

BOOK REVIEWS

Abraham and All the Families of the Earth: A Commentary on the Book of Genesis 12–50. By J. Gerald Janzen. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993, 215 pp., \$17.99 paper.

Janzen has written a very original and highly theological commentary, given the fact that his assignment was Genesis 12–50. From the very outset of his work, the reader is alerted to the fact that he or she is in for an unusual treat: “Genesis 12–50 everywhere presupposes the reader’s familiarity with the preceding chapters, in such a way that scene after scene [of] the ancestral narrative receives its depth and precise nuance of meaning from the way it takes up and repeats or transforms themes and images anchored in Gen. 1–11.” This makes for a most creative contribution.

Janzen also correctly argues that patriarchal religion holds a midpoint between the accounts of creation and the accounts of Mosaic religion. While the relationships between these sections is not unilinear but complex, still Janzen does not opt for a type of supersessionism that has Christianity twice removed from the patriarchs. Instead, he quips, if “the New is in the Old concealed, and the Old is in the New revealed,” the reverse is also true: “the Old is in the New concealed, the New is in the Old revealed!”

Occasionally one might wish to dispute one item or another. For example, the reflexive translation of Gen 12:3 appears several times: “Abram was told by Yahweh that his name would become a means by which all families bless themselves” (pp. 18, 33, etc.). Few have read, much less answered, O. T. Allis’ 1927 article in the *Princeton Theological Review* entitled “The Blessing of Abraham,” which demonstrates that the passive translation of the verb “to bless” is not only preferred here but is required.

At other points Janzen fields a brilliant discussion of the interpretive options but is unable to come to any conclusion. Such an example is his exegesis of Gen 15:6 (pp. 37–39). He suggests that his “interpretive uncertainty” may allow for “further insight into the meaning of the text [to] emerge . . . at a later time.” Janzen concludes his discussion of covenant ceremony at the end of Genesis 15 by equating the smoking fire pot and the flaming torch of Abram’s vision with representations of Abram and God. Thus instead of this being a unilateral covenant in which God obligated himself alone it becomes an act of “mutuality” (p. 40).

But there are many more things that I appreciated than I might wish to quibble about. For example, the ram in Genesis 22 takes Isaac’s place and represents him in the sacrifice (p. 81). The repetition in the servant’s conversation with Rebekah (Genesis 24) is not a sign of clumsy editing but is “typical of ancient Near Eastern narratives, in which at times dozens of lines are repeated almost word for word” (p. 89).

Janzen has produced a great exegetical and theological commentary on a part of Scripture that presents rather unusual difficulties for one interpreter who wishes to help another move across the gap of BC to AD. I heartily recommend its use by pastors and scholars, for there are few that will match its depth of comment on Genesis 12–50.

Walter C. Kaiser, Jr.
Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, South Hamilton, MA

The New Interpreter's Bible: Volume 1. Edited by Leander E. Keck *et al.* Nashville: Abingdon, 1994, xviii + 1195 pp., \$65.00.

The New Interpreter's Bible (NIB) is designed to be a twelve-volume replacement for its older sibling, *The Interpreter's Bible (IB)*, published four decades ago. The first seven of these volumes will cover the OT, and the last five the NT. The first volume to each testament contains, as well, general articles on the OT (vol. 1) and on the NT (vol. 8). The editors have opted for a larger canon of the OT, and hence the reader will discover commentary on Additions to Esther, Tobit and Judith (vol. 3), on 1 and 2 Maccabees (vol. 4), on the Book of Wisdom and Sirach (vol. 5), on Baruch and the Letter of Jeremiah (vol. 6), and on Additions to Daniel (vol. 7).

There are several significant features about *NIB* that will distinguish it from its predecessor, and, in my judgment, make it a more valuable tool for Scripture studies. For one thing, the two Bible translations appearing throughout the *IB* (KJV and RSV) are replaced in the *NIB* with the NIV and the NRSV in parallel columns. I note that, at least in volume 1, the commentators will on occasion direct the readers' attention to differences in these two translations and the reason(s) for their preference. I would imagine the choice of the NIV and the NRSV is dictated by the fact that both are relatively recent translations, and both are fairly popular in respective segments of the religious community. The NIV is the house Bible among more conservative communions, while the NRSV is more widely used in mainline denominations and where a Bible that is oriented toward politically correct language is the preferred Bible. Hence, neither conservatives nor liberationists will be offended by the exclusion of their Bible of choice. I do not decipher anywhere that the editors have chosen these two translations because of their superiority to other translations. The grounds surely must be the popularity of each.

Another significant change that sets *NIB* apart from *IB* is the decision to assign both the "Commentary" section and the "Reflections" section to the same individual. This is a departure from *IB*, which assigned the commentary section ("Exegesis") to a recognized Biblical scholar, and the application section ("Exposition") to a recognized homiletician. The disadvantages of this latter system are obvious. As far as I could ascertain, the scholar and the homiletician wrote totally independent of each other, and seemed to be unaware of the other's contributions. Accordingly, there was no connection or flow between the two parts. That disjunction has been erased in *NIB*. As a result, the reflections flow from the commentary naturally, and creative exposition is properly rooted in probing exegesis.

A third difference I would underscore is that the choice of writers for *NIB* reflects a much greater commitment to diversity within the religious community than is evident in *IB*. This is what one should expect forty-plus years later after the original publication. For example, 22 of the 97 contributors are women. Writers of Asian, Hispanic and African-American background are included. Perhaps the most intriguing diverse element of all is the inclusion of authors of recognized conservative evangelical persuasion. I do not recall anybody who contributed to the original *IB* who would be identified as a card-carrying member of ETS. The presence of the work of evangelical scholars in *NIB* may reflect the increasing role of such scholars in the larger milieu of academic religious studies. It also demonstrates the desire of *NIB* to be a valid representation of diverse religious communities.

By my count, the highest number of contributors are Roman Catholic and United Methodist (17 each). In descending order the next highest number of writers are Presbyterian (15), Episcopal (9), Baptist (7), Lutheran (6), Christian and United Church of Christ (5 each). Several distinctly evangelical denominations are also represented, including The Free Methodist Church (2), the Evangelical Free Church of America (1), and the Church of God, Anderson (1). There are also several Jewish writers.

All of the authors are professors of religion. All members of the editorial board, except one, are also professors in higher education (p. iv). Of the fourteen consultants, eleven are clergy (p. vii).

While the editors have generally assigned books like 1 and 2 Samuel or 1, 2, and 3 John to the same writer, they have chosen to break up several others and divide them among different scholars. Thus, D. L. Bartlett will do 1 Peter and D. F. Wilson will do 2 Peter. Similarly, J. P. Sampley will do 1 Corinthians and W. L. Lane will do 2 Corinthians. The reason for this bifurcation is not transparent to me. Most inexplicable of all is the decision to assign Isaiah 1–39 to one author (G. M. Tucker) and Isaiah 40–66 to another author (C. R. Seitz). While both Tucker and Seitz are eminently qualified to write on Isaiah, does not the assignment of commentary on Isaiah to two authors reinforce the now generally abandoned idea that Isaiah 1–39 and 40–66 are two (or three) totally independent and widely diverse collections of prophetic literature that were at some post-exilic date arbitrarily conjoined? Even if the unity of Isaiah be redactional rather than authorial, it is, nonetheless, a unity. Will Seitz' commentary then build on that of Tucker?

The first third of volume 1 of *NIB* contains twenty-two general articles in the area of understanding, reading, interpreting and using the Bible. They range in length from thirty-two pages, double-columned (Phyllis Bird's article on "The Authority of the Bible"), to four pages (James Earl Massey's article on "Reading the Bible from Particular Social Locations: An Introduction"). One will find the standard subjects in these articles such as "Modern English Versions of the Bible" (pp. 27–32) or "Introduction to the History of Ancient Israel" (pp. 244–271). As well, one will find articles not normally found in Bible commentaries such as "Reading the Bible as African Americans" (pp. 154–160), "Reading the Bible as Asian Americans" (pp. 161–166), "Reading the Bible as Hispanic Americans" (pp. 167–173), "Reading the Bible as Native Americans" (pp. 174–180), "Reading the Bible as Women" (pp. 181–187), and "The Use of the Bible in Preaching" (pp. 188–199). Regrettably, these articles, with the exception of the last one, are the shortest of all.

I suspect that among these articles the one by Phyllis Bird on "The Authority of the Bible" (pp. 33–64) will generate the highest interest and debate, if only because of the topic. While certainly some will wish for an article on this subject that is somewhat differently contoured in its reaffirmations and conclusions, evangelicals should, by and large, be in agreement with much that she states. I would also highly recommend the article on "Contemporary Theories of Biblical Interpretation" by Moisés Silva (pp. 107–124), especially those parts where Silva evaluates, both forcefully and negatively, some of the newer theories of Biblical interpretation that are blatantly ahistorical in questions they ask of the Biblical text.

The bulk of volume 1 (the last three quarters) is the commentary on (1) Genesis by Terence Fretheim (pp. 321–674), (2) Exodus by Walter Brueggemann (pp. 675–981) and (3) Leviticus by Walter C. Kaiser, Jr. (pp. 983–1191). These three individuals are widely recognized OT scholars who have demonstrated both ability and commitment to integrating the more academic study of Scripture with a theological/homiletical/pastoral reading of the text. Brueggemann stands a little to the left theologically of the other two, and more in the tradition of neo-orthodoxy. Conversely, Kaiser stands a little to the right of the other two, solidly in the tradition of orthodox evangelicalism, and the only one of the three, I think, to have been published in *JETS*. I would place Fretheim in the middle with his roots in evangelical Lutheranism.

It appears that Fretheim and Brueggemann have switched commentary work on the first two books of the Torah. Fretheim, who previously did Exodus in the Interpretation series (John Knox), here does Genesis. Brueggemann, who previously did Genesis in the same Interpretation series, here does Exodus. I do not believe that Kaiser has published a commentary before on Leviticus, but he certainly has employed

illustrative material from Leviticus in several published articles and throughout his numerous books. He also did "Exodus" for the *Expositor's Bible Commentary*.

Apparently each of the authors was allowed to include what they wanted in their "Introduction" unit. They do not follow the same format. In fact, the only sub-units common to all three are the last two, i.e. a bibliography (curiously, Brueggemann's and Kaiser's are annotated; Fretheim's is not), and an outline of the contents of the Biblical book. To illustrate this diversity, I would draw attention to Fretheim's treatment of "Faith and History in Genesis" (pp. 325–328), Brueggemann's treatment of "Three New Testament Extrapolations" (pp. 686–687), and Kaiser's treatment of "The Present-Day Use of Leviticus" (pp. 1000–1001). Possibly because Leviticus is shorter than Genesis or Exodus, Kaiser devotes a few more pages (20) to introductory matters than does either Fretheim (14) or Brueggemann (13).

Both Fretheim and Brueggemann clearly state their respective views on the dating of the final shaping of Genesis and Exodus. For Fretheim, Genesis is "a patchwork quilt of traditions from various periods in Israel's life" (p. 322), first woven together by a redactor (maybe J) in the early monarchical era, but climactically and definitively reworked by P during the exile. Similarly, Brueggemann opts for Exodus reaching its final form during the time of the exile (p. 680) and hence it is to be heard as a text addressed to those experiencing the crisis of exile. Kaiser, on the other hand, is noncommittal *vis-à-vis* Leviticus. He notes the range of opinions from Mosaic authorship (the traditional position) to a late post-exilic composition (the preferred view in the academy of Biblical studies) but appeals to Kaufmann and Milgrom to suggest that even if Leviticus is from P, it may still be a pre-exilic P (p. 196). Hence, Kaiser tantalizingly drops hints that Leviticus' origin and date may be earlier than is often thought, without stating his own position.

The quality of both the commentary and the reflections sections is consistently high. The commentary, while necessarily limited, is sufficient to be stimulating to both scholar and nonscholar. Technical matters are not sidestepped, but the reader is never lost in a discussion of minutiae that may be of great interest to those in the academic guild but of equal disinterest to those not in the guild. Happily, all three authors keep footnotes to a minimum.

Of the three, I found Fretheim's work on Genesis to be the most thought-provoking. There is hardly a page of my copy of the Genesis portion of the *NIB* that I have not copiously marked and made observations in the margin. For example, I would direct the reader's attention to Fretheim's scintillating comments on the account in Genesis 22 of Abraham's offering of Isaac, especially as he develops what all this means for God (pp. 494–501). Genesis 22 is both a test for Abraham, and a test for God.

Brueggemann's commentary on Exodus is equally probing and creative, and what one expects from somebody of his stature. More so than either Fretheim or Kaiser, Brueggemann exploits the gains to be derived from using the relatively new method employed by Biblical scholars known as sociological criticism. Hence, he reads the Exodus text in such a way as to focus on the ideological thrust of a liberation narrative (Exodus 1–15) and the ideological thrust of a so-called monopolistic Aaronide priesthood in the latter half of Exodus. The first of these is revolutionary; the second is consolidating and possibly reactionary.

Kaiser has perhaps the biggest challenge of all. Leviticus, especially in the Christian community versus the Jewish community, has not shared the prominence of either Genesis or Exodus. It has not been as thoroughly exegeted or as theologically analyzed (except perhaps for the sacrifice sections) or as pastorally explored as have the first two books of the OT.

To a much greater degree than either Fretheim or Brueggemann, Kaiser pulls in the NT, especially in his reflections section. For example, after his discussion of the

whole burnt offering that is given to God for total consumption on the outer altar (Leviticus 1), we are told (p. 1015) that this particular offering is a type of Christ who surrendered completely his will to his Father. The same offering, it is suggested, also undergirds Paul's admonition that we are to present ourselves wholly to God (Romans 12:1).

In my judgment this movement to the NT is at times premature. For example, in Kaiser's discussion of clean/unclean foods (Leviticus 11), his main point is that such food laws are no longer binding on Christians (pp. 1082–1083). True enough. But why were they binding on God's first-covenant people? Why is one of the longest chapters in Leviticus devoted to the topic of food? How could holiness have been reflected in what one eats? Such kinds of questions might well be explored.

Volume 1 of *NIB* is beautifully laid out. The NIV and NRSV translations are produced in parallel columns against a light green background. The commentary sections are double-columned against a white background, with chapter number and verse numbers under discussion highlighted with bold green (and occasionally in black for sub-units within a unit). The reflections section, by contrast, runs the width of the page, and individual observations are simply listed in a numerical sequence. Typographical mistakes are almost nonexistent, although it is not difficult to spot the error in this sentence: "Genesis 4:24–25 is among the most enigmatic verses in the entire book of Exodus" (p. 718)!

Volume 1 of *NIB* has set a high standard for the following eleven volumes to emulate. If they succeed in that endeavor, *NIB* will be an invaluable addition to the library of both academician and pastor.

Victor P. Hamilton
Asbury College, Wilmore, KY

Deuteronomy. By Eugene H. Merrill. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1994, 477 pp., \$27.99.

The New American Commentary series is intended to address the needs of pastors, teachers and students as they proclaim the word of God and thus sets its focus on theological structure and content. Merrill's volume conforms admirably to its intentions as he seeks the balance between theological exposition and interaction with contemporary scholarship. His historical strengths are evident as he offers an intelligent and viable defense of the early date of the exodus in relation to the Egyptian background of the material. His presentation of geographical information is consistently good and his historical coverage is better than adequate.

In any commentary the author is faced with choices concerning what to spend time on and what to relegate to footnotes. Observing some of the choices made in this volume, one could understand the decision not to spend much time evaluating C. Carmichael's radical theories or A. Phillips' view of the Decalogue as a criminal code. But it is less apparent why there is so little discussion of the relationship between Israelite and ancient Near Eastern law (both generally and regarding specific laws; cf. e.g. 5:18), particularly as represented in the works of B. S. Jackson and R. Westbrook, to name but two of those who are sparsely alluded to. Finally, one might also wonder if it is justifiable to spend only ten pages on the exposition of the Decalogue, which figures so prominently in the book and would comprise the centerpiece of most preaching and teaching on it. More specific comments fall into five categories.

1. *Theological perspective.* As would be expected, Merrill's theological leanings are evident in a number of places. These would include his insistence on discontinuity

between the covenants (pp. 141–142) and his affirmation of the timeless nature of the Decalogue in contradistinction to the rest of the Law (p. 145). For the most part, however, the evangelical will find the treatment nonpartisan on in-house matters.

2. *Tendentious style.* There are a number of places where Merrill lapses into phrasing such as “The meaning clearly is” or “It is quite apparent that” when in reality the suggestions he is proposing are neither clear nor apparent (e.g. pp. 149, 155). While his interpretations warrant consideration, they should not be passed off on the reader in so cavalier a manner.

3. *Questionable interpretations.* In a number of other places his interpretations are open to more serious questioning. On p. 162 Merrill is guilty of vast overstatement when he claims for the Shema that “it is the expression of the essence of all of God’s person and purposes in sixteen words of Hebrew text.” But on p. 165 it is even more difficult to understand how he can claim that the Shema “encapsulates all of God’s saving intentions and provisions.” Another interpretation that I found difficult to accept was the explanation offered as the rationale for the switch from creation as the basis for the Sabbath in Exodus 20 to the exodus as the basis for the Sabbath in Deuteronomy 5. Merrill sees it as a reflection of a change in theological emphases over the forty years in the wilderness. He suggests that for the generation of Deuteronomy “creation pales into insignificance in comparison to the act of redemption itself” (p. 152). By contrast, one might easily be persuaded that the exodus would have had more impact for the generation that experienced it as a recent event.

As in the above example, it is often unclear what kind of line Merrill draws between seeing the Israelites as redeemed out of Egypt and seeing them as God’s elect, redeemed from their sins. Such confusion is evident, for instance, in the section dealing with the firstborn, where Merrill comments: “The sacrifice in mind here is not fundamentally atoning in nature but expressive of atonement already achieved and of covenant relationship between the Lord and his people based upon it” (p. 250). What does Merrill mean by “atonement” here? It is mildly surprising that the commentary offers no coverage of the concept of atonement. Though the Hebrew term *kippēr* is used infrequently in Deuteronomy, passages such as 21:1–9 use it and would have provided opportunity for discussion of its meaning.

4. *Analysis of Hebrew.* Most of the Hebrew analysis of the commentary is relegated to the footnotes, as one might expect. Merrill’s treatment of the original language is generally fair and judicious. One example where exception could be taken, however, was with his comments on the piel of שָׁנָן (*šnn*) in 6:7 (p. 167). There, rather than following KB’s division into two separate roots (with the occurrence in 6:7 representing the sole example of שָׁנָן II), he accepts BDB’s combining of this with שָׁנָן I, meaning “to sharpen” (but lacking any other example in the piel). Classification itself can be innocent enough, but Merrill uses this classification as the basis for his nuancing of the term in 6:7 with the comment: “The image is that of an engraver of a monument who takes hammer and chisel in hand and with painstaking care etches a text into the face of a solid slab of granite.” Such diachronic nuancing might serve as welcome fodder for the preacher but reflects little of the rigor of modern semantics.

A second example occurs in Merrill’s handling of the difficult *huttammā’â* in the notorious divorce legislation of 24:4. Along with most commentators, Merrill makes the mistake of translating this form as if it were a simple pual (“she had become defiled”; p. 316), thus imputing blame on the woman and even seeing the prohibition as directed against her. In fact, however, the legislation places prohibition on the first husband, not on the woman, and the huthpael form of the verb (passive/reflexive subject, passive undersubject: “she had been made to declare herself to be unclean”) puts the woman in an entirely passive position, thus vindicating her from any complicity in the offense. A corrected reading of the Hebrew would render Merrill’s interpretation immaterial.

5. *Resourcing*. Occasionally Merrill is guilty of settling for an outdated reference when a more recent and informed source would be desirable. Such is the case, for instance, in his comments on Asherah (p. 180) and his discussion of cultic prostitution (p. 313). More noticeably, it would have enhanced the work if he had more often used Milgrom's work on various issues of cultic practice.

In conclusion, I should emphasize that each of these criticisms is limited only to isolated incidents and is not to be considered as marring the fine work of Merrill in any substantial way. His commentary is particularly welcome in that it is the first full-length commentary to view the Deuteronomistic laws as organized according to the Decalogue. This distinction should help it to find its place among the most useful of commentaries on Deuteronomy.

John H. Walton
Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, IL

Two Nations Under God: The Deuteronomistic History of Solomon and the Dual Monarchies. By Gary N. Knoppers. Vol. 1: *The Reign of Solomon and the Rise of Jeroboam*. HSM 52. Atlanta: Scholars, 1993, xv + 302 pp., \$39.95; Vol. 2: *The Reign of Jeroboam, the Fall of Israel, and the Reign of Josiah*. HSM 53. Atlanta: Scholars, 1994, xvii + 349 pp., \$39.95.

