent treatment can dispense with these discussions, based on the original sources.

Persians by E. M. Yamauchi succinctly outlines the history of the Medes and of the Achaemenid Empire, linking it up with post-exilic biblical history, in the wake of his major book *Persia and the Bible* of 1990. For Geshem the Arabian (p. 119 and n. 53), cf. now his dynasty, Kitchen, *Documentation for Ancient Arabia*, I (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1994) 49–50, 237.

Hittites enjoy a comprehensive and excellent treatment by H. A. Hoffner, covering history, language, writing, text-sources, excavations and material culture and institutions (including religion). He ends with some judiciously-selected “Cultural and Literary Parallels to the Old Testament,” some being cited also in earlier sections. On p. 127 (and cf. pp. 146–147), Middle Hittite may run from ca. 1420 to 1344 BC, but the use of historical prologues in treaties runs only from Suppiluliuma I (1344 BC) all the way down to Tudkhaliya IV (ca. 1200 BC). On p. 147, it is misleading to ascribe this writer's comparisons between the great Hittite treaties and the Mosaic covenants to “a conservative Christian viewpoint.” It is a question of verifiable *fact*, not of any particular viewpoint. The features are there in both corpora for all to see—unless their prejudices impel them to try wriggling around the facts. (To note 79, add my upgraded treatment, in *TynBul* 40 [1989] 118–135 with wider context. See also my popular-level work in *BAR* 21/2 [March–April 1995] 48–57, 88–95.) On a minor note, Ramesses II (p. 130) helped himself to two Hittite princesses, rather than just one.

Canaanites and Amorites are treated by K. N. Schoville. The origins and history of these two overlapping groups are complex and controverted, as Schoville's summary makes clear. The Egyptian term Fenkhu may mean (a land of) woodcutters; cf. M. A. Green, *Chronique d'Égypte* 58 (1983) 57–58, and Kitchen in C. Eyre, A. and L. Leahy, eds., *The Unbroken Reed* (London: EES, 1994) 162–163. Concerning comments on pp. 167–168, Eblaite is now considered as closer to Akkadian than Canaanite; it may have been an early form of “North Semitic” intermediate between the two. An important source for the Canaanite language in the Late Bronze Age are the numerous words and some grammatical forms preserved in texts from New-Kingdom Egypt; cf. latterly the thorough treatment by J. E. Hoch, *Semitic Words in Egyptian Texts of the New Kingdom and Third Intermediate Period* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994). Canaanite culture is usefully summarized.

Phoenicians comes from the experienced pen of W. A. Ward. He ably sketches the history from very disparate sources, and likewise the data on writing, crafts, and religion, with appropriate cautions.

Aramaean is by W. T. Pitard, author of *Ancient Damascus* (1987). After consideration of origins, he provides a good history from the 12th to 7th centuries BC, and rightly stresses the importance of Aramaic language and script in contrast to other facets of Aramaean culture. On origins, it should be noted that “Aram” is now securely attested in Egyptian sources for the 14th and 13th centuries BC, under Amenophis III and Merenptah respectively; cf. E. Edel, *Die Ortsnamenlisten aus dem Totentempel Amenophis III* (Bonn: Hanstein, 1966) 28–29.

Philistines by D. M. Howard, Jr., again well covers origins, history and cultural features (including their main cities and probable pottery). It is currently fashionable in some quarters to discount the occurrence of migrations virtually anywhere in antiquity these days (cf. latterly R. Drews, *The End of the Bronze Age* [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993], with lopsided insistence on military factors)—but such certainly did occur, and the Sea Peoples were *not* native to Canaan. It remains a possibility that “Philistines” became a general term among biblical writers for Aegeans—hence the term being applied to the patriarchs’ contemporaries, who may have been Middle Minoans, whose pottery (and even frescoes) have been found in Syria, Palestine, and Egypt in the first half of the 2nd millennium BC. As for Philistine words and names, to *seren*, “lord”, one should add the name Achish, attested in an Egyptian list of “Keftiu-names” of the 16th century BC (Akashu / Akasht); cf. Kitchen in Wiseman’s volume, *Peoples of OT Times*, p. 67.

