

## BOOK REVIEWS

*Knowing Jesus Through the Old Testament.* By Christopher J. H. Wright. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1992, 256 pp., n.p. paper.

Wright begins by pointing out the importance of the genealogy in Matt 1:1–17. It tells us that “we will only understand Jesus properly if we see him in the light of this story which he completes and brings to its climax.” Because Jesus completes the story, Jesus also “sheds light backward on it.”

Wright proceeds to review the history involved in Matthew’s genealogy to show that it was God’s answer to the “growing web of corruption and violence” seen in Genesis 1–11. It began with the promise to Abraham, came to “a measure of fulfilment with David” and then took off again “in a renewed form.” Because the prophets emphasized God’s consistency in both his covenant threats and promises, the Jews survived the exile and during the intertestamental period became increasingly devoted to the law. Along with this came “the upsurge of apocalyptic, messianic hope.” Then came Jesus as God’s “yes” to the promises and to all the acts of God, not only in Israel’s history but also in the history of the world.

Chapter 2 shows how “Matthew sees the whole Old Testament as the embodiment of promise—in the sense of presenting to us a God of gracious and saving purpose.” Wright distinguishes between promise and prediction, promise involving relationship with God and “the universal goal of blessing to all nations,” also requiring faith in God’s Word and action based on it. Thus the promise has “a dynamic quality that goes beyond the external details involved.” So Jesus was “the singular seed of Abraham, through whom the seed would become universal and multinational.” Wright then proceeds to deal with the covenants of the OT as another stream adding to the full force of the promise.

Chapter 3 deals with Jesus and his OT identity. It sees the OT as a storehouse of precedents, figures, images, models and analogies that help us to understand who Jesus was. Wright adds that they also “helped *Jesus* to understand Jesus”—as the Son of God.

Chapter 4 goes on to discuss Jesus and his OT mission as the Son of Man, as the servant of the Lord and as having a mission to the Gentiles. Chapter 5 then deals with the OT values of Jesus. Wright shows that many of the ethical teachings of Jesus had precedents in the OT and that they were “the true heart of the Law.”

Wright gives important insights into the relation of Jesus and his ministry to the OT. Though he recognizes Jesus as truly the Son of God, unlike Walter Kaiser he does give some concessions to liberal higher critics, and he reflects a replacement theology. He says those who look for literal fulfillments in the land of Israel or a revival of the throne of David “make the mistake of taking literally what the Bible always intended figuratively even in its original form.” He holds that the promises are “living and ‘transformable.’” I would say he goes too far in this and would rather agree with Kaiser, who sees the promises having present and future applications to both Israel and the Church.

Stanley M. Horton  
Springfield, MO



*The Westminster Guide to the Books of the Bible.* By William R. Ramsay. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1994, xi + 564 pp., \$30.00.

William Ramsay's *Guide* opens with an introduction on interpreting the Bible, understanding the Bible and the unity of the Testaments. It is divided into two parts, covering the OT and the NT.

The OT is presented with an outline chart for each book, excluding Ruth, Proverbs, Song of Songs, Esther, Obadiah and Nahum. The authorship and dating of each book are discussed, and the text is surveyed or presented according to thematic considerations, keeping in mind genre. Included in part 1 is an overview of the Apocrypha. Ramsay includes warnings directed at historical concerns and the Biblical record. He concludes that "the church finds in the Bible not so much a record of the past as a living word from God for the present" (p. 22). At another point, he offers: "These stories should not be read as curious bits of ancient history" (p. 221). His position on prophecy is likewise uninspiring: "The prophets did predict the future, and often their predictions did come exactly true" (p. 183). The inability to accept prophecy as foretelling, without equivocation, may explain the late date attributed to Daniel (p. 219). His division of Isaiah into three parts spanning two centuries of authorship makes it difficult to place Ramsay in an evangelical camp (pp. 184–199).

Part 2 begins with the historical background of the gospels. The possible oral and written sources of the synoptic gospels are presented. The books of the NT are surveyed with charts provided for each, excluding Mark, Luke, Jude, 2 John and 3 John. Mark and Luke are presented according to thematic considerations. Dating, authorship, occasion and purpose are discussed for each book. The Johannine literature concludes this book with John's gospel being the final entry. Ramsay aligns himself with a liberal approach when, for instance, he denies Pauline authorship to the pastoral epistles (p. 462) and Ephesians (p. 455).

Ramsay has provided an introduction to the Bible and Apocrypha that is helpful to the beginning student. The narrative style of this book makes it enjoyable reading. There is, however, a lack of documentation, heavily concentrated in the OT section. These include statements concerning archeology, such as "Sometime around 1900 B.C., a wealthy Egyptian commissioned an artist to decorate his tomb" (p. 32). Ramsay's narrative style in these instances is not helpful, since specific archeological finds must be addressed. Had he discussed these finds and included a detailed bibliography, these sections would not resemble sermon illustrations. See also other examples on pp. 20, 37, 39, 42, 45, 48, 49, 60, 71, 88, 236, 245, 302 and 368. Generalized statements such as "Many scholars agree . . ." occur too frequently and without referencing. Ramsay also includes anecdotes that are interesting to read. Ben Franklin is said to have told the story of Ruth to the ladies of the court of Louis XVI, but no documentation is provided (p. 82). Other examples are Ben Franklin's use of Proverbs (p. 161), Rabbi Aqiba and the Song of Songs (p. 176), and a resolution in the Israeli Knesset (p. 341). The section of notes heavily favors material published prior to 1985. Primary sources are lacking in these citations. There is no separate bibliography.