This is a major work by a brilliant young scholar well-immersed in studies of the Deuteronomistic History (DH). Knoppers' concern is to show that the bulk of the DH stems from the time of Josiah and that in 1–2 Kings it intends to legitimate Josiah's kingship and reforms.

Knoppers believes, following his teacher Frank Cross, that there were two editions of the DH: The first edition was produced close to Josiah's time by the "first Deuteronomist[s]" (Dtr¹), whose agenda was to glorify Josiah's reforms and defend the Davidic monarchy. Dtr¹ was responsible for compiling most of Deuteronomy–2 Kgs 23:23 (using many available sources); an "exilic supplement" was later added by Dtr² (mainly 2 Kgs 23:24–25:30), and other scattered additions were made.

Knoppers' argument is at once simple and complex. It is simple in that he argues that the DH in 1–2 Kings glorifies the Davidic monarchy and the promises to David, and that it points from the beginning to the great reforming king, Josiah. Thus, the DH's purpose is to legitimate Josiah as the best and most legitimate successor to David. Beyond this, Josiah was a symbol who brought together the two great figures of Moses and David, since he returned with diligence to Torah obedience (recalling Moses) at the temple in Jerusalem (recalling David). True success for God's people lay in a monarchy that encouraged correct worship as described in the Torah but that was carried out under the exemplary leadership and sponsorship of a faithful Davidic king in the temple at Jerusalem.

In this way, Knoppers differs from Noth, who argued that the DH's purpose was essentially negative, and he differs from many scholars who argue that the Deuteronomist was anti-kingship. "Within the spectrum of anti-monarchical, moderating, and pro-monarchical positions, the Deuteronomist advocates a decidedly pro-monarchical stance" (vol. 2, p. 248). Yet, kings did not have free rein: They were subject themselves to the Torah and to correct religious observances. Knoppers states that "the Deuteronomist expects kings to support the (Jerusalem temple) cultus. . . . The author posits the need for a strong relationship between king and temple if the kingdom is to flourish" (vol. 2, p. 249).

Knoppers approaches the difficult problem of the intent of 1–2 Kings by starting at the beginning: He shows how the Deuteronomist is concerned to show from the outset

that Solomon is the legitimate and highly successful heir to David's throne (1 Kings 1–10). A key to Solomon's success is in his temple building and his clear support for true cultic worship, but this is not the only one: Solomon's early reign was a "utopia of rest, unity, worship, prosperity, and peace" (vol. 1, p. 54).

Solomon's sins in 1 Kings 11 mark a sharp reversal in his life and lead to his "fall and the inauguration of the dual monarchies" (chap. 4 in vol. 1). Here we find one of Knoppers' major contributions: He argues that many scholars have downplayed or missed the importance of 1 Kings 11 (actually, 1 Kings 11–14) in the formation of 1–2 Kings, and that 1 Kings 11, at least, should be added to the catalogue of programmatic Deuteronomistic compositions. 1 Kings 11–14 are carefully crafted to anticipate themes that are resolved with great specificity in the account of Josiah (2 Kings 22–23).

The seeds for the creation of the northern kingdom are sown in Solomon's fall. YHWH's promise of a "sure house" to Jeroboam (1 Kgs 11:38) echoes the vocabulary of the Davidic Covenant at 2 Sam 7:16, and this is the basis for Knoppers' title: "Two Nations Under God." He states that "for the Deuteronomist, the story of the kingdoms is a story of two nations under one God" (vol. 1, p. 55).

(This assertion is initially somewhat confusing, since the *southern* kingdom was the recipient of most of God's blessings. Knoppers means by his title that the northern kingdom was nevertheless a legitimate one (1 Kgs 11:38); however, Jeroboam quickly forfeited his right to a legitimate kingly line, and thus the "two-nations-under-God" motif is to be understood to refer to the religious unity of God's people. This becomes clear at the end of volume 2: When Josiah undertook to correct cultic violations in the (already defunct) *northern* kingdom (2 Kgs 23:15–20), this shows that, even at this late date, the northern kingdom was still understood to be part of God's people [in a way similar to how the Chronicler keeps alive the idea of "all Israel" throughout his work, or how many of the prophets anticipate a restoration of the entire nation, not just of Judah]).

In the Deuteronomist's extreme criticisms of Solomon for cultic violations, and in his initial positive treatment of Jeroboam, followed by his even more scathing condemnations of Jeroboam for the same sins, we see the contours of his agenda: Kings were to be pure in their following after YHWH, as David was, and especially as Josiah was. That is, writing for a late pre-exilic audience the Deuteronomist shows that Josiah was the reforming king who most clearly and completely erased the sins of the kings of both north and south, most especially in his obliterating the high places and the Asherahs (chap. 6 in vol. 2 is revealingly entitled "Josiah's Reforms: Recovering the Davidic-Solomonic Kingdom"). Josiah's reforms redress, in a step-by-step manner, the failings of Solomon, Jeroboam and succeeding kings.

How are we to evaluate this work? Space does not permit a host of observations begging to be made. On the positive side, I, for one, applaud Knoppers' emphasis upon the pro-monarchical stance in the DH, and I am impressed by his arguments that 1 Kings 11–14 are written with 2 Kings 22–23 in mind. He shows in convincing detail how points raised in the former chapters are resolved in the latter. Furthermore, Knoppers well shows the Deuteronomist's unrelenting focus upon true worship, which was required even of the kings.

However, *caveat lector*: This work is extremely complex and difficult to read (especially vol. 1). Part of this is because studies of 1–2 Kings and the Deuteronomistic History themselves are myriad, varied and complex. In this work, page after interminable page is devoted to detailed text-critical (sometimes helpfully) and source-critical reconstructions (usually not helpfully). Not only does Knoppers review almost everything that has been written on each pericope he deals with, he also dissects each text for himself, usually detecting a number of different authorial or editorial hands. For

the uninitiated, we should note that he distinguishes between “Deuteronomic” writers (those northerners who wrote Deuteronomy sometime during the monarchy) and “Deuteronomistic” writers (those southerners who rewrote Deuteronomy and added the rest of the DH during or shortly after Josiah’s time); these do not necessarily agree with each other, in Knoppers’ estimation (see e.g. vol. 1, pp. 86, 121, 125; vol. 2, pp. 53, 227, 251).

Most evangelicals will reject his late dating of Deuteronomy, his seemingly endless concern with layers of Deuteronomistic editing, his resort to conflicting sources to resolve many conundrums, and his view of the historical (un)reliability of the text (on this last point, see e.g. vol. 1, pp. 130–131). Furthermore, Knoppers does not deal adequately with the *final* shape of 1–2 Kings; because of his two-edition theory of the DH, he writes as though 2 Kgs 23:23–25:30 do not exist (although he promises a treatment of “Dtr^{2s}” work in the near future).

Nevertheless, this is an important work that will take its place among the plethora of works wrestling with the complex purpose(s) of 1–2 Kings (and the Deuteronomistic History as a whole). How it will stand among many other proposals is more difficult to predict. Given its exhaustive attention to detail, and its persuasive argumentation of its main points, it deserves serious attention.

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

Solomon’s Prayer: Synchrony and Diachrony in the Composition of I Kings 8, 14–61. By E. Talstra. Translated by G. Runia-Deenick. Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 3. Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1993, 306 pp., \$35.25 paper.

This work was originally a 1987 dissertation at the University of Leiden and is translated and published with essentially no changes. Despite its title, Talstra’s work is more about method than it is about one specific text. Talstra’s overriding concern is that texts be analyzed first on their own terms, as written documents, using the methods of linguistics, which is the study of language (not languages). This linguistic study can and should be done independently (i.e. classifying and sorting of clause types, syntactical relations, etc.). Only later should analysis of texts proceed to consideration of semantics, contents, themes, and literary origins. The text of Solomon’s prayer in 1 Kings 8 provides Talstra with a convenient test case for his method.

After a preliminary chapter in which he orients readers briefly to linguistic analysis, he turns to Martin Noth’s influential work on the Deuteronomistic History and analyzes Noth’s argumentation for distinguishing “Deuteronomistic” editing from non-Deuteronomistic material (pp. 22–33). He shows that, whereas Noth claimed to base his identification of several key texts as Deuteronomistic compositions (Joshua 1, 23; Judges 2; 1 Samuel 12; 1 Kings 8; 2 Kings 17) upon purely “linguistic” considerations (“Sprachbeweis”), in fact he was methodologically inconsistent, and more often than not reverted to considerations of structural placement, literary genre or presumed literary origins of texts, rather than strict linguistic analysis, especially later in his work.

Talstra then turns to the scholarly reaction to Noth and considers the most influential treatments in the vast literature, showing how each measures up to Talstra’s standards of putting linguistic standards first (pp. 34–82); most do not measure up. Talstra does commend a few, however, most notably Brekelmans (pp. 54–57 and *passim*) and Langlamet (pp. 63–65, 75–77).

Talstra then devotes two lengthy chapters to (1) synchronic analysis of Solomon's prayer and (2) diachronic analysis of the same text. He argues that this is the most proper and correct order and method of analysis. In the first of these chapters—a brilliant and most helpful analysis (pp. 83–170)—he systematically classifies each clause in the prayer and shows the syntactical relations among them. I highly recommend a careful study of this chapter for both students and teachers, and scholars not familiar with detailed linguistic analysis. It is a masterpiece of careful observation of the objective data of textual phenomena.

The following chapter (pp. 171–256) is devoted to diachronic or “literary” analysis (Talstra speaks of “literary criticism” to mean “source criticism”). Talstra identifies no less than five literary strata in Solomon's prayer (mainly using Brekelmans' supposedly “objective,” purely “linguistic” criteria [see p. 55]), including a pre-Deuteronomistic layer, two separate Dtr¹ layers, a Dtr² layer, and a post-Deuteronomistic layer (see his chart on pp. 276–287). These correspond in various degrees to different proposals by scholars about the various editions of the Deuteronomistic History, but they also “disprove” Noth's theory about 1 Kings 8 being a unified Deuteronomistic composition coming directly from the Deuteronomist's pen.

How are we to evaluate this work? I cannot escape the impression after reading Talstra that I also have had after reading B. Childs' commentary on Exodus (OTL) or his *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*. That is, Childs engages in the requisite historical-, source-, form-, and tradition-critical analyses before commencing on his distinctive analysis of the text as canon. Yet, the latter analysis usually does not hinge in very crucial ways upon the former analyses; it is as if Childs must prove his critical credentials before doing what he is truly interested in doing, namely, canonical analysis. So too with Talstra. While he claims that the diachronic questions arise out of the synchronic analysis (p. 170), it is difficult to see how his extensive synchronic analysis *necessarily* informs his equally extensive diachronic analysis. This reviewer, at least, comes away from the diachronic analysis no more enlightened concerning the meaning of the text than when he began, and wondering about the relevance of this diachronic analysis to exegesis. (Actually, Talstra acknowledges that the two methods are different, when he equates “meaning” with synchronic analysis and “genesis” [i.e., source criticism] with diachronic analysis [p. 257], but his claims for the necessary interrelatedness of the two are unconvincing.)

With this work, Talstra departs from his earlier published articles, in which his concern is almost exclusively (if not entirely) a linguistic one. Whether this new approach is merely to prove his source-critical credentials or whether this represents a true change in his thinking is difficult to discern. However, to this reviewer's eye, his diachronic analysis bears no necessary relation to his synchronic work, and it sinks into the same morass of subjective criteria for distinguishing layers of editing that is so commonly found in works on the Deuteronomistic History.

Despite these criticisms, Talstra's work is extremely beneficial on several fronts. (1) It provides a penetrating critique of Noth's method of argumentation, and it helpfully reviews the methods (not the substance) of subsequent work. (2) It provides a well-formulated model for a linguistic analysis of a text. (3) It argues well that linguistic analysis should *precede* other forms of analysis, whatever they may be. Here, evangelicals may also be instructed, even if they do not wish to engage in the source-critical analysis done by Talstra and others. That is, linguistic analysis should precede considerations of semantics, contents, themes, etc. (This is what W. Kaiser argues for with his “syntactical analysis” in his *Toward an Exegetical Theology*; Kaiser's weakness is that he does not acknowledge, as Talstra does, that at times syntactical analysis must look to semantics or other tools to resolve certain cruxes. Even “linguistic” or “syntactical” analysis is not completely devoid of the need for exercising one's critical judgments on occasion.)

I recommend this work first as a primer on linguistic method, and second as a commentary on Solomon's prayer.

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

Kings without Privilege. David and Moses in the Story of the Bible's Kings. By A. Graeme Auld. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994, x + 203 pp., n.p.

Auld argues the thesis that the material common to Samuel and Kings and to Chronicles reflects a shared source that was used by the authors of both accounts. Chronicles did not adapt the text of Samuel and Kings. Samuel and Kings do not preserve the original source. Instead, the Biblical texts are themselves derivative from a common source. Following Trebelle, Auld posits that this source is found in its original state in the Lucianic Greek and Old Latin traditions of Samuel and Kings. The Hebrew texts of Samuel, Kings and Chronicles are the products of a "rolling corpus," a compositional method similar to that which McKane has suggested for Jeremiah. The result for all these books is a postexilic date of composition and no certainty as to the historical reliability of any of the Biblical material, including the common source.

Auld is an original thinker. He has already demonstrated this with hypotheses about the priority of Chronicles over Joshua in shared material. This volume contributes to the present discussion in several ways. First, it takes advantage of recent studies of the books of Chronicles that have again emphasized the literary value of the text (as well as the historical in some cases at least; cf. the recent commentaries of Japhet and Selman, apparently not available to Auld) and not merely regarded it as a midrashic commentary to Samuel and Kings. Second, Auld asks some hard questions about the Deuteronomistic History. If one does not "privilege" MT Samuel and Kings before Chronicles as somehow a more authentic text, then Auld's procedure of identifying the text common to both and discussing adaptations and variants in each account is methodologically defensible. The interest in the theological tendencies of Samuel and Kings, a logical outcome of the literary studies of these texts, needs to pay attention to objective literary criteria, as Auld has done. This is preferable to an approach that, without such criteria, identifies supposed historical sources and distinguishes these from theological additions of a Deuteronomist. Finally, Auld not only suggests this method but also identifies the shared text, supplying comparative charts of LXX and MT passages, and providing an English translation of his reconstruction of this text. One does not need to accept all of Auld's arguments to find here a useful source for the study of Samuel, Kings and Chronicles.

Has Auld demonstrated his thesis? More work is required, as his own cautious language suggests. Several criticisms may be noted. First, Auld displays a tendency to cite conclusions in related disciplines without attending to their limitations. Although these cognate studies may appear to support his case, his brief notice of them, without interaction with alternative views, weakens their cogency. For example, Trebelle is not the final work in the complex issues surrounding Lucianic and Kaige versions. B. Taylor's recent study is not mentioned. Second, Auld does not address the extrabiblical comparative literature. This might weaken some of his conclusions. His discussion of 1 Kings 6-7 depends on the traditional literary analysis of the passage as undergoing substantial editorial revision and addition. However, Auld does not address the examples of Hurowitz from ancient Near Eastern building inscriptions. These demonstrate, for example, that the greater detail devoted to the temple's furnishings, as opposed to the shorter description of the royal structures, is paralleled

throughout the ancient Near East. It is not necessarily proof of later editorial elaboration. Also surprising, in light of the Tel Dan stele, is the assumption that "house of David" in 1 Chronicles must be an alteration from an original "Judah" in the parallel Kings passages (pp. 134–135). Finally, Auld has demonstrated that many of the literary arguments used to support traditional hypotheses are reversible. This conclusion cuts both ways and therefore requires additional evidence before his case can be considered proven.

Richard S. Hess
Glasgow Bible College, Glasgow, Scotland

Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther. The New American Commentary 10. By Mervin Breneman. Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 1993, 383 pp., \$27.99.

In accordance with the Broadman tradition, the perspective of the NAC is "unapologetically confessional and rooted in the evangelical tradition." Mervin Breneman is Professor of Old Testament at the Seminario Internacional Teologico Bautista in Buenos Aires.

He takes Ezra-Nehemiah together as one book, as they evidently were originally, and rightly gives a prominent place to historical background, without which it is scarcely possible to follow the order of events and the gaps between them. Puzzling questions raised by the text are faced, and the theology of the narrator is considered in the light of modern philosophies of history. The composition of the books and their relation to the books of Chronicles is included, together with a detailed outline that forms the basis of the exposition. In the Introduction to Esther there is rather more emphasis on literary features, such as historicity, genre and purpose. Under the heading "The Teaching of Esther" Breneman indicates the importance of the book for Christians today. There are three maps and indexes.

The author is well acquainted with the literature on the post-exilic period, from which he quotes freely, including several commentaries that have been written during the last decade. He is more interested in the positive achievements of the leaders than in the more academic chestnuts, such as the identity of Sheshbazzar or the date of Ezra's coming to Jerusalem (before or after Nehemiah). Not that he neglects to deal with difficulties in the text: He quotes the Hebrew or Aramaic when this is appropriate, but he wears his scholarship lightly, keeping technicalities to marginal notes. This enables him to write in an easy, readable style, putting the main emphasis on weightier matters of interpretation.

The stated purpose of the NAC series is to meet the need of ministers and Bible students who want to understand and expound the Scriptures. This aim is fulfilled in Breneman's commentary, and he also keeps in mind the needs of the worldwide Church. In expounding on the return to Jerusalem under Cyrus in Ezra 1, he comments, "Revivals are a result of God's work in the whole community and in each individual" (p. 72). The theme of revival recurs in the section on the renewal of the covenant (Nehemiah 8): "Christian renewals are always related to a return to the Scriptures" (p. 222), and the chapter "serves as a paradigm for us to study and follow." The initiative of the people, as opposed to the priests, is emphasized: "Just as these people took the initiative, we should encourage all Christian believers to take the initiative in seeking spiritual revival." Another prominent theme is the joy of communal worship in the newly restored Temple (p. 122), while Ezra 8 sets Christians an example "to be circumspect in all their accounting." The book of Esther raises the ongoing problem of anti-semitism: It cannot prosper. All three books illustrate

how the hand of God plays an unseen part in the outcome of events. Even when, as in Esther, his name is not once mentioned, the outworking of God's overruling providence is unmistakable.

This commentary would not satisfy the requirements of research students, but then it is not designed to do so. It is somewhat repetitive, even in its format. Some of the abbreviations used are not listed at the beginning of the book (e.g. DSB, NCB, VE). There are occasional spelling and typing errors: malevalent (p. 209); my initials become JBB instead of JGB; Kaufmann gains an "f" (p. 250). "Economical" (p. 314) should be "economic." But these are easily noted and corrected.

This is an excellent commentary for any serious student of the Bible, but especially for preachers and teachers. As Breneman writes of Esther and could have said of Ezra-Nehemiah, "There are few books of the Old Testament more relevant to life in a society hostile to the gospel."

Joyce G. Baldwin

The Shape and Shaping of the Psalter. Edited by J. Clinton McCann. JSOTSup 159. Sheffield: JSOT, 1993, 130 pp., \$35.00.

All but two of the essays in this collection originate from the 1989 or 1990 sessions of the Society of Biblical Literature Psalms Group. They represent a small but significant contribution to the recent resurgence of interest in the overall editorial design and makeup of the Psalter.

The first part of this volume, "A New Approach to the Psalter," concerns itself with questions of method. J. L. Mays, in his programmatic essay "The Question of Context in Psalm Interpretation" (pp. 14–20), asks the question whether "it is possible and useful to read a psalm as part of the book of Psalms" (p. 14). His answer is a guarded "yes," and he recommends five kinds of data that can be used to form a description of the forces that shaped the book of Psalms. Although R. E. Murphy and W. Brueggemann respond favorably to Mays' proposal ("Reflections on Contextual Interpretation of the Psalms," pp. 21–28, and "Response to James L. Mays, 'The Question of Context,'" pp. 29–41, respectively), they also suggest some further refinements. Murphy is perhaps the most cautious about the benefits of this new approach and argues that the traditional "historical literal meaning" still must be used as a starting point and norm for Psalms studies. Brueggemann explores the underlying assumptions and specific points of Mays' proposal and predicts that the tension between "book as context" and "history as context" will remain an ongoing problem for such studies. The first section is rounded off by two essays that focus on recent studies on the editorial arrangement of the Psalter. G. H. Wilson evaluates a number of recent works and offers some recommendations for further research ("Understanding the Purposeful Arrangement of Psalms in the Psalter: Pitfalls and Promise," pp. 42–51), while D. M. Howard, Jr., provides a comprehensive overview of scholarly work done on both the macro-level of collections and editorial principles of the Psalter as a whole and the micro-level of links between contiguous psalms ("Editorial Activity in the Psalter: A State-of-the-Field Survey," pp. 52–70).