Egyptians get full treatment by J. K. Hoffmeier, as their extensive documentation imposes. To the historical survey, he adds summaries of Egyptian religion and Egypt and Israel. Some details call for comment. Thus, p. 252, I very much doubt that *Ta-meri* (for Egypt) means “beloved land”; “land of the river-bank(s)”, later (with dual determinative) “of the two (river) banks” is more likely, if less romantic. On the limitations of the so-called divinity of Pharaoh, add to p. 253 n. 9, G. Posener, *De la divinité du pharaon* (Paris: Imp. Nationale, 1960). For the boat of Cheops, add Nancy Jenkins, *The Boat beneath the Pyramid* (London: Thames & Hudson, 1980). On p. 260, note that Papyrus Westcar (despite W. K. Simpson) has traces of Late-Egyptian in its language, and is surely of post-12th-Dynasty date. On p. 263, the “name” Weret-Yamtes may simply be a title (*wrt-hts*), while Uni’s campaigns went far beyond Sinai, once at least around Carmel. On p. 265, the father of Merykare (Dynasty 10) would be a later Khety than Meryibre (founder of Dynasty 9). On pp. 268–269, mention of the annals of Amenemhat II would be desirable, with their mention of Egyptian military and commercial interventions in Canaan. On p. 277, the opponent of Ramesses II at Qadesh was Muwatallis (not Hattusil III, with whom he signed the later treaty, then marrying two of his daughters). On p. 278, it is more likely that prince Sety (later Sethos II) led Merenptah’s armies in Canaan as well as against Libya. On pp. 280–281, the point made about conserving past literature in Egypt, Mesopotamia and Israel is an important one: there has to be something to conserve—it cannot just be invented, as some fashionable views on the OT would suppose. On p. 286 and n. 222 (Joseph and background), see now Kitchen in *He Swore an Oath* edited by R. H. Hess, *et al.* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994) 67–92 (esp. 77 ff.).

Finally, we reach Transjordan: *Ammonites* by R. W. Younker, *Moabites* by G. L. Mattingly, and *Edomites* by K. G. Hoglund. All three essays give extremely good modern surveys of these sectors of Transjordan’s antiquity, the more valuable in that there has been immense growth in our archaeological and related knowledge here in the last 20 years. The archaeological record would appear to have Ammonites in Ammon long before we have literary mentions of them (see p. 304). In 13th-century Moab (p. 324), there is not the slightest doubt about the Ramesses II mention of Dibon, any more than of Moab itself; Ahituv’s treatment is not competent (nor is he alone in that). On p. 336 top, no pharaoh does battle specifically “with nomads of Edom”; the term “Edom” is only mentioned once, under Merenptah, when herdsmen from Edom seek pasture and water in Wadi Tumilat near Succoth. All other Egyptian references (and in war contexts) are to Seir, Mount Seir, or much more vaguely to the Shasu.

The volume ends with a set of three useful indexes: subject, author and scriptural. Overall, it is a valuable piece of work, substantially up to date, and a welcome and worthy successor to the Wiseman volume (which is still worth consultation).

In terms of usability, there is just one immense drawback. This is the use of the lunatic “Vancouver system” in the footnote references, an increasing blight in American publishing. Citing papers by their titles over and over again in the notes is utterly useless—it is the *journal-name* and *not* the paper-title that enables one to find the reference on the bookshelf. Going back through notes looking for the primary reference wastes incredible amounts of time—one *cannot* read every paper from its first page every time one consults it. I must beg of Baker Book House (and their fellow-publishers): ban this pernicious system before it strangles scholarship completely. It seriously damages the utility of precisely such valuable works of reference as the excellent book reviewed here (a co-winner of the Biblical Archaeology Society’s 1995 “Best Popular Books on Archaeology” award; cf. *BARev* 21/5 [September–October 1995] 78).

Kenneth A. Kitchen
University of Liverpool, Liverpool, England

The Pentateuch as Narrative. By John H. Sailhamer. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992, \$39.99.

This volume represents the most successful attempt yet by a credentialed evangelical scholar to extract a coherent message from the Torah that is both internally consistent and consonant with NT interpretations. The challenge is a daunting one, since it requires the studied examination of 187 chapters of OT material, punctuated by regular glances in the direction of the NT canon. In Sailhamer’s case, the task is complicated by the self-imposed obligation to sift through the results of rabbinical and early Reformation Christian interpreters for clues to the text’s intentions.

In his book Sailhamer takes positions commonly associated with the most conservative wing of modern biblical scholarship. He assumes, for example, that the Torah was written by Moses (pp. 6, 23), the Noahic Flood was both historical and universal (p. 6), the Exodus occurred during the reign of Thutmose IV (pp. 257, 265), the Israelites went through the same Reed Sea that “served as the port of Solomon’s fleet of ships” (p. 269) and the rock which provided Israel with water “accompanied God’s people from the beginning until the end of their time in the wilderness” (p. 277). Literary sources were used in the composition of the Torah, but they were pre-Mosaic “archival records of God’s great deeds in the past” (p. 24). While these positions are inimical to those of the vast majority of modern scholarship, Sailhamer’s skillful use of NT and pre-Enlightenment era sources confirms the fact that his views are in the historical mainstream of the pious/orthodox interpretive tradition.