G. H. Wilson's essay "Shaping the Psalter: A Consideration of Editorial Linkage in the Book of Psalms" (pp. 72–82) introduces the second half of this collection, "The Psalter: A Whole and Its Parts." Wilson identifies a series of editorial "frames" that provide structure and an interpretive context for the Psalter as a whole. P. D. Miller then explores how Psalms 1 and 2 form a joint introduction to the book of Psalms in "The Beginning of the Psalter" (pp. 83–92). The placement of Psalm 1 before Psalm 2

suggests to Miller a “democratizing move” that invites the reader to understand the references to the Lord’s Anointed as anyone who lives by the Torah. In “Books I–III and the Editorial Purpose of the Psalter” (p. 93–107), J. C. McCann offers a corrective to previous studies that have limited the response to the apparent failure of the Davidic covenant to Books IV and V of the Psalter by isolating a number of editorial features within Books I–III that already begin to address this problem. The final essay by D. M. Howard, Jr., “A Contextual Reading of Psalms 90–94” (pp. 108–123), is a meticulous study of the many lexical repetitions that bind Psalms 90–94 together. This grouping forms one of the three blocks of psalms on which the structure of Book IV is dependent (the other blocks being Psalms 95–100 and 101–106). Reference and author indexes complete the volume.

The essays in this collection are excellent representatives of the current interest in the shape and shaping of the Psalter. They are all engaging and, for the most part, persuasive. However, it is also clear from reading these essays that the question of method is still paramount. What constitutes meaningful signs of editorial shaping? Psalm titles? Key words? Psalms at the “seams” of collections? And more significantly, how are these marks to be interpreted? Perhaps the most perplexing issue that needs to be worked out is the relationship between the literary context and the historical context of the Psalter, as Brueggemann contends. How exactly the complex prehistory of the Psalter can be adequately described in a way that takes seriously the historical and literary forces that shaped it remains to be seen. What is clear, however, is that to talk about “*The editing of the book of Psalms*” is reductionistic.

While such methodological problems are to be expected in any new field of interest, the articles in this volume go a long way to demonstrate the promise of this approach. All in all, this volume is an excellent—even mandatory—introduction for those desiring to explore this new avenue of research into the Psalter.

Tyler F. Williams
Wycliffe College, Toronto, Canada

Literary Forms in the New Testament. By James L. Bailey and Lyle D. Vander Broek. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1992, 219 pp., \$14.95.

This book emerged as a result of the authors’ concern about teaching exegesis to seminarians. It represents an attempt to fill the void that exists due to the lack of introductory textbooks on literary criticism. The layout of the book and the depth with which each literary form is treated are two aspects that characterize this work as a prolegomenon. This handbook has among its many fine qualities a clear definition of each literary form, an accurate application of each form to NT texts (with a few exceptions), and a concise explanation of the interpretive importance of each literary form studied.

Each chapter of the book introduces and defines a NT literary form. The thirty literary forms discussed include aphorism, parable, Johannine discourse, diatribe and midrash. Even though the focus of the discussion is mainly on literary forms in the gospels, Acts and Pauline epistles, the last nineteen pages of the book are devoted to the so-called “Other New Testament Writings.” For each literary form, examples from different Biblical corpora are presented. At the end of the discussion of each literary form, the authors elaborate on the value of the form for interpretation. This feature is one of the strengths of the book. The selected bibliography on each literary form is also very helpful; nevertheless, one cannot help but wonder why works produced by Craig Blomberg, James Barr and others are missing. The “Index of Scripture Refer-

ences” in the back of the book will be beneficial to those engaged in the task of preaching and teaching. On the other hand, the book would be more helpful if the authors had also offered indexes for subject and author, and extrabiblical documents (e.g. 1 Clement, Ignatius).

As with any work of such importance, it will be the subject of criticism. I believe four distinct topics will be challenged. First, there is a lack of distinction between genre and form (see p. 14). Second, the discussion on the importance of the literary form of the poetic will be examined (p. 81). The problem arises because when Vander Broek uses Phil 2:6 as an example it seems that his method misguides him and consequently leads the reader to the understanding that Christ was God only in form. Third, the section on “Infancy Stories” is controversial (pp. 149–151). Especially significant is the paragraph in which Bailey states that Matthew 1–2 and Luke 1–2 are not historical accounts in any modern sense. Perhaps he should have developed this idea a bit more in order to avoid misinterpretation. Finally, the use of mythic language in the section entitled “Resurrection Stories” (pp. 153–154) will represent a problem for evangelical readers.

Nevertheless, the authors have achieved their goal of providing the theological community with a handbook that tackles one important area of Biblical exegesis—namely, the literary forms in the New Testament. Indeed, they are pioneers crossing a minefield and therefore deserve praise for such boldness.

Luiz Gustavo da Silva Gonçalves
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

A Survey of the New Testament. By Robert H. Gundry. 3d ed. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994, 495 pp., \$24.99.

Gundry encourages students who perhaps have never read the NT to make their first forays into it. This is done by tracing the argument of each book and providing interesting and often penetrating insights into the text.

An improvement from previous editions is the placement of some of the background material concerning intertestamental history, Judaism and other matters in with the discussion of Biblical texts rather than in one massive, intimidating section at the beginning of the book. In this way students learn how this material actually helps in the understanding of different texts.

The pedagogical methods Gundry uses are very effective. Such learning aids include questions at the beginning of each chapter, brief paragraph and section headings in the margin, many maps, charts, figures and pictures, questions for further discussion at the end of each section, and resources for further investigation. The book is very reader-friendly.

Although excellent, the book could be even better with a few modifications. Future editions might incorporate information about the social world of the first century as each book is discussed rather than in one introductory chapter. A pronunciation guide for difficult words might help beginning students. The resources for further study would be more helpful if grouped under topics encountered in the particular letter and, to help the reader in actually reading the New Testament, a chart could list things to be aware of in a particular letter.

This survey of the New Testament is well written, is in touch with scholarly issues, and respects the authority of the Scripture. It is more conservative than recent surveys of the New Testament, such as H. C. Kee’s *Understanding the New Testament* (5th edition, 1993), and is formatted in the traditional ordering of the New Testament

books, rather than chronologically as are D. Barr's *New Testament Story* (2d ed., 1995) and others.

Paul Pollard
Harding University, Searcy, AK

A Theology of the New Testament. By George Eldon Ladd. Rev. ed. by Donald A. Hagner. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993, 740 pp., \$34.99 paper.

Anyone who has pursued formal theological training in the English-speaking world is at least acquainted with G. E. Ladd's masterful work on the theology of the NT. It may be rightly claimed that any cycle of advanced theological studies remains incomplete without some degree of exposure to this work, and also that exposure to it provides of itself a theological education that is far from negligible.

Ladd was an affable and urbane scholar who first taught at Gordon Divinity School when it was still located in Brookline, near Boston, before he joined the faculty of Fuller Theological Seminary, where he taught for more than a quarter of a century until his death in 1980. His teaching and his writings may well represent the flowering of the best NT scholarship that the American evangelical tradition has had to offer during the twentieth century.

As indispensable a discipline as Biblical theology may be for the attainment of a comprehensive approach to theological inquiry, it still remains a field of study searching for its own definition. The purpose generally assigned to Biblical theology seems simple enough: to describe the message of the books of the Bible in the basis of their own historical settings. As such, it should be an objective science focused on defining the content of God's revelation within the circumstances that pertained to each stage of its release to humans as recorded in the books of the Bible. However, the history of interpretation has demonstrated the elusiveness of this goal. Even when granted legitimacy as a discrete discipline, Biblical theology has been variously shaped by pressures exerted upon it by hermeneutical methodologies, philosophical considerations, theological presuppositions and a spate of agenda issues that are often smuggled into the discussion without being germane to it.

To his credit and at the risk of appearing dogmatic or simplistic, Ladd provided theological students with a NT theology that was intended to be essentially descriptive of God's revelation in history. In order to do so, he combined resources made available by the best insights of the historical-critical method with a resolute commitment to uphold the revelational integrity of the Bible as divine Word. As a result, Ladd's original work remains to this day a valid and valuable compendium of evangelical scholarship.

The magnificent work of editing done by D. A. Hagner enhances immeasurably the usefulness of this classic reference volume. The updating of Ladd's work is generally subtle and therefore not intrusive, but substantial and comprehensive. Some of the improvements are formal, such as language revision, additional footnoting, minutely researched bibliographic expansions and the addition of a subject index. Other changes remedy lacunae that had been deplored by Ladd himself: a chapter on the theology of the synoptics by R. T. France, an appendix on unity and diversity in the New Testament by D. Wenham, and a survey of the recent history of Biblical theology by the editor himself.

Undoubtedly, Ladd will continue to enrich the lives and ministries of many students of the Word through this updated version of his book. The editor, who providentially occupies the endowed chair named for Ladd, admits his indebtedness to his former professor for motivating him to pursue graduate work in the field of NT. By a

strange coincidence that should be interpreted as a tribute to the teaching ministry of George Ladd, the review of this book was assigned to one of his former students who traces also his lifelong passion for the study and the teaching of the NT to the impact made upon his life by this great servant of God.

Gilbert Bilezikian
Wheaton College, Wheaton, IL

Christians and the New Creation: Genesis Motifs in the New Testament. By Paul Sevier Minear. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1994, 142 pp., \$14.99 paper.

This is an amazing book. A prolific and respected Biblical scholar now retired from a long teaching career at Yale Divinity School relates his excitement at the discovery of "intertextual linkages" between the Old and the New Testaments. He lifts some archetypal themes from the Genesis stories of creation and fall and traces their influence in providing the theological dynamic and the symbolic structures that helped shape several narrative traditions in the NT. As such the book presents a strange mixture of Biblical erudition and of historical naiveté.

The author's guiding theme is that Jesus and his early followers found in the first two chapters of Genesis a prototype for God's creation. The next two chapters of Genesis provided the explanation for the intrusion of evil and for the cursing of creation that ushered in the old age. However, the apostles saw in Jesus the second and last Adam who made it possible for the Christian community to transit from the old age of the curse to the new age of liberation from the curse.

This paradigm is applied selectively to several NT passages. Consequently, this work cannot be viewed as a systematic interpretation of the NT from the perspective of narrative theology. Rather, it is presented as a series of demonstrations of the applicability of the methodology of narrative theology to the faith of the Church when it is validated by conceptual and linguistic cross-references from archetypal motifs drawn from the Genesis text.

Appropriately, the author begins his inquiry about the removal of the Genesis curse with the story of the new beginning presented in the Lukan account of the birth of Jesus. According to him, Luke's understanding of the new creation in Christ was shaped by the Genesis story of creation and fall. Thus, the story of the shepherds required that we "enter into its own symbolic world." This world was formed by the language of both the narrator and the congregations for which he was writing the story. In this context, the "narrator's choice of shepherds was not accidental." In Luke's "imagined world," the shepherds were "the imagined descendants" of Abel and David, both of them shepherds, and of the shepherds promised by God in Ezekiel 34. The peace they were instructed to proclaim was the lifting of the curse from the earth and from the progeny of Adam and Eve.

The same subtle influences that derive from the Genesis text are assumed to have been operative in the making of the story of Mary, thus contributing to "the gestation of the tradition." The Christian image of Mary was painted to show the likeness and unlikeness to the picture of Eve, her validating primal archetype. The fact that God's blessing on Mary and her child supplanted his curse on Eve and her offspring provides a "way of understanding Mary's virginity as a form of narrative theology that stresses the reality of the new creation." In the development of the oral tradition, the song of Mary that celebrates this new beginning "may well have provided the original nucleus around which the narrative of Jesus' birth took its final shape."

In subsequent chapters, the same method of interpretation is applied to other passages in Luke, to 1 Corinthians 15 with its Adam/Christ duality, to texts in John's gospel, in the synoptics, and in a few epistles. The theme that runs through those discussions may be summarized with the question raised by the author: "What is the relation of the narrative as history to the narrative as theology?" He answers by making a distinction between a "true story" and a "truth story." Luke, for instance, did not tell a "true story." As a historical narrative, his story is not credible. Luke "was too sophisticated an author to expect that the historical narrative would be credible." His interest lay in the realm of truth, "the imagined world in which the primary reality was the activity of . . . God."

This book provides another specimen of attempts that have been made for almost a century to explain the formation of the gospel tradition through the methods of literary criticism. As such, it views the historicity of the NT stories with skepticism and attributes the emergence of its gospel tradition to the creative genius of the early Church communities and of its narrators. However, our question to the critics remains unanswered: "If the Church invented the story, who invented the Church that could invent such a story?"

Gilbert Bilezikian
Wheaton College, Wheaton, IL

Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels. Edited by J. B. Green, S. McKnight, and I. H. Marshall. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1992, 934 pp., \$34.95.

Some have described ours as a generation of dictionaries. Multivolume and single-volume works fill my shelves, and I have often wondered if there is not some duplication, if perhaps this is not simply a publishers' paradise. If I wish to read, say, a concise article on Messiah, I can look in the *ISBE*, *ABD*, *IDB*, *EDB*, *ZPEB*, or *NIDNTT* and *TDNT* if I want lengthier articles (of varying academic quality). We have even become accustomed to their coded abbreviations! One-volume treatments are even more abundant, and publishers are promising more. For instance, Baker's *Evangelical Dictionary of Biblical Theology* (edited by W. Elwell) should prove to be a valued asset to every Biblical scholar.

When the *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels* appeared in 1992 (followed by the *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters* in 1993), many of us wondered what contribution it could possibly make to this burgeoning field of dictionaries. At once, its editorial leadership (Green, McKnight, Marshall) gave a clue that here was a volume that would command serious attention. By now, multiple reviews (I have seen more than ten) have confirmed that *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels* is no mere supplement to the others but is in a class of its own. Praise has come from every quarter. J. H. Charlesworth, writing in the *Princeton Seminary Bulletin*, is typical: "This is an impressive work. It successfully bridges the disturbing gap between scholars and pastors, by demonstrating that critical scholarship can enrich evangelical theology."

This volume is a part of InterVarsity's effort to supply a series of reference volumes for research into various aspects of Biblical literature. In this case, about 90 evangelical scholars contribute more than 200 articles focused exclusively on the gospels. The editors have also compiled exhaustive Biblical and subject indexes, making it a uniquely versatile tool (for instance, Gospel of Thomas has 19 entries; Lord's Supper has 54, with three substantial treatments). In addition, each entry is followed by a lengthy bibliography that will assist scholars to pursue major works. Clearly the public has noticed. D. Reid, an editor at IVP, told me that the volume had sold more than 15,000 copies by the end of 1994 (with strong ongoing sales) because many professors have already adopted it as a text. It is already being translated into Korean.

What makes this volume noteworthy? First, the subject entries are selective, which permitted the editors to assign lengthy articles to topics that warranted it. Discussions of subjects important to gospel research (the historical Jesus, Son of Man, etc.) are treated in full.

Second, the editors carefully solicited articles from scholars in fields where they had already made important contributions. This to my mind is what makes the volume unique. The roll call of scholars who have done this is remarkable: H. Hoehner (Chronology, Herodian Dynasty), F. F. Bruce (Canon), B. Chilton (Judaism, Rabbinic Traditions and Writings), G. Stanton (Q, Sermon on the Mount), G. Osborne (Redaction Criticism, Resurrection), R. Stein (Synoptic Problem), G. Fee (Textual Criticism), M. M. B. Turner (Holy Spirit), C. Blomberg (Form Criticism, Gospels—Historical Reliability), C. Brown (Historical Jesus—Quest of), S. McKnight (Literary Criticism), K. Snodgrass (Parable). And this is only to cite a few. Take Blomberg's seven-page article on the historical reliability of the gospels. Not only has Blomberg established himself as an expert in this subject (see his *The Historical Reliability of the Gospels*, 1987), but here he distills the essence of his views in seven pages of tightly argued text and follows it with 21 suggested bibliographical references to the very best current sources. The same is true for the major articles on the various gospels (S. McKnight on Matthew, R. Guelich on Mark, D. Bock on Luke, and M. Meye-Thompson on John). All writers are accomplished in their respective fields. In some cases, the editors even employed the work of recent Ph.D. graduates who have completed major dissertations on aspects of specific subjects (see "Abraham" by N. Calvert). Therefore the editors should be commended for their ingenuity and industry in finding writers who were not merely willing to submit an article, but who were authorities in their assignments.

Third, certain major subjects are given sweeping, thorough attention and hardly qualify as dictionary entries. One might think of them virtually as book chapters. This is the case, for instance, in Christology. Important, in-depth articles guide the reader through all of the major issues in contemporary debate. For instance, note articles on Christ (L. Hurtado), Son of Man (I. H. Marshall), Divine Man/Theios aner (B. Blackburn), Logos (D. Johnson), Lord (B. Witherington), Son of God (D. Bauer). Similar splendid articles appear for Death of Jesus (J. Green) and Resurrection (G. Osborne). This is the reason the volume has been adopted as a textbook in colleges and seminaries. I have used it as a text in a class on the life of Christ with tremendous success. Students cover the same material as in a text but also have the advantage of hearing different writers from widely different views. I have also noted that this is one textbook the students do not sell back to the bookstore after the semester.

There is little to complain about here except for minor details that will no doubt be improved in a second edition. Maps no doubt would enhance some articles, particularly the entry for Archeology and Geography. A few of the articles seem brief and need to include more current developments. The article on Galilee, for instance, fails to talk about the extensive excavations now underway there, which are changing how we now view life surrounding Jesus' ministry. Likewise, current debates about the nature and function of the Sanhedrin (as argued by E. Sanders and R. Brown) need to be included. In addition, some of the articles assume a fairly sophisticated audience, but I do not feel that these make subjects inaccessible. But these are small quibbles about an otherwise excellent dictionary.

Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels is a landmark volume that deserves careful study by scholars and students alike. Scholars who wish to be quickly updated about particular issues in gospel criticism or interpretation should look here first. Pastors who wish to reap the benefits of scholarship for interpreting Jesus' life and ministry will find a wealth of material as well. This dictionary—and the volumes that follow—have made a place for themselves in the flood of new books about the NT. Think of

them not just as dictionaries, but as guides—road maps, perhaps—to the complicated terrain of current NT theology and criticism.

Gary M. Burge
Wheaton College, Wheaton, IL

The Gospel of Jesus: The Pastoral Relevance of the Synoptic Problem. By William R. Farmer. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1994, xiv + 240 pp., \$19.99.

Bill Farmer, Professor Emeritus of New Testament at Southern Methodist University and now Research Scholar at the University of Dallas, is well known for his advocacy of the Two-Gospel Hypothesis, which holds that Matthew wrote first, that Luke used Matthew and that Mark condensed Matthew and Luke. He claims that the present volume is not a defense of this view nor a refutation of the rival Two-Source Hypothesis, which holds that Mark wrote first and then Matthew and Luke independently used Mark and a collection of Jesus' sayings called Q. Nevertheless he sets forth most of the arguments in favor of the former and against the latter. Indeed one value of the book is that it is a good summary of Farmer's position. Instead he is most concerned with demonstrating what difference his view makes for theology, worship and ethics. His main targets are the radical conclusions of the so-called Jesus Seminar and more particularly J. M. Robinson and H. Koester.

Part 1 sets forth a justification for the book. Part 2 is a description and justification of the Two-Gospel Hypothesis. Part 3 tries to show what difference one's view of synoptic relationships makes in his or her understanding of the Lord's prayer, the Lord's supper, justification by faith, the witness of the women to the resurrection, what the gospels say about the poor and the Matthaean passages about the keys of the kingdom. (I get the impression that Farmer's recent conversion to Catholicism led him to include the last of these.) Part 4 attempts to explain how the Two-Source Hypothesis ever became the dominant theory (the need of 19th-century German civil religion to dethrone the foundational gospel of Matthew and enthrone a bland gospel—Mark—in order to unify Protestants and Catholics and Christians and Jews!). Part 5 tries to show why there is so much current interest in Q (the attempt of Robinson and Koester to dismantle the NT canon by claiming that the Coptic *Gospel of Thomas* is as early and authoritative as Q and that neither says anything about Jesus' death having saving significance). Part 6 lists sixteen areas where the author thinks one's view of synoptic relationships makes a difference.

The big question raised by this book is whether one's solution to the synoptic problem greatly affects his or her exegesis, theology and practical application. This reviewer insists that it does not. There are simply too many people who are well-trained in Biblical studies and who think critically but who hold the Two-Source Hypothesis, who reject the radical claims Farmer opposes, and whose theology is as conservative or even more so than that of Farmer. He acknowledges this, but he thinks that such adherents do not realize the dangerous implications and tendencies of the view. The truth is that radical positions are not determined by a view of synoptic relationships but by philosophical presuppositions. Are all those who embrace the Two-Gospel Hypothesis theological conservatives? Of course not. Lest the readers of this *Journal* be tempted to jump on Farmer's bandwagon, they should consider some implications of his thesis. One is that Mark is not a very reliable gospel, in part because it is the latest of the three. Following this line of reasoning, however, one might question whether Matthew is reliable. Farmer does not attribute it to the apostle, and there is no indication that he dates it anything like as early as others date Mark (i.e. about AD 65). Farmer claims that Matthew was demoted in 19th-century Germany in part because of an anti-semitic passage. By promoting it, does he want to reaffirm its alleged

anti-semitism? Nobody would accuse him of such a thing, but perhaps he does not realize all of the implications of his line of reasoning!

James A. Brooks
Bethel Theological Seminary, St. Paul, MN

Jesus the Prophet: His Vision of the Kingdom on Earth. By R. David Kaylor. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1994, xi + 227 pp., \$19.99 paper.

Jesus "did not intend to be the savior of the world; he intended to be a good Jew, faithfully following the path of conscience inspired by tradition and by the fresh presence of God." But "above all else, he was a prophet, in word and deed" (p. 211). So argues Kaylor, religion professor at Davidson College, North Carolina, after 27 years of teaching undergraduates about Jesus, in a book aimed at a similar audience. He breaks little fresh ground, ignores more conservative scholarship almost entirely, but summarizes a good amount of recent work on his topic.

After an introduction defending his methodology, Kaylor gives a helpful overview of the political and economic conditions of the time of Christ. He stresses the impossibility of separating religion from politics and notes the peasant unrest in Roman Palestine. Into this unstable milieu, Jesus came preaching the multivalent "kingdom of God." Almost everyone—Roman and Jewish leaders, crowds and disciples—interpreted this to include a threat to the prevailing social order, and they were not all wrong. Not that Jesus promoted violent revolution or any overt political program, but had his vision for a radically egalitarian community practicing social justice ever been widely implemented, it would have clearly undermined the authority of the ruling elites. This accounts for his crucifixion, especially after his triumphal entry, temple demonstration and comment on paying taxes, which really meant that Caesar had no legitimate authority.

Considerable exegetical attention is paid to the sermon on the mount, highlighting both a spiritual and social dimension to numerous parts. In the lengthiest and least convincing chapter, Kaylor surveys a large number of parables, sundered from their literary contexts and reinterpreted as either visions of a renewed social order or ironic commentary on the status quo. Jesus the prophet walked the tightrope between Essene and Zealot options, calling Israel to covenant renewal and re-establishing OT norms of social justice. The resurrection, otherwise left undefined, means that his followers should do the same for the Church and society today.

In general, Kaylor is overly skeptical when it comes to authenticity, even by the standards of the so-called "third quest." (He takes the Jesus Seminar, for example, far too seriously.) As a result, the portrait is one-sided, ruthlessly eliminating as secondary everything that does not fit into his picture. But, if used alongside more balanced studies, this book would prove to be a helpful and readable introduction to the socio-political world and dimension of Jesus' ministry.

Craig L. Blomberg
Denver Seminary, Denver, CO

The Essential Jesus. Original Sayings and Earliest Images. By John Dominic Crossan. San Francisco: Harper, 1994, vii + 199 pp., \$18.00.

This work is Crossan's third recent discussion of the historical Jesus (see *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant* [Harper, 1991] and *Jesus: A Revolutionary Biography* [Harper, 1994]). A member of R. Funk's Jesus

Seminar, Crossan here offers ninety-three original sayings and twenty-five images of Jesus in pre-Constantine art. Included are an essay discussing the historical Jesus, a brief explanation of his sayings, and a description of sixty-five images of Jesus. Crossan starts with the three principles of the minimalist historical position: (1) that an early movement associated itself with Jesus, (2) that Jesus suffered execution at the hands of official authority, and (3) that this movement continued and spread after Jesus' death. The author presents Jesus as the herald of equality for all.

There are many strengths in Crossan's work. One is pithy renderings of Jesus' statements (e.g. "If someone takes your coat offer your suit" [p. 113] and "You buried your heart where you hid your treasure" [p. 118]). Another strength is Crossan's command of the wider Greco-Roman literature, which he displays in his explanations of Jesus' sayings.

A weakness is Crossan's acceptance of later material. For instance, 4% of his collection has attestation only in the *Gospel of Thomas*. Moreover, Crossan sees the images of Jesus as an "absolutely necessary counterpoint to the translation of Jesus' words" (p. 3), but the earliest of these representations dates from the 190s AD. Another criticism is Crossan's reconstruction of Jesus as a revolutionary preaching social equality. Could such a man preaching only such a message have sparked a movement that has lasted to the present?

However, in general, this is a good, well-written presentation of one scholar's assessment of the historical Jesus. The work is thought-provoking and well worth a careful perusal.

Carl Judson Davis
Conyers, GA

Gesù e i suoi fratelli: contributo allo studio della cristologia e dell'antropologia nel Vangelo di Matteo. By Santi Grasso. Supplementi alla Rivista Biblica 29. Bologna: Dehoniane, 1993, 307 pp., 33,000 lira.

This work, a revision of Grasso's 1991 Pontifical Biblical Institute dissertation (Rome), is a lucidly written redactional study of the concept of brotherhood in the gospel of Matthew. It analyzes in detail the three pericopes in Matthew in which Jesus makes reference to someone being his brother (12:46–50 // Mark 3:31–35 // Luke 8:19–21; 25:31–46; 28:1–10).

Grasso (p. 237) persuasively demonstrates that Matthew, "in comparison with the other Synoptics, is completely original in presenting an articulated design" of brotherhood with Jesus. Especially useful in this regard is Grasso's detailed exegesis of Matt 12:46–50 *vis-à-vis* its synoptic parallels.

In Matthew in this passage Jesus declares as his brother(s)—and sister (not in Luke) and mother—those who do the will of Jesus' *father* in heaven. In Mark and Luke, in contrast, the condition for being related to Jesus as a family member is stated as doing the will of *God*. Thus the statement that God is Jesus' father (a designation of which Matthew is fond) in a discussion about believers being Jesus' brothers grounds the declaration of brotherhood in the paternity of God in Matthew's version of this triple-tradition pericope (pp. 35, 76).

Matthew 28:9–10 in the resurrection narrative is the third passage Grasso discusses. Strictly speaking these verses have no synoptic parallel, although they have important links with John 20:14–18. In both John 20:17 and Matt 28:10 Jesus tells Mary Magdalene (in Matthew and John) and "the other Mary" (not in John) to give a message to his *brothers*. Jesus' use of brothers, Grasso notes, is significant in Matthew's account since in Matt 28:7 an angel had just told the women to communicate essen-

tially the same message to Jesus' *disciples*. It is reserved for Jesus (pp. 155–156) to refer to the disciples as *his brothers* (cf. 23:8–9 in regard to believers referring to each other as brothers).

Less satisfactory than Grasso's discussion of the first (12:46–50) and last (28:9–10) passages in which Jesus makes declarations of fraternity in Matthew is his treatment of the second passage (pp. 79–141), the last judgment in 25:31–46. G. N. Stanton has recently remarked that aside from the sermon on the mount "no passage in Matthew's gospel has attracted more attention from exegetes, theologians, and preachers, than" 25:31–46 (*A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew*, p. 207). Thus differing conclusions about this pericope are not surprising.

Grasso opts for the so-called universalist interpretation of the key phrase "least of these my brothers" (v. 40), in which at the last judgment these least of Jesus' brothers constitute all the needy without exception (p. 99). In fact Grasso, in contrast to those who take the generic universalist interpretation, does see an exception: Those needy ones who have been helped by others but who have not in turn helped yet others will not figure in the judgment as brothers of Jesus (pp. 137, 141). (Within the confines of this review I can only refer the reader to the arguments for the particularist interpretation of this passage, which I feel are by and large persuasive, as advanced by Stanton in the work mentioned above.)

Grasso is very charitable in his interaction with other writers. His work is well-ordered and should be of special interest to students of Matthew. The fact that Grasso interacts with or references works in Latin, Spanish, French, German and English, as well as his native Italian, serves to enrich this study.

Peter Ciavarella
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

Narrative Asides in Luke-Acts. By Steven M. Sheeley. JSNTSup 72. Sheffield: JSOT, 1992, 204 pp., \$47.50.

A narrative aside is a note or remark made by a story's narrator directly to the reader. Picture the narrator turning away from the story and informing the reader face to face and you have the essence of the narrative aside. An example is the portion of Luke 20:27 here given in italics: "There came to him some Sadducees, *those who say that there is no resurrection*, and they asked him a question." This remark is not strictly part of the story. Nevertheless, it is a fact known to Jesus and a necessary datum for understanding the trick question about marriage in the resurrection. Luke, sensitive that his readers may be unfamiliar with Sadducean doctrine, gives them the essential fact just before they need it.

Within the recent literary studies of the NT, very little has been done with the narrative aside or "footnote." There are a few articles on how this device is used in the gospel of John, but one has to go all the way back to Cadbury's commentary on Acts to find any substantial writing on Lukan literature. Sheeley's study is the expansion of the techniques developed for Johannine studies to the RSV text of Luke-Acts.

After a review of the literature and a discussion of methodology, Sheeley does some analysis with use of asides in other contemporary literature, such as in *The Golden Ass* and 1 Maccabees. He establishes that narrative asides vary in frequency and obtrusiveness, depending on the attitude struck by the narrator. The Lukan asides are seen to be sober, well-timed, subtle and, above all, informative. He uses asides much less frequently than did John, or about 50 times. Luke is not as interested

in showing off his erudition as he is in helping the readers understand the story and in giving them cause to be confident in the storyteller. Sheeley develops a taxonomy of Lukan asides, grouping them under such labels as "custom," "etiology" and "identification."

There are a few points that Sheeley does not fully address. Most importantly, he sidesteps the question of whether Luke composed all these asides or found some in his sources. A quick search reveals that the asides in Luke 5:24 and 9:14, not to mention the note about the Sadducees in 20:27, are all phrased as asides in both Matthew and Mark. And does an aside in special Lukan material come from Luke or his source? And if an aside is found in Peter's speech in Acts 10:36, should we attribute it to Peter, a speech source, or Luke? This gap is partly closed by the fact that Luke and Acts are very similar in their use of asides, perhaps pointing to a Lukan pattern. To be sure, source criticism lies outside the boundaries of this sort of study. Another area of possible study is how the Septuagint may have affected Luke's style.

There is much to praise in this study. First, Sheeley establishes his goal of making us better acquainted with the narrator's style of Luke-Acts. Second, he (like Luke!) must be commended for writing a volume that is altogether clear and stimulating for the nonspecialist. For the most part he avoids or defines the literary jargon. Beyond that, the worst that can be said is that he is slightly repetitious. Readers will quibble over whether this or that phrase is a genuine aside, but they will enjoy Sheeley's insights nonetheless.

Gary Steven Shogren
Biblical Theological Seminary, Hatfield, PA

The Plan of God in Luke-Acts. By John T. Squires. SNTSMS 76. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1993, x + 233 pp., \$54.95.

In the present work, which is a revised version of the author's 1988 Yale University Ph.D. dissertation produced under the supervision of Abraham Malherbe, the author seeks to demonstrate that the "plan of God" (i.e. divine providence) plays a central role in Luke-Acts: God is the subject of the whole two-volume Lukan story (p. 37); the Lukan presentation of Jesus indicates that God is acting in history (p. 102); indeed, God actively guides the unfolding of history (p. 121).

Squires envisions a Hellenistic context for Luke's readers because, among other reasons, Luke-Acts bears many similarities to Hellenistic historiography. History "is the genre which best describes Luke-Acts" (p. 21). The theme of the plan of God in Luke-Acts has the apologetic functions of confirming the faith of Luke's readers, encouraging them to bear witness to that faith, and enabling them to stand firm against opposition. Readers' potential objections to the suffering and death of Jesus as Messiah and to the Gentile mission are answered with Luke's resounding declaration of divine sovereignty: All events in the narrative unfold in fulfillment of God's foreordained purposes.

Squires employs two main methods: (1) a comparative analysis of divine providence in Hellenistic histories by Diodorus Siculus, Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Josephus, (2) a survey and exegetical analysis of Luke-Acts with attention to the theme of the plan of God and in light of features observed in Hellenistic histories. Each of the book's main chapters explores in the selected literature a "strand" of the theme, namely providence (the primary strand), portents, epiphanies, prophecies and declarations of divine necessity. Many similarities between Luke-Acts and Hellenistic histories are noted, including a balancing emphasis on human responsibility alongside divine providence (p. 180).

Squires is to be commended for this well-organized, precisely defined study. And yet, though the topic is properly restricted, the notes open up endless doors for those who want to go further. Moreover, Squires convincingly demonstrates the centrality, multifaceted nature, and widespread presence of the given theme in Luke-Acts.

From a different angle, I found that, by looking past the dry and dispassionate scholarly approach required of a dissertation and a work in this series, the actual substance of Squires' analysis of Luke-Acts provided real encouragement for faith in a sovereign God. Not all dissertations offer comparable fuel to stoke the fire of Christian belief!

Squires correctly identifies the need for a new and comprehensive work, with extended comparative analysis, to pull together the various (and numerous) studies on related themes and language in Luke-Acts (works on the Lukan $\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}$, the prophecy-fulfillment motif, election, etc.). This study admirably provides that synthesis and extension of previous work.

Nevertheless, the book would be stronger if Squires had given more consideration to possible Jewish features of Luke's readership. The plan of God is said to have its apologetic impact mostly in relation to readers of a Hellenistic context (e.g. pp. 185, 191). While we do well to heed the advice of Hengel (and others) and appreciate the extensive overlap of Hellenism and Judaism in the first century, Squires situates Luke-Acts too far from a Jewish context (contrast the works of, e.g., Jervell, Dahl, and Brawley). Ironically, many of the author's assertions (e.g. pp. 153, 187, 191) would support—indeed, would argue for—a Lukan readership within or close to the orbit of Judaism, but such opportunities are bypassed.

Readers of *JETS* may wish that Squires had said more, at least in the conclusion, about the comparative emphasis on the plan of God in Luke-Acts as opposed to other NT writings. Further, it is regrettable that the author merely asserts that the speeches of Acts are "constructed by Luke himself" (pp. 75–76) without defending or explaining that claim. Also, Squires' use of the expression "free will" is sometimes quite imprecise (e.g. pp. 155, 177–179, 182–184).

In the end, however, it must be said that Squires makes an important contribution to Lukan studies in light of Hellenistic backgrounds. His work will become a standard resource on the thought and theology of Luke-Acts.

Peter K. Nelson
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

Expository Reflections on the Letter to the Ephesians. By Leon Morris. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994, 217 pp., \$17.99.

Morris, the former Principal of Ridley College, Melbourne, continues to place the Christian reading public in his debt with his expositions of the books of the NT. Although it is some years since Morris retired, the flow of expositions from his pen continues unabated and recently includes a lengthy commentary on Matthew's gospel.

The present volume is not a commentary as such nor even a devotional treatment, but a series of expository reflections that elucidate in nontechnical language the major truths of Paul's letter to the Ephesians. Morris, who believes Paul is the author of the letter, divides Ephesians into twenty-one separate sections that range from two to eight or nine verses each, and then treats each section as a unit. This has the advantage of dealing with a manageable amount of text, which is important in a letter like Ephesians. However, there will be difference of opinion about the sectional divisions, and the structure makes it difficult to pick up the flow of the argument or the epistle's

overall movement of thought (e.g., the connection between 5:18 ["Be filled with the Spirit"] and the following participial imperatives is not made).

The epistle is expounded phrase by phrase in clear, matter-of-fact language, something that we have come to expect from the author's writings. He often provides helpful word studies with relevant statistics (see "fruit" on p. 165) and uses simple, homely illustrations to reinforce the points he is making. For example, in his exposition of Paul's petition in chap. 1, he asserts that it is all too easy to concentrate on our own affairs, and then concludes: "A man wrapped up in himself makes a very small parcel!" There are helpful reflections on the nature of sin in our society as part of the exposition of 2:1-3 (pp. 40, 41) and on what is implied in being saved by grace within the contemporary scene (p. 55).

These expository reflections are, on the whole, convincing and edifying. There are some judicious words on predestination and its implications, while his exposition at 1:11-14 of "we" denoting Jewish believers and "you" referring to Gentile Christians (p. 25) is, in our judgment, correct. Attention is appropriately drawn to the prominence of love in the letter (p. 46), and a good discussion of lowliness against the backdrop of first-century pagan values is provided (p. 113), to mention only a few examples.

A weakness of dealing with the exposition phrase by phrase (which may be appropriate in passages like 4:1-6) is that the thread of the apostle's argument and his vitality are sometimes lost. The significance of particular clauses may be missed and Paul's special emphases not brought out. Morris cites earlier commentaries (and Grimm-Thayer's lexicon) but does not refer to the recent significant volume of A. T. Lincoln (*Word Biblical Commentary*) or the important monograph by C. E. Arnold, *Ephesians: Power and Magic* (Cambridge), both of which have considerably furthered our understanding of Ephesians.

Morris' commitment to "source" or "origin" as the meaning of "head" (*kephalē*) comes out clearly in his treatment of 1:22, although most commentators consider this to be the clearest passage in Ephesians where head signifies "authority over." The distinctive nuances of "love" and "subjection" were minimized in relation to 5:21-33: Was this because a symmetrical relationship between husbands and wives was assumed? One might question the exposition here and there, e.g. the explanation of Gentiles being "without Christ" at 2:12 (p. 61), the significance of fatherhood in 3:14 (p. 102), or whether there is any theological significance to Paul's listing only some of the gifts at 4:11 (later called the "great gifts," p. 126).

However, in spite of these few caveats, we are grateful to Morris for providing his readers with clear, insightful expositions and reflections on a letter from the hand of Paul that is packed full of treasures that further our understanding of God's purposes for the universe and his people and that spells out his demands on their lives.

Peter T. O'Brien

Moore Theological College, Newtown, N.S.W., Australia

Paul and the Self: Apostolic Teaching for Personal Wholeness. By J. Knox Chamblin. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1993, n.p. paper.

Knox Chamblin has written *Paul and the Self* as a personal testament of faith and as an attempt to bridge the gap between theology and counseling. Having experienced intense personal struggles for over a decade, he writes as one who has turned

to the apostle Paul for guidance. "Paul," he acknowledges, "has been both my pastor and my doctor, my teacher and my therapist. In my struggle toward maturity and authenticity, nothing under God has helped me so much as Paul's letters" (p. 12). In fact, according to Chamblin, it is precisely because Paul himself experienced personal struggles and brought these pains before the throne of God that he is qualified to help. "Paul is one patient telling other patients where to find healing" (p. 29).

The premise of the book is that each of us is engaged in three relationships: to oneself, to other people and to God. Among these interrelationships, we find ourselves in the midst of struggles. In his approach to Paul, Chamblin uses the triads first suggested to him by his colleague Richard L. Pratt, Jr. These triads are writer-letter-reader, rational-emotional-volitional and informative-affective-directive. In a valuable first chapter, "Learning to Read Paul," he illustrates how these triads help us understand Paul. And as we understand Paul in his relationships, we in turn understand ourselves in our relationships.

Although the book does not claim to be "a comprehensive study of Pauline theology" (p. 13), it is an impressive treatment of almost every major Pauline passage. The chapter headings read like a systematic theology of Paul: "Learning to Read Paul," "God, the Self, and Sin," "The Saving Work of Christ," "Life in the Son," "The Conquest of Pride," "Freedom in Slavery," "The Christian Struggle," "Power in Weakness," "Life in Community," "The Church at Worship and at Prayer," "The Christian Hope" and "The Family Celebration." In every chapter Chamblin carefully shows how the Pauline gospel brings personal and corporate wholeness to the body of Christ. The chapter "The Conquest of Pride" should be read by every Christian. I was certainly humbled.

I used *Paul and the Self* as the textbook for my seminary course on Paul. My students found it to be an excellent guide. I found it to be a worthy model of evangelical exegesis. Chamblin shows great skill in his use of textual criticism, his analysis of Paul's Greek, his criticisms of contemporary translations of Paul (occasionally submitting his own), and his debate with other scholars over key issues. For my money, the footnotes are worth the price of the book. Chamblin has read almost everything relating to his subject, from J. D. G. Dunn, J. R. W. Stott and L. J. Crabb, Jr., to C. Dickens, C. S. Lewis, and G. F. Will. Lewis is quoted in the book more than any other author.

If I were a millionaire, I would subsidize another printing and give a copy to every seminarian, minister and scholar.

Oswald G. Barnes
First Presbyterian Church, Florala, AL

The Johannine Epistles. By Rudolf Schnackenburg. Translation by Reginald and Ilse Fuller. New York: Crossroad, 1992, xv + 320 pp., \$39.50.