Though not a brief work, Sailhamer’s work is small compared to the magnitude of the task. Obviously any volume that includes the systematic treatment of the entire Torah in 398 pages must be selective. What is surprising is not that it is selective, but the nature of the materials that were omitted. What was left out was a serious presentation and critique of the dogmas or conclusions of higher criticism of the Torah. (Contrast Sailhamer’s work in this regard with G. Archer’s *A Survey of Old Testament Introduction*.) A clue to Sailhamer’s justification for this glaring omission is found in the last two words of the title of his work, *The Pentateuch as Narrative*. His is a study of the Torah, not as history, not as science, not as sociology, not as a compositional puzzle, but as sacred *text*.

The Torah is the narrative “embodiment of an author’s intention—that is, a strategy designed to carry out an author’s intention” (p. 10). Believing that “the whole Bible, including the OT had only one Author—God” (p. 3) and that the “locus of God’s

revelation is in the Scriptures themselves" (p. 17), Sailhamer's goal in the work, then, is to determine God's communicative intention as expressed in the Torah. This he does with a reverent Christian pen.

The author's attempts to find and explicate the message of the Pentateuch are aided by the fact that his work treats every chapter of the Torah. This interpretive breadth affords him a considerable advantage over anyone who would attempt to critique the Torah after having written a commentary on only a single book. Since Sailhamer "focuses on the narrative and literary continuity of Scripture rather than on its historical background and setting" (p. xxi), he is positioned to find unifying themes in the text. Controlling his analysis is the assumption that Genesis—Deuteronomy "are not hastily written documents or mere historical records"; instead, "they are carefully constructed works of literature" (p. 3). Thus, in spite of tensions in the text, "it is possible to read the narratives as a coherent whole" (p. 384).

Sailhamer's credible conclusion is that the central theme of the book is "the covenant between God and Israel established at Mount Sinai" (p. 27). This theme entails a cluster of five sub-themes: "(a) God comes to dwell with Israel; (b) Israel is a chosen people; (c) God gives Israel the land; (d) Israel must obey God's will; and (e) salvation or judgment is contingent on Israel's obedience" (p. 27). The covenantal relationship God established with humanity, however, was not one built upon law but faith: "the issue of 'faith versus works of the law' was, indeed, central to the theological purpose of the Pentateuch" (p. 61). As such, the author of the Pentateuch used the stories of Abraham and Moses to portray the contrast between a life lived by faith and one lived apart from faith. "Abraham, who lived before the Law (*ante legem*), is portrayed as one who kept the law, whereas Moses, who lived under the Law (*sub lege*), is portrayed as one who died in the wilderness because he did not believe" (pp. 61–62).

According to Sailhamer, Israel's time in the wilderness was marked by God imposing multiple sets of laws on his people, each one increasingly more restrictive than the previous one. These layers of laws were "added because of sin"; each time Israel displayed significant disobedience or unbelief, more laws were added. The first covenant was established at Sinai in Exod 19:1–16a; the second Sinai covenant was established in 24:1–18, and then reestablished following the golden calf incident in chap. 32; additional restrictions were imposed following other acts of disobedience. This more complex reading of the Sinai narratives has the advantage of explaining apparent discrepancies in portions of the legal material.

A point consistently made by Sailhamer is that the Torah in no way was meant to contain the whole of Israel's law. As he states, "There is an intentional selection behind the collections of laws found throughout the Pentateuch. The purpose of that selection appears clear enough. In reading through these laws we can readily see that God is concerned about every detail of human life. Nothing is too small or unimportant" (p. 391).

Sailhamer finds the Torah relevant for post-Mosaic generations in part through its eschatological dimension. Israel's goal, indeed the goal of all humanity is to return to the beginning. What humanity lost in Eden was "being restored in the Torah, the word of God. Obedience to the Torah is seen as the key to enjoying once again the blessings of the good land and of avoiding the curse of death" (pp. 441–442). The Torah teaches the need for a mediator (p. 317), ultimately a messianic one. "We are thus invited to look beyond . . . to the coming Messiah, and . . . the future work of God in fulfilling his promises to the fathers" (p. 479).

Throughout the book Sailhamer displays a sensitivity to and respect for the text uncommon for a post-Enlightenment scholar. The absolute authority he accords the

text, coupled with the scrupulous attention he takes in avoiding even a hint of contradiction in his interpretation of the text, makes his book reminiscent of a medieval rabbi's. Curiously—yet consistent with his own mindset as expressed in the book—the single most mentioned interpreter in Sailhamer's footnotes is Rashi (in 26 different notes); the longest quotation taken from an outside source was from Hizquni (p. 391); and the 36-page appendix is devoted to Maimonides' list of 613 laws in the Torah. By contrast, the most-referred-to western scholar was Keil (in 21 different notes). After reading Sailhamer's work, I got the distinct impression that Sailhamer has become a modern anomaly—a Christian rabbi. This "rabbi's" work should provide an interesting alternative for those who are inclined to view the past 250 years of higher-critical scholarship as a pothole on the road to proper Pentateuchal interpretation.

Robert D. Bergen
Hannibal-LaGrange College, Hannibal, MO