D. A. Carson, in his recent commentary survey, expresses regret that Schnackenburg's commentary on the Johannine epistles has never been translated. Now it has. While the work is a helpful addition to the English-speaking literature on this corpus, it not exactly brand new—the first German edition of this work appeared in 1953, and the version translated here is the seventh German edition dating from 1984. This edition, in turn, differs from the sixth edition of 1979 merely by some added material on selected topics. It does not include, however, any extensive interaction with commentaries published after this date, such as Raymond Brown's work, which appeared in 1982.

The publication of this work at this time is therefore somewhat of an oddity. The original setting in time of Schnackenburg's commentary is revealed by frequent references to works published in the early 1950s as "recent." Perhaps it is best to follow the lead of the publisher who labels the work as marking the conclusion of an era that saw three great Johannine scholars, Rudolf Bultmann, Raymond Brown and Rudolf Schnackenburg, each publish major commentaries, first on the fourth gospel and subsequently on the Johannine epistles. One's collection is now complete.

The work includes, as does Schnackenburg's three-volume commentary on John's gospel, substantial excursuses on topics such as "fellowship with God," "gnosticism," "the antichrist," or "being born of God." The discussion of introductory matters is erudite and fairly evenhanded. Generally, however, Schnackenburg's rather cautious discussions leave the reader unsatisfied owing to their noncommittal stance. Schnackenburg also gives insufficient consideration to the possibility of common authorship of the fourth gospel and the Johannine epistles. He manages to speak very favorably of the possibility of common authorship and yet ends up by rejecting it without adequate discussion, much less convincing argumentation. The external evidence and the apparent claim of eyewitness testimony in passages such as 1 John 1:1-4 would appear to call for more serious consideration. Likewise, Schnackenburg's discussion of whether the gospel or the epistles were written first is unduly brief and ends rather abruptly.

Overall, this commentary has primarily documentary value for the contemporary reader. One is left longing for a fresh treatment that rises above the stale, and at times dogmatic, brand of German scholarship that dominated the first half of the twentieth century, a treatment that would be more open to the possibility of Johannine authorship, more pastoral and relevant in its orientation, and one that would incorporate recent linguistic advances in Biblical scholarship such as verbal aspect theory (cf. e.g. Schnackenburg's claim that the aorist in 2:19 indicates that false teachers left the community at a particular point in time). Will D. A. Carson's forthcoming NICNT commentary be this kind of work?

Despite its limitations, Schnackenburg's treatment probably still deserved to be translated. For my part, I prefer the commentaries by Stott or Marshall. Finally, if one of Schnackenburg's works should have been translated, why not the fourth supplementary volume to his John commentary? This might have been the better and more strategic choice.

Andreas Köstenberger
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

Issues in Dispensationalism. Edited by Wesley R. Willis and John R. Master. Chicago: Moody, 1994, 271 pp., \$24.95.

The bolded and capitalized back cover blurb of *Issues in Dispensationalism* is a snippet from Charles Ryrie's "Introductory Word." Although intended to allay fears, this blurb quickly informs the reader of the serious situation old-line dispensationalism is facing: "Dispensationalism Dying? Hardly—Read on." Despite Ryrie's confidence, in the late 1980s a number of dispensational works written both by theologians (e.g. Wayne House, *Dominion Theology*) and by populists (e.g. Dave Hunt, *Whatever Happened to Heaven?*) admitted to the declining influence of historic dispensationalism.

Traditional dispensational theologians (e.g. Charles Ryrie and John Walvoord) are feeling the effects of the radical changes within dispensationalism and of the relentless assaults from without. Classic dispensationalism—as the older position is becoming known—is undergoing a paradigm shift. The shift is so radical that Ryrie (pp. 21–23) and Walvoord (p. 88) deny the new view is even dispensationalism. The changes represent systemic alterations that would have been declared “liberal” in tendency twenty years ago. These transformations have been presented to a wider audience in a recent important article in *Christianity Today* by Dallas Seminary’s Darrell Bock (“Charting Dispensationalism,” September 12, 1994, pp. 26–29). The major thrust of *Issues in Dispensationalism* is directed toward this newer form of dispensationalism, promoted by such theologians as Darrell Bock, Craig Blaising and Robert Saucy.

Furthermore, Reformed critiques of dispensationalism have continued putting stress on the system’s foundations since O. T. Allis’ monumental *Prophecy and the Church* (1945). *Issues in Dispensationalism* even makes special note of the small but growing anti-dispensational influence of the Reconstructionist branch of Reformed theology.

This composite work is not intended as a primer on dispensationalism. Rather, it is a defense of key issues that have been historically associated with dispensationalism, issues defining what Ryrie calls “normative dispensationalism” (p. 9). Editors Willis and Master note in their Preface: “At one time those who described themselves as ‘dispensationalists’ generally agreed upon the meaning of the term *dispensationalism*. However, today there seem to be wide differences of opinion concerning key features of the system” (p. 11).

Ryrie’s opening chapter, “Update on Dispensationalism,” bristles with the tension in the intramural dispensational debate: Progressive dispensationalism is an “aberration” (p. 20), an “abandonment” of dispensational principles (p. 21). In discussions with covenant theologians “most of the ‘give’ is from dispensationalists and not from covenant people” (p. 24). Walvoord charges that progressive dispensationalism “is built on a foundation of sand” and is an “innovation” (p. 90). Zane Hodges, well known for promoting minority viewpoints, bemoans: “Were it not for the fact that serious men have proposed this view [regarding David’s throne in Acts 2], it might well be dismissed out of hand” (p. 174). His polemical disdain is seen in his use of “thin air,” “shocked,” and other such emotion-laden terminology.

Chapters in the book include the following: Thomas Ice’s “Dispensational Hermeneutics” and Charles Dyer’s “Biblical Meaning of ‘Fulfillment.’” Both of these are defenses of literalism. Dyer’s is easily the superior of the two. Ice’s inadvertently concedes ground to the progressives by allowing additives to simple literalism.

Walvoord’s “Biblical Kingdoms Compared and Contrasted” attempts an answer to the progressive dispensational acceptance of the presence of the initial stage of the Davidic kingdom within the Church age. One surprising concession made by Walvoord is that the mystery form of the kingdom established in the NT was not “clearly revealed” in the OT. In his earlier works he taught that it was absolutely “hidden from view as far as Old Testament revelation is concerned” (*The Church in Prophecy*, p. 27).

Two chapters are given to special consideration of Israel’s distinctiveness in the plan of God: John Master’s “The New Covenant” and Arnold Fruchtenbaum’s “Israel and the Church.” Master attempts a defense of what some deem classic dispensationalism’s Achilles’ heel: Jeremiah’s new covenant, which by all appearances seems to find fulfillment in the Church. Master virtually accepts the outlandish notion, demanded by the classic dispensational system, of two new covenants. Fruchtenbaum’s chapter simply rehashes S. Lewis Johnson’s “Paul and ‘the Israel of God’” (1986). Out of twenty-one footnotes, sixteen are from Johnson.

Other chapters discuss Daniel's seventy weeks (chap. 7), Acts 2 (chap. 8), already/not-yet prophetic fulfillment (chap. 9), the rapture (chaps. 10–11), and imminency (chap. 12). The chapter on imminency wisely warns against date-setting, a temptation that is irresistible among dispensational populists such as Hal Lindsey.

Unfortunately, the book contains no subject or name indexes and is crippled by a sparse two-page Scripture index.

For those interested in eschatological issues and particularly the paradigm shift within dispensationalism, this is an important contribution to the debate. Its very existence is an important admission of the troubled waters of dispensationalism, once considered to be monolithic and providing a simple, unified, and understandable approach to Scripture. This work strongly indicates that in future studies references to "dispensationalism" will have to be qualified as either "progressive" or "classic." Having read much on both sides of the classic/progressive debate, I find myself being more impressed with the case for progressive dispensationalism than with the fading classic version.

Kenneth L. Gentry, Jr.
Christ College, Greenville, SC

Church History: An Introduction to Research, Reference Works, and Methods. By James E. Bradley and Richard A. Muller. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995, 236 pp., \$19.00.

Bradley and Muller, both experienced senior scholars in the field of Church history, have produced an important introduction to the discipline. Designed primarily for advanced graduate students, this work is helpful for anyone working in the field. The authors cover a wide array of topics including a history of the development of Church history, an analysis of the problem of historical meaning, a "how to" section for research in primary and secondary sources, and a section on the craft of writing the scholarly article and dissertation. The authors also include a chapter devoted to the work of the Church historian as a scholar and as a teacher. The accompanying bibliography provides a comprehensive list of sources for further research. Lastly, they provide helpful suggestions of how the ecclesiastical historian can make use of computer technology.

The authors argue for a revision in the traditional approach to the history of Christianity to include both social and intellectual history. They praise recent developments in gender studies and quantitative analysis that have served to broaden our understanding of the past.

They also assert that the "Christian" historian should strive for personal detachment from his or her subject in order to reach the most objective conclusions possible. They see strict sectarianism as a severe handicap that can render ineffective the work of historical research and writing. It is extremely difficult, if not impossible, they argue, to discern the providential hand of God throughout the ages. The problem I see with the desire to achieve such a level of objectivity for the Christian is that it can leave one with a methodological atheism. Bradley and Muller conclude that Christian and secular historians should come to the same conclusions based on the evidence.

The importance of history for Muller and Bradley is not that it teaches valuable lessons. This is the proper domain of ethics, not history. Furthermore, it is not the task of the historian to assign values to events of the past, but rather to analyze

events in historical context. Muller and Bradley point out that much of history has been lost because of the lack of records. People living in ancient times knew far more about the intricate details of their world than any historian could possibly discern. What they lacked, however, was the means to interpret the implications of the events of their times. Church history adds depth and perspective and helps deepen our theological and religious understanding.

This book is designed primarily to help the research student to find and narrow a topic, to distinguish between primary and secondary sources and to begin the process of composing the master's thesis or doctoral dissertation. The authors also discuss the proper way for the junior professor to begin organizing lectures and to begin the arduous process of publishing. They dispel the common notion that a good teacher is probably not a good scholar and vice versa. Both avenues work hand in hand. They make an interesting comment on how to write a monograph. No one writes a book, they say, but pieces of a book. Bit by bit, as one composes sections of a major work, the pieces of the puzzle come together. This is encouraging to those who at times feel overwhelmed by the process.

This important book is must reading for the graduate student in history or in any theological discipline. It can be used for a theological research methods class, for a historiography seminar, or by the graduate student or junior faculty member. For the more advanced scholar who might not be fully up to speed on the use of computers, this book is invaluable.

Martin I. Klauber

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School and Barat College, Lake Forest, IL

Eriugena: East and West. Edited by Bernard McGinn and Willemien Otten. Notre Dame: Notre Dame University, 1994, 290 pp., \$39.95.

When referring to the Middle Ages, scholars should abandon any lingering use of the label "Dark Ages." New studies have produced fresh and re-examined evidence illustrating a resilient yet struggling Europe in greater contact with the outside than traditionally conjectured. *Eriugena: East and West* conveys "how the great Irish scholar (John Scottus Eriugena) of the ninth century represented a special, even unique, meeting place between eastern and western Christian thought during the Early Middle Ages" (p. 1).

The first chapter, by M. McCormick, entitled "Diplomacy and the Carolingian Encounter with Byzantium down to the Accession of Charles the Bald," explores Eriugena's exposure to the language and patology of the Greeks. The demise of the Roman empire, not to mention the philosophical, theological and political conflicts between Greeks and Latins, created an ever-deepening division of east and west. Yet McCormick demonstrates that embassies, conducted over a period of eighty years and involving over one thousand people, created a unique atmosphere for dialogue. Eriugena was one of many scholars brought from Ireland, Northumbria and elsewhere as a participant in the "Carolingian Renaissance." He attempted to capitalize on this opportunity for reunification by creating a dialectic of eastern and western patristic sources.

In chapter two J. Meyendorff tempers McCormick by emphasizing insurmountable divisions. He refers to the anti-Byzantine bias of the Carolingians and the Greek

view of the Franks as barbarians. Eriugena was one of many whose attempted reconciliations failed. Meyendorff suggests that Eriugena himself viewed eastern theology as superior to Latin thought. Finally, it was Eriugena's isolation that caused his incomplete knowledge of Greek theology and his subsequent Neoplatonic heresy.

Further chapters provide the particulars of Eriugena's work. In chap. 3, W. Otten rejects the source-critical approach of many Eriugenian studies and argues for a focus on authorial intent. He discerns a deliberate, complex mix of east and west in the composition of Eriugena's writings that exhibits a consistent dialectical program.

J. Marler and G. d'Onofrio explore the intricacies of *auctoritas* (authority) in Eriugena. Marler asserts that Eriugena rejected Scripture as a final *auctoritas* while reason (wisdom) was that which preceded authority. From this stance Eriugena freely worked with various Greek and Latin sources. d'Onofrio denies that Eriugena had such a view of Scripture. He perceives a low view of human authority in Eriugena though the Church fathers remained reliable as rightly trained believers. Their authority, when Scripture was silent, was to be accepted. Of course patristic contradictions provided a difficulty that, before the time of Abelard when *auctoritas* began to be weighted, could only be treated as human limitations in reason. For the Neoplatonic Eriugena truth had an *ousia* that was unknowable to creatures. Hence, divisions in eastern and western patristic opinion could be synthesized.

D. Carabine, J. McEvoy and J. Pépin explore the specifics. Carabine discusses the use of light, cloud and darkness symbolism in the *Periphyseon*. This metaphor suggests not only an ascent into light, but for Eriugena also the ascent from created light into a darkness representing human limitedness and divine transcendence. In his usage Eriugena is closest to Augustine. McEvoy states that in the notion of "measure," a concept representing the orderliness of the universe, Eriugena draws from the Apocrypha, Augustine and the Greek fathers. Eriugena's originality includes the idea that Pythagoras would have found himself confirmed by the Old Testament because true philosophy agrees with true religion. Pépin explores the Irishman's exegesis of Scripture as it related to anthropology and asserts that here he is indebted most to Augustine and the Latin/Carolingian tradition.

Concluding chapters, written by W. Beierwaltes, D. Duclow and E. Perl, focus exclusively on Greek influences. Beierwaltes outlines the Neoplatonic tradition of "unity" and "plurality" in relation to the Christian doctrine of the Trinity. Though he does not discuss the *filioque* controversy per se, Beierwaltes illustrates Eriugena's agreement with the Latin formula and Augustine as well as the influence of Greek, Dionysian thought on the inner-interrelatedness of the Trinity. Beierwaltes does not comment on the success of this dialectic.

Duclow illustrates important differences between Eriugena and Dionysius regarding angelic hierarchy. Though Dionysius taught that no intermediary existed between God and the contemplative, he interpreted Isaiah's experience with the coal-laden seraph in terms of hierarchy, God's light being filtered through various mediators. Eriugena claimed participation of all created beings in the light of God. However, Eriugena also ventured into more radical claims of ultimate entry into God. It was due to its near-panteism that his *Periphyseon* was later condemned. Perl's related chapter discusses Eriugena's imprecise knowledge of Byzantine Christology causing a misunderstanding of nature and hypostasis with a separation of the human and divine natures of Christ. In the end, Eriugena's dialectic and its heretical elements represent the opportune interaction as well as the insurmountable gulfs between Greeks and Latins during the Carolingian period.

Kenneth R. Calvert
Hillsdale College, Hillsdale, MI

Revelation, Redemption, and Response: Calvin's Trinitarian Understanding of the Divine-Human Relationship. By Philip Watkin Butin. New York: Oxford, 1995, 132 pp., \$39.95.

What does one say about a book whose endnotes and bibliography (91 pp.) total two-thirds of the argued text (132 pp.) and whose price probably puts it out of the range of readers who would profit most from it (pastors)? Several things: (1) It belongs in college, university, and seminary libraries. (2) It is exhaustively documented with endnotes bristling with informative and insightful commentary. (3) It is well argued.

Himself a pastor, Butin argues that "from the beginning, Calvin understood the entire movement of God's redemptive relationship with the elect believers who constitute the church according to an economic-trinitarian paradigm" (p. 38). Butin seeks to explain that "'the Trinity in its external operations' received a great deal more emphasis in Calvin's understanding of the divine-human relationship than did 'the Trinity in its internal relations.' . . . His Trinitarian approach reflected the practical, relational concern that motivated every aspect of his theology" (p. 39). Although it is now common knowledge that the most recent Calvin studies have rescued him from the false accusation that his God was an abstract, scholastic, metaphysical *ontos* who, if he feels at all, merely broods about his creation, Butin troubles to carefully and completely show from Calvin's own work, especially (but not only) from the 1559 *Institutes*, that he "understood epistemological access to the divine being to be exclusively through the 'lense' of God's economic-trinitarian operations with human beings, as revealed in scripture" (p. 41).

Emphasizing the doctrine of *perichoresis* throughout his own argument, Butin claims that Calvin's God is the ontological or immanent Trinity known through his (their?) operation in the people of God, the Holy Spirit assuring us of the truth of such a claim. This, of course, leaves Calvin (and Butin?) open to the charge of modalism, and also to the charge that Calvin was a quaternarian and not a trinitarian, if he taught that the three, who meet us personally in our lives, together express a fourth whom we know only in its economic or modal expression, the knowledge of which is secret, or at best very remote. However, Calvin declares: "Furthermore, this distinction (of persons) is so far from contravening the utterly simple unity of God as to permit us to prove from it that the Son is one God with the Father because he shares with the Father one and the same Spirit; and that the Spirit is not something other than the Father and different from the Son, because he is the Spirit of the Father and the Son. For in each hypostasis the whole divine nature is understood, with this qualification—that to each belongs his own particular quality. The Father is wholly in the Son, the Son wholly in the Father, even as he himself declares: 'I am in the Father, and the Father in me' " (Jn. 14:10)." That is to say, Calvin's doctrine of the Trinity *is* his doctrine of God. The Father is the basis of the divine-human relationship; the Son, the pattern; and the Holy Spirit, the dynamic. "The very possibility of any knowledge of God at all is predicated for Calvin on the premise of the divine self-revelation of God, as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit" (p. 121).

Butin is especially helpful and convincing in his final argument that the Holy Spirit enables the believer to participate in the life that the Trinity provides for the Church; Calvin wrote that we "cannot know by idle speculation what is the sacred and mystic union between us and Him and again between Him and the Father. . . . He is said to be in us because He plainly shows by the efficacy of His Spirit that He is the author and cause of our life" (p. 99). Concerning the sacramental life of believers, Butin claims that in the *Institutes* "Calvin saw even his discussion of the external means of grace in Book IV—the more concrete collective and communal realities of the church, the sacraments, and civil government—in terms of the perichoretically

variegated yet unified action of the triune God" (p. 97). His analysis of preaching, baptism, and eucharist in trinitarian terms will be especially helpful to the pastor-reader. Altogether, Butin's study is a remarkable example of theological thinking in the pastoral mode. What other mode *is* there?

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

Dancing Alone: The Quest for the Orthodox Faith in the Age of False Religions. By Frank Schaeffer. Brookline: Holy Cross Orthodox, 1994, 327 pp., \$20.00.

Schaeffer claims no scholarly pretensions, historical or theological. Rather, he writes as an evangelist, a convert to the Orthodox faith from evangelical Protestantism, one who wishes to share that journey with others in the hope that they too will see the errors of evangelicalism and convert to the true faith. In principle, evangelicals should not object to such an enterprise, for much of our own writing is of that same genre.

Schaeffer ought to know the genre of evangelicalism. As the son of Francis Schaeffer, it is part of his heritage. Unfortunately, he botches it miserably. While he claims that his "reasons for becoming Orthodox are described in this book," he in fact gives no reasons at all, either for his own conversion or for why anyone else should consider the Orthodox option. Schaeffer's effort leaves aside his own personal testimony in favor of a poorly researched and gracelessly presented diatribe against Protestantism.

In substance *Dancing Alone* is one long, slippery-slope argument. He argues that all the problems of modernity are the direct historical result of the Great Schism of the papacy from the east in 1054. Rejecting the divinely-ordained authority of a bishopric that could trace its historical lineage back to the apostles and Christ (p. 77), the west created not only an alternative Church but also an alternative religion (pp. 59 ff.). Stripping the faith of all mystery and holy awe, the west fell prey to all the evils of Augustinianism: rationalist epistemology and theological reflection; unilateral predestination; fatalistic hamartiology; and "a juridical, vengeful and capricious god-devil" (p. 72) in place of the Biblical God.

The western revolt against ordained ecclesiastical authority came to full rebellious maturity in the Reformation's rejection of ancient ecclesiastical tradition and doctrine. While the Great Schism was a blow to apostolic succession, the Reformation was far more serious, Schaeffer contends, for it sought not merely to debunk ecclesiastical authority but also to destroy all Church unity and discipline, sacramental worship, the veneration of images, and the integrity of tradition (p. 77). As such, the Reformation was not reformist at all, but thoroughly revolutionary. It was a revolt against God's Church, a revolt against authority, a revolt against history (pp. 41, 43).

The Reformation created the environment that inevitably led to the end of Christian culture. If you are looking for the real culprit behind the death of beauty and art in modern culture, the truly malevolent force behind the evils of materialism, secularism, denominationalism, subjectivism, environmentalism, rampant crime, educational chaos, big government, the welfare state, abortion, feminism, sex education, the furor over homosexual rights, adolescent disobedience, and deconstructionism, Schaeffer has the answer: The Reformation did it. Martin Luther and John Calvin could teach the serpent a thing or two about chaos.

Hasty conclusion, questionable cause, *post hoc ergo propter hoc*, contrary-to-fact conditional, rhetorical question, false dilemma, emotional language, sweeping gener-

alization—all of that and more characterize this text, and Schaeffer has not even begun with character assassination. Luther and Calvin were not only wrong, they were evil. Calvin, at least Schaeffer's Calvin, was a coldly logical purveyor of fatalistic soteriology, scholastic dichotomies, and coercive social ethics, a man who championed the very worst elements of Augustinian theology (pp. 82–83). Interested in nothing but his own dogmatic opinion and possessed of a “shamelessly self-righteous mindset,” the “tyrannical inquisitor” of Geneva set himself up as a new pope and codified a “very dreary, self-righteous religion . . . called Puritanism” (pp. 84–85). This sort of historical description and theological analysis is not exceptional in the book. It is the normal fare.

Schaeffer is no scholar, but he is a very mad and frightened man, mad at modernity and frightened by history. He has a lot to say about “history,” but his use of the term is thoroughly ahistorical. The Protestant problem, according to Schaeffer, is its subjectivist eclipse of history. Protestantism stands for the triumph of the individual, subjective self over objective history and authoritative tradition. The best and truest statement of the book is Schaeffer's assertion that “if Christianity is true, then its truth exists independently of our feelings about it. It is rooted in history, not simply in theological ideas or subjective feelings” (p. 192). Yet, Schaeffer's articulation of historical truth itself lacks the stuff of history.

Truth, according to Schaeffer, is by its very nature transcendent, eternal, changeless (pp. 3–4). Truth is not discovered; it can only be received. And the one and only authoritative mediator of truth is the Orthodox Church and its theological tradition: “In the Church of the ages the rejoinder to critics, ‘This is how it has always been done’, is in fact a legitimate answer. The Church holds that certain truths are changeless and cannot be improved upon” (p. 158). Ever at the mercy of historical flux, Protestantism is always seeking to update itself, to make its doctrines more relevant, to tickle the ears of a narcissistic culture. “The outstanding and distinguishing feature of the historic Church,” however, “is its changelessness, its continuity, its faithfulness from age to age and its orderly, apostolic succession” (p. 150). Where Protestantism elevates novelty over continuity with tradition, the Orthodox Church supposedly preserves and defends those things that have been believed by all Christians everywhere, since the beginning (p. 200).

The guarantor of truth is the Orthodox Church, its unbroken apostolic succession, hierarchical authority, church order, and tradition. The truth vouchsafed to the Church is the theology of the ancient Church fathers, the Nicene Creed, and the decisions of the seven ecumenical councils. In these assertions Schaeffer has certainly lost all semblance of his Protestant roots. The unity and authority of the body of Christ and of God's saving revelation are not found in Jesus Christ or even in Scripture, but rather in the hierarchy of the Orthodox Church. Schaeffer's ecclesiocentrism is troubling enough, but his notion of history and tradition is positively mythological.

Like Schaeffer, I also belong to a creedal and confessional community, so in principle I have no problem with the idea that a confession is a legitimate way of opening up Scripture for the people of God. But surely it must be held that while the Creed interprets Scripture, it is finally more important that Scripture interpret the Creed. The Reformers were correct in their contention that Scripture alone is the key to God's saving revelation in Jesus Christ. Our creeds and confessions are our human and historical responses to the Word of God in Scripture.

Schaeffer's articulation of Orthodoxy suggests that the Creed functions as a fence against thinking rather than a guide for reflection. He speaks of the eastern theological tradition found in the movement from Nicea to Constantinople IV as a monolithic reality, a univocal thinking of God's thoughts after him. In response, I mention here but four of the more obvious problems with the notion of a single, static, authoritative tradition.

First, why should Christians affirm the tradition of the ancient councils? What makes them right? For his answer Schaeffer offers no reasonable argument. He merely apodictically alleges that they are the embodiment of truth itself. Yet typical of the caesaropapism of the east, all the ecumenical councils were convoked not by bishops, patriarch, or the rank and file within the Church, but by the emperor. And most were dominated by political wranglings and imperial machinations, a very strange way indeed for God to mediate changeless, decontextual doctrine. The Council of Nicea is a case in point. Constantine called the council not out of love for the truth but because he wished to use the Christian religion as a tool to unify his empire. The deal cut at Nicea was very much a political settlement. Hosius of Cordova's *homoiousios* clause had all the theological clarity of the sentence, "Those two women are wearing the same dress." Constantine might speak this way, but not Christ.

Second, even if one believes that Nicea *et al.* got it right, on what principle ought one separate the so-called ancient ecumenical councils from later theological decisions? Schaeffer might respond: the fact that they were ecumenical, that is to say, that they supposedly represented the entirety of the Church. But competent students of historical theology know that that is simply not true in every case. Nicea was a completely eastern council. While it was later affirmed by Rome, there was no Roman representation among the 318 bishops.

Schaeffer repeatedly charges Protestantism with being subjectivistic. Evidently holding human beings responsible for hearing and responding to the Word of God rather than blindly obeying an ecclesiastical hierarchy is subjectivistic. While the truth of the gospel is objective, it is true external to me; I must respond to it. I must respond just like the bishops of the Orthodox Church must respond, just like the Church fathers were called to respond. To call the theological determinations of Irenaeus objective and those of Michael Williams subjective is pure fantasy. Both are subject to Christ and to his Word.

Third, Schaeffer speaks of the tradition of the ancient Church as if it were a single, organic entity. But the reality is that there has always been a multiplicity of traditions within Christianity. The New Testament evidences the fact that there were many issues of doctrinal debate within the first-century Church. The contest between Judaism and Christianity, and between Jewish Christianity and Hellenistic Christianity, produced questions about the Judaizing of the gospel and the legitimacy of telling the gospel through a gnostic or docetic worldview. Even if one were to conclude that the writers of the New Testament answered such challenges from a consistent or unified perspective, that would not mean that there were not real differences, even major disagreements, between the New Testament authors. The gospel of John approaches Christology in a way very different from the synoptics. The two may be complementary, and I believe they are, but they are different, and the difference is more than style. The fathers present even more diversity, even disagreement. Tertullian's theology cannot be made to square with Origen's. Evidence forbids us to believe that Athanasius agreed with Athenagoras, Gregory the Great, and John Chrysostom on all important issues. And if the tradition, the fathers and the history of creedal development, is the proper interpreter of Scripture, who interprets the tradition? Are we not always forced to make responsible choices? It never appears to be legitimate that one merely acquiesce to the authority of a magisterium. Somewhere human beings must make interpretations and choices. Yet this very choosing is the definition of subjectivism according to Schaeffer.

Fourth, Schaeffer's absolutization of tradition in effect closes all doctrinal issues to Christian reflection. But neither Nicea nor Chalcedon spoke the last or definitive word on Christology. Truth is dynamic and contextual. One cannot learn that truth from Ni-

cea; one must go to the Jesus of the gospels. In fact, I think that one might easily accept the Jesus of the Niceno-Constantinopolitan tradition and miss Jesus of Nazareth. Quite simply, there is more to learn than the fathers and the councils can teach us.

Premature closure is not a mark of courage but its opposite. By romanticizing the past, which was never quite as pure or holy or honest as we imagine, and by demonizing the present by suggesting that God's Word and God's Spirit cannot speak to the present, the primordialist retreat always misrepresents and trivializes the issue in question. While engagement with the history of interpretation is certainly important in our seeking the truth, it is not all that is important. Answering a doctrinal question by way of Schaeffer's favorite phrases, "according to the Church," "according to the tradition," "according to the Fathers," is not an end, but only a beginning—an important beginning, but only a beginning.

I have dwelt on tradition in this review because it stands at the center of Schaeffer's polemic against Protestantism. According to Schaeffer, evangelicalism denies the authority of tradition; the tradition of the Orthodox Church is true; therefore evangelicalism is false. Schaeffer's syllogism is that simple. But we must not ignore the ecclesiocentrism that accompanies Schaeffer's static and ahistorical view of tradition: Evangelicalism is wrong because the Orthodox Church (not merely Orthodox doctrine) is right. "I realized that I had not been introduced to the historical Christian Church at all even though I had grown up in an informed, even 'intellectual' Evangelical Protestant home. Nor had I ever experienced the forms of sacramental worship that had been taken for granted by countless generations of Christians before the relatively recent Protestant revolution against history and tradition" (p. xviii).

Make no mistake, Schaeffer hates evangelical Protestantism. No dialogue is possible between Orthodoxy and evangelicalism because there is no church where there is no participation in the mystery of the Orthodox eucharistic meal (pp. 282, 308). Because it rejects the Orthodox liturgy, evangelical Protestantism is an "affront to the claims of the historical Church," and those who hold evangelical views participate not in the true supper but the "great and tragic sin" of Protestantism's rebellion against the true Christian faith. Pointing his polemical finger at Protestantism's rejection of Orthodox tradition, Schaeffer says that "theological theories are easier to manipulate than history." Yes, quite.

Finally, in response to Schaeffer's contention that Protestantism represents the end of Christian culture, I ask him to cite even one place on this planet where the Orthodox Church has presided over a truly Christian culture. In fact, I would like to know of even one country that is not both largely Orthodox and culturally backward. Every country in which Orthodoxy is the state church is also culturally secularist, ecclesiastically nominalistic, and religiously superstitious—every one.

Michael Williams
Dordt College, Sioux Center, IA

Ecumenical Faith in Evangelical Perspective. By Gabriel Fackre. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993, 230 pp., \$17.99 paper.

This volume draws together nine well-crafted essays that have appeared over the last ten years or so in various ecumenical or evangelical contexts. They are intended to serve "a missionary purpose" by demonstrating to ecumenicals the intellectual rigor and breadth of contemporary evangelical thought and to "show evangelicals that

ecumenicals have not completely overlooked or failed to engage evangelicals." They also serve to illustrate to evangelicals that there are those in the ecumenical movement who are committed to the proclamation of the gospel and the historic Christian faith as well as to the social/cultural mission of the Church and ecclesial unity. Fackre writes as one who embraces this evangelical ecumenical perspective.

The first part of the book deals with evangelical typology and serves to convey the considerable diversity that exists among those who call themselves evangelicals. Fackre begins with the difficult question of definition: What is an evangelical? He provides a useful and substantive definition grounded in, but not limited to, the sixteenth-century understanding of the term. Evangelicals are those who believe that the heart of the gospel is justification by grace through faith and that the sole authority for faith is Scripture. Currently, evangelicalism "refers to these same two accents as they have been radicalized and interiorized by the historic movements of Pietism, Wesleyanism, Puritanism, the Great Awakening, and modern revivalism." From these common roots and varied backgrounds modern evangelicals are characterized by an intense personal experience of justification, rigorous use of Scripture, and a piety accented by evangelistic fervor and strong moral codes. Concerning the various positions on Scripture that have been set forth by this diverse group, Fackre locates their commonality in the insistence that the Bible is the primary source for theology and life. The divergence of evangelical opinion resides in the various attempts to explain the nature of this primacy.

The second part of the book explores the boundaries between the evangelical and ecumenical communities. In this section, Fackre considers the use of Scripture in theology, narrative theology, the place of Israel in Christian faith, and evangelical catholicity. In his discussion of the nature of theology and the use of Scripture in the process of theological formulation, Fackre develops his position in the context of a narrative approach to theology, a Christological hermeneutic, and an appreciation for the insights of a variety of constituencies. While Scripture serves as the primary source for theology, it is interpreted in the context of the tradition of the Church and in dialogue with contemporary culture. He works this examination out by asking the questions: "Do traditional claims stand up under the scrutiny of what the Bible declares about Jesus Christ?" and "Are there new dimensions to inherited Christian doctrine not perceived in earlier formulations?" The historical setting of a particular time and place in which theology is done aids in these inquiries by offering a fresh vantage point from which limited and narrow understandings of faith can be exposed and enriched conceptions can be developed. However, this enterprise is carried on in the context of the heritage of the Church, which provides needed ballast in an age of relativism. Thus, while Christian doctrine is revisable it is not reversible for it "develops along the line of the trajectory that comes from its origins."

At the heart of the book is the chapter on evangelical catholicity, in which Fackre describes the contours of such a perspective drawing on themes from the Mercersburg theology and P. Schaff's address, "The Principle of Protestantism." Here catholicity stands over against the impulses of tribalism and sectarianism prevalent in modern culture and the Church. These are characterized by a tendency to associate fundamental Christian identity with loyalty to a particular subcommunity of the Christian tradition. Fackre contends that the necessary response to these trends is "evangelical catholicity." As catholic, this orientation takes seriously the imperative of unity and solidarity in the Church and among its various traditions. As evangelical, it is not marked by a reductionistic or institutional inclusivity with no self-critical principle, but rather by a commitment to the norms articulated during the Reformation: justification by grace through faith alone and the final authority of Scripture. This perspective means "the rebirth of theological conversation" among the various tradi-

tions for the purpose of mutual growth and correction, which will result in a “full-orbed” and “far richer grasp of the content of faith.” The final section consists of two essays on the work of C. F. H. Henry and D. Tracy concerning theological method.

This volume is exceptionally well written and is marked by a sincere desire to promote genuine Christian unity. Fackre does not seek such unity on the basis of a reductionistic approach to faith that marginalizes the tenets of orthodox Christianity. Rather, he calls for serious dialogue based on the premise that both constituencies have things to learn from each other about the nature and content of orthodoxy. Dialogue of this sort is often frustrating to participants from both groups as well as risky, arousing the suspicions of those in each group who believe that this sort of discourse implies a willingness to compromise on fundamental commitments. However, in spite of its challenges this evangelical-ecumenical discussion is an essential part of the theological agenda for those in both camps who take seriously both the truth of the gospel and the unity of the Church. Fackre is to be commended for his ongoing efforts to promote this dialogue and for the winsomeness of his approach in these essays. They provide a fresh perspective on a number of important questions and should serve as a stimulus for continuing the conversation between evangelicals and ecumenicals.

John R. Franke
Biblical Theological Seminary, Hatfield, PA

Not a Chance: The Myth of Chance in Modern Science & Cosmology. By R. C. Sproul. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994, n.p.

Because we are interested in evangelical theology, perhaps a good place to begin reviewing this book is at its most theological section, where Sproul discusses the Trinity and the incarnation. He raises these topics in the context of showing how the formulations of physicists must not violate the law of noncontradiction. As examples of what he means, Sproul discusses how logic applies to these two essential doctrines. In doing so he also shows why modern conservative theologians are questioning the nature of the role of logic in theology.

Sproul asserts: “The Church Fathers were careful not to formulate the nature of God in contradictory terms” (p. 85). Because the Trinity does not mean that God is one person in three persons, or one essence in three essences, the formula “is not inherently or analytically irrational.” Sproul concludes: “He (God) is unified in one essence, but diversified in three *persona* [*sic*]” (p. 86).

So where did the singular personal pronoun come from? If an essence and a person are “a different thing,” as Sproul emphatically insists, then how can he refer to God’s essence in personal terms? Should he not have said “*It* is unified in one essence”? I am glad he did not use the impersonal pronoun because I think that would be blasphemous—and I suspect Sproul thinks so too, logical or not.

The issue gets even more cloudy when Sproul discusses the incarnation, for there he identifies the term “essence” in the trinitarian formula with the term “nature” in the formula for the incarnation. But if a “nature” is the same as an “essence,” then how can the trinitarian formula be trinitarian and not tritheistic? After all, I have a human nature, as do my wife and Sproul. Are we a trinity?

I mention this to give some idea of my ambiguous feelings for the book. Sproul seems to be saying some things that are true and that need to be said, but saying them in a way that leads to saying some things that are not true.

Besides arguing *for* logic as “the police of science” as well as theology (p. 126), Sproul argues *against* chance. “The mere existence of chance,” he writes, “is enough to rip God from his cosmic throne” (p. 3). Sproul goes on to deny chance’s very existence: “Chance is not an entity. It is not a thing that has power to affect other things” (p. 6). Sproul laments that when we say a thing happened “by chance,” we inadvertently give chance “instrumental power” when in fact that power comes from whatever cause actually made the thing happen (p. 7). A flipped coin may come up heads “by chance,” but the result is caused by the force of a person’s thumb, air current, gravity, etc. Because modern scientists and cosmologists have ascribed to chance real existence and causative power, “the very integrity, indeed the very possibility of science” is at risk (p. xiv).

While Sproul’s case against the “existence” of chance is fine, it does not seem to do much for him. It is true, after all, that a child’s fear of “the dark” is probably a fear of concealed or unknown threats, but that hardly makes the word inaccurate. Likewise, when things are said to happen “by chance,” it usually means that they happen because of a coincidence of unknown, unpredictable, and impersonal forces. Because Sproul acknowledges that things do happen by coincidence, his critique does not seem too radical. Cosmologists, as far as I can tell, could simply clarify their language and continue to promulgate the same message. The world would still be chance-ruled because things would still be said to happen without anyone intending they would happen or being able to predict them.

Furthermore, it is not at all clear that the worldview posited by Sproul is any closer to the Christian position than what he is refuting. He claims that modern cosmologists are presenting the universe as irrational because they say that things happen “by chance”—that is, for no reason at all. But Sproul’s mechanistic alternative of impersonal cause-effect relationships that explain everything that happens does not seem to lead to theism. There were plenty of atheists in the world after Newton and before Einstein.

Sproul’s attempt to rescue himself by claiming that the world necessarily requires a “self-existent” being to start the whole process of cause and effect does not seem plausible (though I certainly agree that God is self-existent and necessary). This is especially evident in Sproul’s seemingly unthinking dismissal of B. Russell’s position that the world is an infinite regress of a series of finite causes. “That option is,” responds Sproul, “simply a thinly disguised or camouflaged form” of saying the cosmos is self-created (p. 138). Perhaps this sentence is as self-evident to others as it is to Sproul, who makes a big deal about the difference between self-creation (logically impossible) and self-existence (logically possible), but as written it makes no sense to me.

Indeed, Sproul’s affirmation of impersonal cause-effect forces seems to bolster the idea of a “chance” world. After all, things happen by chance when they are the result of impersonal forces—unintended consequences are always “by chance.” To the extent that our knowledge will never be exhaustive of all reality, men will always deal with what they call “blind chance.” The only alternative, as I see it, is to say that these forces are not impersonal, but are the creations of God (or the personal actions of God, depending on how one defines providence). I do not think Sproul’s self-existent first cause does the trick.

Of course, Sproul is right in seeing modern cosmology’s deification of “chance” as a challenge to the Christian faith, as well as an opportunity to challenge the modern world. Hopefully, this first effort will lead to further discussion on the matter.

Mark Horne
Franklin, TN

Holy Scripture: Revelation, Inspiration and Interpretation. By Donald G. Bloesch. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1994, 384 pp., \$24.99.

The anticipation with which I approached the reading of this book turned, at least in measure, to frustration. In this the second of the projected seven-volume *Christian Foundations*, it seems that Bloesch has sought to walk the *via media* between what he perceives to be the theological pitfalls of fundamentalism and liberalism on Holy Scripture. This is the dialectical structuring found on almost every page. Yet Bloesch does far more as he endeavors to lay bare and point the way into the twenty-first century on this truly foundational issue for the Church of Jesus Christ, evangelical, catholic and reformed, from a position much informed by his own Reformed pietism and emphases in neo-orthodoxy.

Though *Holy Scripture* is comprised of nine developmental chapters, the book actually falls into two parts. The first four chapters, which focus on the current crisis in Biblical authority, the nature or meaning of revelation and the meaning of Scriptural inspiration, set forth Bloesch's theological and epistemological bases, including two (of his five) stimulating and helpful appendices. The second half of the work builds from these bases to deal with questions more immediately related to the intended effect and nature of Scripture in, of and to the world. Herein Bloesch's timely discussion of issues is elucidated in ways that are usually accurate, useful and, at crucial points, somewhat disturbing. Included are Scripture and the Church, the hermeneutical problem, the continuing effect of Bultmann, the Bible and myth, and the question of the nature of truth. While this second half contains much that is excellent in every chapter, it is upon the first four foundational chapters that we will focus discussion. Here what appears disturbing or questionable throughout the work has its grounding.

In the early chapters on Biblical authority, revelation and inspiration, Bloesch makes it clear that he intends a unity or unification of Word-Scripture and Spirit-Scripture, which are all too often left separated. Bloesch's healing intention extends not only to the relatedness and expression of what God has disclosed but also to those parties within the believing Church separated over these issues. Bloesch understands God's revelation to be objective (in the sense emphasized by Barth) and to refer not only to God's self-disclosure in Jesus Christ but to the dynamic and effectual meaning and significance of such. Bloesch, in his own way, affirms verbal inspiration of Scripture by the Holy Spirit.

Yet for all this, I was regularly frustrated (as well as oft delighted) by much of Bloesch's revelational-bibliological discussion. I shall mention only a few points of concern. Bloesch creates what is largely a straw man of "fundamentalism," forcing such to assert things that this reviewer has never heard and that most would surely disaffirm so that Bloesch's own position can claim the title "true evangelical." In the very way that he lightly chides Rogers and McKim for inadequately expressing the bibliological views of both the fathers and Reformers, Bloesch too seeks to underline minor points to the end that he has Augustine, Calvin, Luther, and the Puritans (among others) apparently disaffirming the full truthfulness of Scripture and the view that Scripture, by the Spirit, *is* the Word of God in written form. Further, Bloesch does little actual theologizing and, with regard to exegesis, there is none to be found. Rather, he regularly drops concise position statements at crucial places in the texts. Of signal importance is that while Bloesch criticizes "neo-Orthodoxy" for a Nestorian view of Scripture (fundamentalism for a docetic view), he makes it clear that his position, despite some advance, is almost wholly formed by Barth, Brunner, Forsyth and, at points, Küng. This reviewer has much appreciation for the thought of Barth, but a formative role given to Barth's theology creates problems. As a result, Bloesch's position on Word and Scripture is almost as "Nestorian" as that variously expressed

in neo-orthodoxy, but, additionally, it is also “adoptionist.” Because of an underlying tendency toward split thinking—indeed, dualism—Bloesch cannot allow that Scripture *is* the Word of God. The result is similar to what Thiselton has critiqued as “Word magic.” Admittedly, “Word of God” is used with much contextual variety in Scripture. Scripture is not the Word of God in the same sense or at the same level as Christ the Word, he who is by nature the eternal self-disclosure of God. Also, Scripture is the God-given witness to Christ. The Scriptures, by the work of the Spirit via inspiration, in, of, from and to Christ, are derivatively the Word of God. But by God’s grace they *are* the Word of God. It is at this crucial place that Bloesch, like Barth, Brunner *et al.*, fall into a dichotomous way of conceptualizing the Word in a neo-Platonic fear that an affirmation of such historicity will tarnish the Word.

All of this is not to say that it is not a fine work. In many ways Bloesch has given us (and is in the process of bringing forth in volumes to come) much that is profitable, the heart of many years of effective theological reflection. So much of what Bloesch says will be (or at least ought to be) received by students, theologians and leaders in evangelicalism. But I have deep concerns about issues at the very basis of his project that might keep it from becoming all that some, including myself, thought it would be.

John D. Morrison
Liberty University, Lynchburg, VA

Evil and the Evidence for God: The Challenge of John Hick’s Theodicy. By R. Douglas Geivett. Philadelphia: Temple University, 1993, 276 pp., \$44.95/\$18.95.

This book evidences Geivett’s expertise in philosophy while addressing an extremely important theological topic: the relationship between (1) evidence for the existence of God and (2) the problem of evil. One purpose of the book is to critique J. Hick’s theodicy. But the scope of the book extends well beyond a mere extended position review.

Geivett does not dive immediately into Hick’s view of theodicy. In fact, one might say that a critique of Hick is not his main point. This book intends to set forth an appropriate response to the problem of evil from within the Augustinian tradition. Geivett begins by discussing the problem of evil for Christian theology and then by summarizing several positions from two competing traditions in Christian theodicy: the Augustinian (which Augustine, Aquinas, Leibniz, and Geivett follow) and the Irenaean (a form of which Hick follows).

The second portion of the book, accounting for almost half its pages, addresses religious epistemology, or inquiry into the justification of belief in God, utilizing natural theology. “A major thesis of this book is that an adequate response to the problem of evil depends upon the possibility of natural theology, or of providing good evidence for the existence of God” (p. xi). Geivett endeavors to provide such evidence using modern scientific data and the existence of a nonnatural reality to show that God not only exists but is personal, powerful, and good. Once Geivett’s natural theology is established, evil fits within the system rather than being its conqueror. According to Geivett, the existence of God and the problem of evil are related but logically separate. If one tackles the former (as the Augustinian tradition proposes), then the latter’s force diminishes significantly.

Hick’s position is not ignored. While addressing various topics Geivett discusses Hick along the way. Nevertheless, it is not until the third section that he directly critiques the bulk of Hick’s position. Hick advocates that God’s purpose for evil is to

shape *Homo sapiens* into humans. *Homo sapiens* evolved from lower life forms with a propensity for self-serving attitudes. Evil pushes them to seek others' good and God's will. This soul-making process may extend beyond this life through a modified version of reincarnation.

This book is valuable for several reasons. In a day when many are evaluating Hick's theology, this book addresses one specific (and important) aspect of Hick's work, critiques it carefully, proposes that the orthodox view is better, and justifies that proposal from a rigorous philosophical viewpoint. Second, in a day when many are abandoning natural theology in favor of alternative methods of religious epistemology (cf. Geivett and Sweetman, *Contemporary Perspectives on Religious Epistemology* [Oxford, 1992]), Geivett offers a thoroughly modern and plausible summary of evidence for the existence of the personal God of Christian orthodoxy. Third, although this is not the first book I would reach for when teaching or investigating the problem of evil, it is a helpful resource to assure one that the order of things is important: (1) Establish the existence of God as separate from the problem of evil, (2) show that evil does not contradict anything previously established.

I would not recommend this text for entry-level philosophers or theologians. Its focus is so narrow that this book works best when one is concentrating on Hick, natural theology, or theodicy. Rarely does a novice venture into the combination of those three. This book does, and does it well. It is, therefore, valuable for that purpose.

Matthew A. Cook
Faith Bible Church, Millersburg, OH

Teach Us to Pray: Prayer in the Bible and in the World. Edited by D. A. Carson. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1990, 362 pp., \$14.95 paper.

Few aspects of Christian faith receive as much popular attention, and as little scholarly analysis, as prayer. Bookstore shelves are crammed with prayer guides, journals, plans, and helps, together with devotional, inspirational and "how-to" volumes. Rarely, however, does a theology of prayer or any other serious work on the subject appear. Calvin's section on prayer in his *Institutes* remains the classic theological interpretation. F. Heiler's *Das Gebet*, published in 1917, is still the best phenomenological account of prayer. The works of Buttrick, Hallesby, Forsyth, and Barth still bear notice; but, with the notable exception of *The Struggle of Prayer* by Bloesch, a contemporary, scholarly, and pious study of prayer does not exist. With the publication of *Teach Us to Pray*, however, evangelicals have available a fine piece of work—scholarly but not pedantic, pious but not sentimental.

Teach Us to Pray is the third in a series of publications emerging from the Faith and Church Study Unit of the Theological Commission of the World Evangelical Fellowship, all edited by Carson and published by Baker. The two previous studies focused on Biblical interpretation and the Church, with studies forthcoming on "justification" and "worship." In all its forty years, however, the WEF may not have published a book more important than this one. It helps to fill the lacuna in serious theological reflection on prayer; yet it is more than a theology of prayer. In the words of the editor: "Certainly this book attempts to take the first steps toward a theology of prayer; certainly it seeks to engage other perspectives firmly and courteously. But our intention is that it should also serve as a call to pray. For what good is yet more talking and writing about prayer, if there is not more and better praying?" (p. 10).

Such a balance of theological reflection and exhortation is difficult to achieve, but for the most part *Teach Us to Pray* succeeds. In keeping with the evangelical ecumenism embraced by the WEF, the nineteen contributors include missionaries, indigenous scholars, and other evangelical leaders from all over the world: the Orient, Central and South America, Europe, Australia, Asia, and of course North America. Their twenty articles fall under four headings, reflecting the principal concerns of the Study Unit. Following Carson's introduction, the book begins with a Biblical theology of prayer (chaps. 2–8). E. Clowney summarizes this section around the theme of communion with God: the “personal God,” the “covenant God,” and the “triune God.”

Chapters 9–12 take up the relationship of prayer and spirituality. The articles examine Hindu, Buddhist, Islamic, and Roman Catholic spirituality and offer an evangelical critique of each. The authors summarize important aspects of spirituality in each religious tradition. But they also go beyond summary to refine Biblical conceptions of prayer in light of divergent spiritualities and to correct popular misconceptions about spirituality itself. The contributions by S. Sumithra (Hinduism, chap. 9) and by E. Nuñez (Roman Catholicism, chap. 12) are especially valuable.

Chapters 13–17 consider “Some Lessons in Prayer from the World-Wide Church.” These essays vary in quality. Articles on “prayer habits” in Korea and Latin America offer the kind of perspective one needs to interpret some of the surprising spiritual phenomena reported in those places. Likewise, R. Williams' article on prayer about the Puritans is a well-documented, insightful synopsis of that significant tradition. One could have wished for a more comprehensive look at prayer in China and Africa, however. The article on prayer in Africa consumes barely three pages.

The final section of the book (chaps. 18–20) is appropriately titled “The Challenge to Pray.” R. Shedd begins with a much-needed reminder that prayer-spirituality, rather than fulfilling job descriptions and following management techniques” (p. 289), forms the indispensable center of Biblical leadership. The book concludes with two “personal experiences of prayer.” Both manage to avoid the superficiality and hype that sometimes degrade testimonial literature. Each integrates theological grasp with personal devotion. They exemplify Calvin's dictum that prayer is the “soul of faith.”

Despite the unevenness one usually expects from edited volumes, *Teach Us to Pray* is not only worthwhile but also important. It would serve marvelously as a text for graduate students and upper-level undergraduates, but this is a book first of all for pastors and Christian leaders. If it is true (and it is) that Christians do not rise above their leaders, and if it is true (and it is) that no one rises above his or her praying, then the life of Christ's Church depends on prayer. This book, taken seriously, will inform us about prayer, and it will help us to do the thing itself.

C. Richard Wells
Beeson Divinity School, Birmingham, AL

Through No Fault of Their Own? The Fate of Those Who Have Never Heard. Edited by William V. Crockett and James G. Sigountos. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1991, 278 pp., \$15.95 paper.

This book contains essays by twenty evangelical authors (six from Alliance Theological Seminary) on several soteriological issues. Though the title of the book might lead one to assume that the essays all deal with the question of the fate of those who have never heard, such is not the case. Actually the book addresses a cluster of topics, some of which are related only as cousins to the unevangelized debate: classical

universalism, eternal conscious punishment versus annihilationism, whether persons can be saved if they never hear about Jesus, the salvific value of other religions, unitive pluralism (Hick and Knitter), and motivations for missions. These topics are scattered around the book as it is divided into four broad headings: theological questions, Biblical exegesis, missiological issues and concluding remarks.

M. Erickson leads off part 1 with a fine overview of the main issues and the important questions to be discussed. D. K. Clark's "Is Special Revelation Necessary for Salvation?" does an excellent job of explaining the logic of the two main evangelical responses to the question. T. R. Phillips' essay on the nature of hell defends the classic understanding of eternal conscious punishment and seems to assert that the unevangelized will endure such a fate. But how does one argue from the nature of hell to the fate of the unevangelized? Surely another premise is needed. Using the Ninevites as a case study, J. L. Walls inquires whether God will change his mind about hell and opt for universalism instead. He says God will not and ends on a pessimistic note regarding the unevangelized.

Part 2 begins with an examination of the "pagan saints" of the Old Testament by R. B. Widbin in which he concludes that the Old Testament allows for salvation outside Israel. J. N. Oswalt explores the prophets for an understanding of the nature of the mission Israel was to have to the nations. He affirms that it was only through Israel that the world would come to know Yahweh. But does this imply that none were saved who did not join Israel? He does not say. Against P. Knitter's argument that Jesus was actually a religious pluralist F. W. Schmidt says that Jesus saw himself as a particularist sent only to the Jews. C. H. Pinnock's essay on Acts 4:12 interprets this text to mean that Jesus has introduced the long-awaited "messianic" salvation (salvation in its fullness) and so it does not teach that all those who fail to hear about Jesus are doomed to hell. D. L. Bock offers a study of Acts 17:16-34 in which he claims that being a "God-fearer" is not the same as having saving faith. Hence, only those who come to faith in Jesus can be saved. A. B. Spencer examines Romans 1, concluding that the knowledge of God from general revelation only condemns and ends up being "bad news." D. Moo's study of Romans 2 follows the "hypothetical" interpretation and concludes that none are saved apart from knowledge of Jesus. S. McKnight uses the standard texts to defend eternal conscious punishment against annihilationism but fails to connect his chapter to the fate of the unevangelized. W. V. Crockett asserts that Paul rejected universalism because Paul spoke of people outside the boundary of salvation. For Crockett, the unevangelized comprise part of the group outside the pale of salvation.

T. D. Westergren heads part 3 with a fine essay criticizing the unitive pluralism of Hick and Knitter while defending an acceptable notion of tolerance. Against unitive pluralism C. Van Engen outlines a model for combining faith particularity (Jesus only) with cultural universality. H. M. Conn surveys the leading nonevangelical answers to whether other religions save. T. Tiéno provides a critique of D. Richardson's *Eternity in Their Hearts*. J. D. Ellenberger defends the view that persons might be saved apart from knowledge of Jesus against the charge that such a view destroys the motivation for missions. J. G. Sigountos argues that early Christians were open to Greek philosophy but not pagan religions.

In part 4, C. F. H. Henry argues that because God never planned on saving the entire human race, and because we all deserve hell, the question about the "fairness" of the unevangelized being automatically damned to hell is dubious. The concluding chapter by the editors highlights the fact that evangelicals are not of one mind regarding the destiny of the unevangelized, annihilationism, or the relationship between Christianity and other religions.

This last point is one of the values of this book. Evangelicals do disagree on these matters, and Knitter is incorrect in thinking us monolithic. Hopefully, this book will further the discussion of these important topics among evangelicals, especially because it has some fine essays that will clarify and provoke further thought.

On the negative side, though I have specific disagreements with several of the essays I will mention only some criticisms of a general nature. Several of the authors argued against universalism or unitive pluralism and then leapt to the conclusion that restrictivism (the unevangelized are automatically damned) is true without further substantiation or even acknowledging that there are mediating positions. Considering that the book is supposedly about the destiny of the unevangelized, the editors should have pressed each contributor to state a position on it. None of the chapters against unitive pluralism addressed Hick's and Knitter's latest maneuver: "soteriocentrism." There is no serious interaction with the primary sources of universalists. Moreover, most of the contributors evince little awareness of what evangelicals of the past or present have written on the fate of the unevangelized. For instance, evangelicals such as Bloesch and Fackre have argued for a post-mortem encounter with Christ for the unevangelized. But there is no substantive discussion of their position, only a back-of-the-hand dismissal. There are several essays against annihilationism and none for it in spite of the admission that it is an evangelical option.

John Sanders
Oak Hills Bible College, Bemidji, MN

Immortality: The Other Side of Death. By Gary R. Habermas and J. P. Moreland. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1992, 275 pp., n.p. paper.

This is a fantastic book. Habermas and Moreland have provided us with a concrete discussion of the issue of death and the afterlife. They divide their book into three sections: 1. The Evidence for Immortality, 2. The Nature of Immortality, 3. The Implications of Immortality. Though scholarly, this volume is not elusive to the common Christian. Laypersons will not be intimidated, and scholars will not be disappointed. This book is for everyone. As the authors state, "This is a book for people who will die" (p. ix).

The first section of the book is primarily philosophical. Habermas and Moreland deal with theistic theories that support the existence of the soul. They look also at the different theories that seek to define the composition of man. They define their position as "substance dualism," which holds that an individual possesses various properties that, while they might change, the substance of the individual remains the same. The substance of the individual is not synonymous with the brain or with the properties of that individual.

In the final segment of this section Habermas and Moreland deal with NDEs (Near Death Experiences), of which they provide assorted cases. They deal with what these individuals saw and felt, and they conclude with questions and objections to NDEs.

The second part of the book is primarily theological. Habermas and Moreland deal with the various possibilities of what happens to the soul after death. They deal with the intermediate state, reincarnation, heaven, hell and purgatory. Their discussion of the intermediate state is provocative. Will we be disembodied until the resurrection of the dead? But their arguments against purgatory are rather weak, being based upon "common sense" rather than Scripture.

In the third part of the book Habermas and Moreland deal with the practical implications of belief in the afterlife. One learns to focus on things that are from above. Scriptural truth holds a monopoly in the hearts of those who know that the grave is not their final destination. The doctrine of immortality also helps one to cope with death. Although one mourns, one need not fear. The authors conclude by looking at the issues of abortion, infanticide and euthanasia in light of the doctrine of immortality. I highly recommend this book.

Jorge Crespo
West New York, NJ

The Vicarious Humanity of Christ and the Reality of Salvation. By Christian D. Kettler. Lanham: University Press of America, 1991, 338 pp., \$24.50 paper.

Utilizing the writings of K. Barth and especially of T. F. Torrance, Kettler seeks to construct an answer to the question: Where is the reality of salvation found? His answer is that it is found only in the incarnation of Jesus Christ. His foil for this conclusion is the anthropocentric approaches to soteriology and Christology found in the writings of J. Cobb, L. Boff, J. Moltmann, W. Pannenberg, J. Hick, and H. Küng. These theologians start from below by grounding salvation in religious experience, world history or the social order. Such approaches stress natural theology and see God at work in all places so that salvation is of and in humanity rather than of and in God.

Salvation begins with the "humanity" of God, by which is meant the self-relatedness of the Trinity as manifested in the selflessness of the incarnation. The reality of salvation must be grounded in the very being of God. The nature of salvation and the essence of the God who saves are not knowable apart from the historical event of the Son of God who truly became a human being. In Jesus we are able to convert our humanistic thinking and accept the divine criteria. If we begin with a Jesus who is both the eternal Son and the true human, then we have a criterion by which to judge all social, political and religious experience.

The treatment of the nature of the atonement is (in my opinion) the best part of the book. Using Torrance and J. M. Campbell as guides, Kettler attempts to articulate a view of the atonement that does justice to both its objective and subjective aspects. Atonement is to be understood in terms of the continuity of the will of God the Creator for his fallen creatures expressed more as a filial than legal relationship. God's love takes primacy over justice even though the penal substitution theory is given due respect. In Jesus we have the true human who vicariously repents and dies for the entire race and who now intercedes for us. The primary goal of atonement is to bring us back to a filial relationship with the Father. This happens only as we participate in the sonship of Jesus, which involves the path of obedience. When this happens the Church as the body of Christ becomes the manifestation of the reality of salvation in concrete acts of faith, hope and love.

The book offers both a helpful overview of recent soteriology as well as its own significant proposal. Readers with sympathies for Barth and Torrance in the areas of epistemology, Christology, and soteriology will, perhaps, find it more satisfactory than those who find a place for general revelation and the human experience in doing theology. Being sympathetic to some of the anthropocentric theologians mentioned above, I came away from the book with several questions: (1) Granted the need for a normative criterion, how do we arrive at the conclusion that Jesus is the criterion?

Must we be fideists? (2) What are the concrete acts of faith, hope and love that the Church is to manifest? Where is the reality of salvation in the lives of believers? What specific difference does salvation make in the world today? (3) If Jesus is the *only* revelation of the being of God, then were the Old Testament believers ignorant of the being of God? Had they no legitimate relationship with God? (4) Is God involved at all in the lives of non-Christians? Is there no knowledge of God outside the Church? Kettler could, I believe, answer these questions if he would follow up on his own idea of continuity—where Jesus would be the final and clearest revelation of the being of God but not the *only* one.

John Sanders
Oak Hills Bible College, Bemidji, MN

Blessed Are the Barren: The Social Policy of Planned Parenthood. By Robert G. Marshall and Charles A. Donovan. San Francisco: Ignatius, 1991, 371 pp., \$19.95 paper.

A pastor friend of mine disparagingly refers to Planned Parenthood (PP) as either “Banned Parenthood” or “Planned Barrenhood.” According to the work under review, my friend’s judgment is more accurate than one might suppose. Written by Robert G. Marshall (Director of Congressional Affairs for the American Life Lobby, Inc., in Stafford, Virginia) and Charles A. Donovan (Executive Staff Director of the Family Research Council in Washington, D.C.), *Blessed Are the Barren* is the best scholarly critique and exposé of PP in print. It shows the founders and leaders of PP, and like-minded movements, to be zealots of a fundamentalistic sexual orthodoxy slavishly dedicated to the inerrant pseudo-Cartesian postulate, *copulo ergo sum*, “I copulate, therefore I am.”

The number of popular myths this book shatters is extraordinary. Take for example the claim of abortion-rights proponents that in the United States every year prior to *Roe v. Wade* there were 1 to 2 million illegal abortions and that 5,000 to 10,000 women died from them. Consequently, it is argued that the 1.6 million “safe” legal abortions that occur every year have numerically replaced the number of “unsafe” illegal abortions that occurred prior to *Roe*. According to Marshall and Donovan, this popular “prochoice” argument is rubbish.

They cite Dr. Bernard Nathanson, one of the original leaders of the American pro-abortion movement and co-founder of N.A.R.A.L. (the National Association for the Repeal of Abortion Laws, now known as the National Abortion Rights Action League) who has since become prolife. He admits that he and others in the abortion-rights movement intentionally fabricated the number of women who allegedly died as a result of illegal abortions: “How many deaths were we talking about when abortion was illegal? In N.A.R.A.L we generally emphasized the drama of the individual case, not the mass statistics, but when we spoke of the latter it was always ‘5,000 to 10,000 deaths a year.’ I confess that I knew the figures were totally false, and I suppose the others did too if they stopped to think of it. But in the ‘morality’ of the revolution, it was a *useful* figure, widely accepted, so why go out of our way to correct it with honest statistics. The overriding concern was to get the laws eliminated, and anything within reason that had to be done was permissible” (p. 250).

Nathanson’s observation is borne out in the best official statistical studies available. According to the U.S. Bureau of Vital Statistics, a mere 39 women died from illegal abortions the year before *Roe*. Dr. Andre Hellegers, the late Professor of Ob-

stetrics and Gynecology at Georgetown University Hospital, has pointed out that there has been a steady decrease of abortion-related deaths since 1942. That year there were 1,231 deaths. Due to improved medical care and the use of penicillin, this number fell to 133 by 1968. The year before the first state-legalized abortion, 1966, there were about 120 abortion-related deaths. This is not to minimize the undeniable fact that such deaths were significant losses to the families and loved ones of those who died. But one must be willing to admit the equally undeniable fact that if the unborn are fully human, these abortion-related maternal deaths, which one abortion-rights scholar, Dr. C. Tietze, said numbered on the average of about 500 per year, pale in comparison to the 1.6 million pre-born humans who on the average die every year. And even if we grant that there were more abortion-related deaths than the low number confirmed, there is no doubt that the 5,000 to 10,000 deaths cited by the abortion-rights movement is a gross exaggeration.

These facts, however, do not prevent abortion-rights advocates from making false, and clearly absurd, claims. For example, Donovan and Marshall cite Dr. E. Hakim-Elahi, who, as medical director of Planned Parenthood of New York City, stated that "when it was illegal for a woman to end her pregnancy, *one out of every 40 women who had abortions died*" (p. 203). This means, of course, that if the 5,000 to 10,000 yearly figure for pre-*Roe* abortion-related deaths is correct, which Nathanson and many others at one time defended, then there were only 200,000 to 400,000 illegal abortions per year, far below the 1.6 million *legal* abortions performed every year and the 1 to 2 million ordinarily claimed by abortion-rights advocates to have occurred illegally prior to *Roe*. This means that, contrary to abortion-rights propaganda, legal abortions *did not* replace illegal abortions but rather the legalization of abortion resulted in up to an eightfold increase in the number of abortions. Consequently, making abortion illegal *did prevent* many abortions. But if the statistics from the U.S. Bureau of Vital Statistics are correct, then the total number of illegal abortions prior to *Roe* is even smaller if we accept Hakim-Elahi's 1 in 40 abortion-related mortality rate: 1972, 1,560; 1968, 5,320; 1966, 4,800; 1942, 49,200. And even if we were to accept the figure provided by Tietze of 500 per year, this would mean that there were only 20,000 illegal abortions every year.

Donovan and Marshall point out that if there were as many illegal abortions per year prior to *Roe* as claimed by PP, the situation becomes more absurd if we assume Hakim-Elahi's claim that 1 in 40 women died from illegal abortions (p. 203). Although they use recent figures provided by Faye Wattleton (see below), if we accept the traditional PP claim of 1 to 2 million pre-*Roe* illegal abortions as well as Hakim-Elahi's mortality claim, it would follow that about 25,000 to 50,000 women died from illegal abortions every year. But this poses an interesting problem. For example, in a typical pre-*Roe* year, 1965, 50,456 women aged 15 to 44 (the childbearing years) died. This means that, according to "prochoice mathematics," in 1965 between 49.5% (25,000) and 99% (50,000) of women aged 15 to 44 died of illegal abortions. That is absurd.

If your thirst for the absurd is not yet quenched, consider a speech made before the American Bar Association's annual meeting in 1990 by former Planned Parenthood president Faye Wattleton. Marshall and Donovan cite Wattleton's claim that in the 1960s the majority of women receiving abortions were "my poor, African American sisters." Not wanting to exaggerate, of course, Wattleton claimed that there were only 600,000 to 1,200,000 illegal abortions per year prior to *Roe*. Marshall and Donovan apply Hakim-Elahi's rates to Wattleton's claim: "Using Hakim-Elahi's rates and Wattleton's figures for black abortions and black abortion deaths produces a complete absurdity. . . . The numbers of black women dying aged fifteen to forty-four in 1965

was 13,056. Using Wattleton's unspecified claim, black women must have had at least 51% of all abortions. Applying this figure to Hakim-Elahi's death rate would yield a minimum of 7,650 abortion deaths for black women, or 58.6% of all deaths among black females aged fifteen to forty-four [assuming Wattleton's low figure of 600,000 illegal abortions per year]. If Wattleton's higher abortion figure is the correct one [1.2 million], then 15,300 black women aged fifteen to forty-four died from illegal abortion, or, *almost 2,000 more black women than died from all causes in that age bracket during 1965*" (p. 203; italics mine).

When abortion-rights supporters, such as Wattleton, claim that more black women have died from illegal abortions than black women have died, it is time for the media, the medical community, and the legal system to start making abortion-rights proponents accountable for their claims.

When PP talks about illegal abortions, they call those who performed them "back-alley butchers" and their instruments rusty coathangers. But this rhetoric, though it may make for a fine placard or a talk-show soundbite, is entirely misleading. Marshall and Donovan point out that Dr. Mary Calderone, while president of Planned Parenthood, wrote in a 1960 article in the *American Journal of Public Health* that Dr. Alfred C. Kinsey showed in 1958 that 84% to 87% of all illegal abortions were performed by licensed physicians in good standing. Accepting Kinsey's conclusions, Calderone herself wrote, as editor of the Planned Parenthood conference proceedings, that "the conference estimated that 90 per cent of all illegal abortions are done by physicians. Call them what you will, abortionists or anything else, they are still physicians, trained as such; and many of them are in good standing in their communities. . . . Whatever trouble arises usually comes after self-induced abortions, which comprise approximately 8 per cent, or with the very small percentage that go to some kind of non-medical abortionist" (p. 261). It seems that the vast majority of "backalley butchers" eventually became the "reproductive health providers" of the present day.

To provide further evidence of how little regard PP has for the truth, Marshall and Donovan ask us to consider the contents of Wattleton's January 22, 1979, letter to members of Congress: "Illegal abortions have virtually disappeared. Estimates are that fewer than two percent of all abortions in 1975 were conducted illegally by unlicensed practitioners (compared with 95 percent in the 1960s)" (p. 262). With only a typewriter and a number she pulled off the top of her head, and not a shred of evidence to support her claim, Wattleton turned Kinsey's authoritative estimate that 90% of all illegal abortions were performed by physicians into a mere 5%.

Blessed Are the Barren covers the entire history of PP, beginning with its founder Margaret Sanger. Marshall and Donovan reveal Sanger to have been a racist who saw birth control as a eugenic means to purify the human race. In fact, a contributor to the Sanger-edited *Birth Control Review*, G. I. Laughlin, "apparently provided Nazi Germany with the practical inspiration for the compulsory sterilization law passed in 1933, which was taken almost in toto from Laughlin's Model Eugenic Sterilization Law" (p. 277). Sanger herself drafted a "Baby Code" in 1934 in order to help the nation recover from the Great Depression. This code was designed "(1) to prevent the overproduction of babies by the *unfit* so as to reduce the burden of charity and public relief . . . ; (4) to require permits for parents legally to have children, and to guide the issuance of these permits only to the *healthy*" (p. 279; italics mine).

Marshall and Donovan cover a number of other important topics in great detail, including sex education, the pill, religion and PP, birth control, and PP's philosophy of sex. Although it takes up only five pages in the book, one of the most frightening aspects of PP's history are those leaders who advocate sex for children, including incest (pp. 125-129).

My only criticism of this book is that the authors tend to blur the distinction between contraception and abortion. Maintaining this distinction is extremely important. Abortion is the killing of a human life *already* conceived whereas contraception, just like abstaining from sex, simply prevents such a life from coming into existence. In addition, the authors give the impression that anyone who supports contraceptive use is proposing something anti-Christian and unwittingly plays into the hands of PP's agenda. But simply because PP advocates something, such as contraception, does not necessarily make it wrong; anyone who claims otherwise commits the genetic fallacy. When it comes to contraceptives we should not throw the baby out with the bathwater, so to speak.

I highly recommend this book. I believe it is the most outstanding and scholarly critique of PP I have ever read. The service Marshall and Donovan have provided for the prolife movement is truly astonishing. Every prolife should have this book in his or her personal library.

Francis J. Beckwith
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Ministerial Ethics: Being a Good Minister in a Not-So-Good World. By Joe E. Trull and James E. Carter. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1993, 256 pp., \$14.99 paper.

In textbook format, Trull and Carter have responded to the unthinkable but true situation among modern clergy: that ministers cannot be assumed to be ethical. The mounting number of clergy failures in ethics, or at least the mounting public awareness of these failures, has driven denominations and congregations to a new skepticism. "Rightly or wrongly, churches formerly assumed Christian ministers were persons of integrity who could be counted on to be ethical. No longer is this presumption possible" (p. v).

Three factors complicate these moral failures: the minister's increasingly complex ethical situation, the lack of literature on ministerial ethics and the lack of course offerings in ethics in divinity schools. For these reasons, Trull and Carter have contributed a dual-purpose work to the literature of ethics: For the seminary, the book is a well-researched textbook that surveys a wide variety of sources and studies, and for ministers, the book is a practical statement of ethical obligations. These two purposes, the training of initiates and the hope for new discussions among experienced clergy, are reflected throughout the book.

Trull and Carter state their case for ministerial ethics in an invitational style. In their seven chapters, they direct the reader to seven ethical categories relevant to professional ministers and offer their research in a manner that invites a foundational decision about each category.

In chap. 1, "The Minister's Vocation," the reader is asked to decide about the content of the call to ministry. Does God's call produce a career, or a God-centered profession rich with spiritual responsibilities? In chap. 2, "The Minister's Moral Choices," the reader is asked how ministers make ethical decisions. Will a dedicated effort toward integrity be required, or do ministers have the innate ability to make good moral choices? These first two chapters form the philosophical base for the practical remainder of the book.

In chap. 3, "The Minister's Personal Life," the reader is asked how far ministerial integrity pervades one's life. Is the minister's personal life beyond the church walls included in God's call? In light of widespread clergy burnout and personal failures,

this chapter and its call for an intentional integrity in matters of personal lifestyle, family, finances, and sexuality could be the most significant chapter in the book. In chap. 4, "The Minister's Congregation," the reader is asked how he or she will view and treat the members of the congregation. In chap. 5, "The Minister's Colleagues," the reader is asked to make similar decisions about colleagues both inside (church staff members and volunteer leaders) and outside (predecessors and other ministers) the congregation. In chap. 6, "The Minister's Community," the reader is asked to decide how he or she will respond to the community surrounding the church. Attention is called to the fact that an evangelical minister must at times be both prophet and pastor to the community.

The final chapter, "The Minister's Code of Ethics," is the special hope of the authors. They admit that asking ministers to construct a personal or denominational code of ethics might be viewed as superfluous, but they maintain their belief that a written code of ethics will prove beneficial. The chapter serves as a practical guideline for writing such a code.

Ministers and ministerial students should find this book to be tremendously helpful. And if, as the authors assume, ministers do want to be persons of integrity, then they will surely want to avail themselves of the potential here for learning the categories and vocabulary of ethics as they answer these questions.

Edwin E. Scott

Goodwood Baptist Church, Baton Rouge, LA

The Unity of the Bible: Unfolding God's Plan for Humanity. By Daniel P. Fuller. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992, 508 pp., \$24.99.

For over forty years Daniel Fuller, professor of Biblical interpretation at Fuller Seminary, has sought to grasp and teach *the* purpose of God in the world, the salvation-historical unfolding of God's redemptive-kingdom plan from Genesis to Revelation—that is, the unity of the Bible. Christian misunderstanding of God's purpose for the world is not only misunderstanding the books of Scripture as reflecting that purpose but also hampering of lives in and for Jesus Christ. Fuller believes that only through a summarization of Scripture along the "timeline of redemptive history" and not by the "timeless categories of God, humankind, Christ, Church, and last things," as reflected in the Church's systematic approach through the centuries, will help Christians follow the inner logic of Scripture, the *boulē* of God. Fuller's ire against classic theological formulation is clear. Throughout the process of interpreting, analyzing and synthesizing the purpose/goal of God, as given in the "inspired" Scriptures, Fuller finds that God's goal may be summarized in the Biblical terminology "that the earth be filled with the glory of God as the waters cover the sea." He has written this book that this goal would be accomplished.

For a book about *the* redemptive-historical purpose of God, the unity of the Bible, this is a very heterogeneous book. The first section prepares the way through helpful analyses of canon formation and evidence for Scriptural unity, along with eschatological comparisons between Biblical understanding and that of Hinduism, Buddhism and Islam. This is also a book about the nature of faith, true faith, and the necessity of persevering faith in the promises of God in the likeness of Abraham's faith. Fuller also emphasizes the true and *continuous* relation of law and the gospel, in opposition

to most Protestant exegesis of Galatians and Romans. Thus, it is indirectly (but openly) a tract much influenced by Jonathan Edwards as set against John Calvin. But preeminently it is a kind of ethics or dogmatics of redemptive history with most of its argument centered in the original expression of God's redemptive-kingdom purpose in and through history, the revelatory acts of God in history for human redemption, and thereby the filling of the earth with the glory of God. After the opening section, more than three hundred pages analyze the line of God's redemptive-historical purpose in Genesis. While often presented plainly and even homiletically, these sections are rich in content, exhortation and encouragement in the faith. God's purpose in creation, human creation, fall, the continuous tension between the seed of the serpent and that of the woman, the persevering faith of Abraham and the nature and purpose of the Mosaic law receive the greatest emphasis in these sections. Fuller thereby directs attention to the kingdom of God first in the OT and the gospel presentation to the world via Jesus' presentation of the kingdom, then the present manifestation of the kingdom and the way in which this unfolding of God's purpose will lead to the conversion of Israel. This culminates historically in the full, final harvest of the Gentiles in the millennium. Fuller concludes with an important appendix on the nature of the Mosaic law by exegesis of pertinent passages in Galatians and Romans. This is done in continuous debate with Calvin's influential understanding of these passages. Fuller endeavors to overthrow Calvin's setting of law in opposition to gospel by his own emphasis on relation, parallel and continuity. One wonders if debate with Luther would not have been closer to the point.

Affirmations and criticisms of this book might cause overly lengthy lists. Several issues will do. This is a rare example of scholarship made truly presentable at several levels. Many will find Fuller's emphasis on inspiration and inerrancy surprising and even suspicious after Harold Lindsell's allegations of the 1970s. Yet Fuller claims never to have negated inerrancy and to have asserted it in his teaching through the years. His willingness to wrestle with truly difficult issues has no doubt been misinterpreted. Fuller's premillennial, salvation-historical, Biblical-theological presentation of the logic, way, and purpose of God from Genesis 1 to the new heavens and the new earth, and the "why" of each step, is excellent and stimulating. This is theology, then, which is openly critical of all "systems," Calvinist–Arminian, covenant–dispensational, etc., which are said to lose sight of the way and goal of God's actual disclosure in history, preeminently in Jesus Christ. Also, Fuller's presentation of the place of the law in relation to the gospel and salvation by grace through faith is, for the most part, both correct and needful.

Yet numerous problems must be mentioned despite the overall excellence. Fuller has a tendency to stretch points to fit his purpose. Coupled with his great admiration for Edwards is his occasional conclusion that since Edwards says something it is therefore true. Surely Fuller did not mean this, but the logic of presentation often lacks other premises of presentation. Indeed, there were numerous places where his logic was "unique" (an "apples, therefore oranges" kind of logic). Fuller's argument at the early stages is partially hinged to his understanding of the trinity of God and the *imago Dei*. But both are not well handled, and Fuller's copious use of the Trinity for his salvation-historical purpose not only is dependent on "despised" systematic theology ("biblical" theology *cannot* come to this end with *its* questions) and is of the outmoded Augustinian-Hegelian type, which in fact lapses necessarily into either modalism or subordinationism (cf. W. Pannenberg, *Systematic Theology* 1.280–327). Others may find his affirmation of redaction criticism or an allusion to Deutero-Isaiah (p. 431) problematic.

A particularly interesting issue in this fine book is Fuller's understanding of salvation and perseverance in God's purpose as reflected throughout Scripture. Fuller eschews all theological labels and their ensuing limitations, yet he is a strong supporter of limited atonement. But Fuller is also to be commended for his antipathy to "eternal security" or "once saved always saved" as is so popularly heard and understood. Rather, he properly emphasizes the perseverance of the saints. The saints prove or make their calling and election sure by their persevering faith. Yet while the elect and only the elect will finally persevere, many will be "regenerated" or "renewed" by the Spirit for a time only to fall away and be condemned. These can have present assurance of salvation (Fuller is concerned to avoid the Roman Catholic view that salvation is known only at the end). But one can so lapse and, without repentance, finally overrun the patience of God. Fuller's view of faith from Hebrews (especially chap. 6) is clear here.

This is an excellent book, an important book, a book effectively exhorting every concerned reader. It has been a rich blessing to me.

John D. Morrison
Liberty University, Lynchburg, VA

Canon and Theology: Overtures to an Old Testament Theology. By Rolf Rendtorff. Translated and edited by Margaret Kohl. OBT. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993, xii + 235 pp., \$16.00 paper.

This volume is a collection of 18 essays presented over the last 15 years; five of these are presented here for the first time in English. It is a European response to changes in the methods of Biblical theology. One of the persistently weak points of the Biblical theology movement was its uncritical acceptance of the liberal hermeneutical presupposition that one came to the Biblical text from a vantage point outside the text. This led to the eventual collapse of the movement but had the positive result of exegetes and theologians giving attention to a holistic reading of the Hebrew text, as is advocated in this volume.

The canonical approach of Rendtorff has a different objective than that of Brevard Childs. Childs approaches the Biblical text as the canon of the Christian Church, which serves as a basis for Christian theology; Rendtorff seeks to interpret the Old Testament in its own canonical framework—that is, "under the presuppositions and conditions of its development up to the close of the canon"—which must be distinguished from the appropriation of that canon by the Christian Church, a society that came into being after the close of this canon (p. 117). Theological interpretation of the Hebrew Bible must be done from the inside, independent of the theological system of the religious tradition to which the interpreter belongs (p. 40). Old Testament theology ought to be done cooperatively between Jewish and Christian scholars, since the theology of the canon both adopt antedates that of rabbinic and Christian interpretation. The authority of the canonical text for each of the two traditions and the validity of interpretive principles used by each of them are separate questions; neither tradition is to be neglected, nor is there any point in discussing hermeneutical principles to relate them to each other (p. 44), but they do have a common theological task.

The first eight essays deal with methodological questions; they not only challenge the supposition that Biblical theology is a Christian enterprise but also show how the enterprise as undertaken by Christians has at times been woefully misguided. The final

essay traces the author's personal pilgrimage of four decades, moving from the quest for historical traditions, as done by his mentor von Rad, to the meaning of the canonical text; he describes this as a paradigm shift (pp. 29–30, 140, 180), using the language of Thomas Kuhn. The remaining essays are stimulating exercises in exegesis and theology that illuminate the doctrines of the Hebrew canon. The book is an excellent introduction to the thought of Rendtorff, who has himself contributed significantly to the paradigm shift. Whatever the future of Biblical theology, his work will be influential.

A. H. Konkel
Otterburne, MB, Canada