Ramsay has provided another tool for introduction to Biblical texts. His targeted audiences (p. ix) will find it helpful, but the serious student may find it lacking.

Alice M. Via  
Evangelical School of Theology, Myerstown, PA

*Genesis 16–50*. WBC 2. By Gordon J. Wenham. Dallas: Word, 1994, xxxviii + 517 pp., \$27.99.

The second volume of Wenham's commentary on Genesis in the WBC series happily maintains the level of scholarly erudition readers have discovered when using his first volume. That the second volume covers the last two-thirds of Genesis, while the first covered but the first third, in no way indicates that Wenham has offered us a thinned-down commentary on the last thirty-five chapters of Genesis.

The introductory section includes five brief essays (2 to 5 pages each) on (1) historical setting of the patriarchs, (2) Egyptian background to the Joseph story, (3) chronology of the patriarchs, (4) religion of the patriarchs, and (5) history, theology and the commentator. Throughout this section Wenham presents a convincing list of arguments against the recent trend to treat the patriarchs as entirely fictive/literary personalities. At the same time, he concedes some of the excesses of indiscriminate and superficial appeal to extra-Biblical sources to shore up the historicity of the patriarchal age. He even sides with the critical commentators, to a degree at least, in his reflections on Exod 6:3, to wit, that the patriarchs knew God only as El Shaddai, and that knowledge of God as Yahweh emerges only in the Mosaic period (p. xxxii). For Wenham the bottom line is that if we have no patriarchs, then the promises of God were never actually spoken to them, and hence the theological heart of Genesis is destroyed (p. xxxviii).

The bulk of the commentary, as one would expect, is analysis of Genesis 16–50. The format is that of the first volume. The author divides these thirty-five chapters into thirty-four units, the shortest being 25:12–18 (Ishmael's family history), the longest being three-chapter sections from the Joseph story (Genesis 43–45 and Genesis 48–50).

Each unit proceeds with the same sequence of presentation: (1) bibliography, (2) the author's own translation, (3) grammatical notes on the Hebrew of the unit under discussion, (4) a discussion of form, structure, and setting, (5) comment, usually on each verse, or occasionally a cluster of verses, (6) explanation in which the unit's meanings, relevance and application are probed. The commentary concludes with an author's index, a subject index and an index of Biblical texts. I believe these indices could have been improved by the inclusion of a Hebrew word index.

In my judgment Wenham is at his best and most original when he is discussing form, structure and setting. Already in the first volume and in published articles he has demonstrated a great sensitivity and insight in threading his way through the whole maze of arguments advanced by scholars *vis-à-vis* the source background of a particular passage and then presenting a case for his own position.

As in volume 1, he continues to make a case for the view that the so-called P portions of Genesis 16–50 (and E portions too) are earlier than the J portions, thus radically reversing a time-honored position of OT source-critical studies. For statements on J's redaction of P (and E), see his comments on pp. 19, 79, 174 and 220. And yet, while Wenham continues to use the letter designations J, E, D and P, it is not clear to me exactly what he means by these, regardless of how he arranges them chronologically. For example, when he consistently cites the authorial/redactional work of J, what J does he have in mind? Wellhausen's J? Van Seters' J? Or, is he using J to designate something totally different from what J normally implies when used by Biblical scholars, and if so, what is it?

The bibliographies are up to date and tend to include only articles published since Westermann's three-volume commentary of 1974–1982. Both in his notes and comments, Wenham avoids excessive footnoting. Thus in any given section there may be

forty or fifty listed articles at the head, but in the comments that follow maybe only five or six of these articles will be alluded to.

The notes section will be useful, of course, almost exclusively to the individual who is using this commentary with his/her Hebrew Bible open. For the most part they deal with grammatical issues and cite frequently the standard works of Gesenius and Joüon. At times the notes are a bit too cryptic and could be extended for clarification and significance.

The last section of each unit discussion is called "Explanation." According to the general editors' statement at the beginning, the purpose of the explanation (and the comment) is to provide "a clear exposition of the passage's meaning and its relevance to the ongoing biblical revelation." At times Wenham succeeds admirably in this task. On a few occasions, however, the explanation section involves essentially a recapitulation of the unit's contents, already discussed in the translation/comment sections.

To illustrate, while it is certainly correct to speak of Ishmael's birth as a "diversion" in Genesis' longer perspective (p. 13), do not God's promises to Hagar *vis-à-vis* her child (16:11–12) at least hint that the God of Israel is actively involved in the life and destiny of the unchosen? By the way, throughout Wenham's discussion of chaps. 16–21, I wonder whether Abraham's behavior is as exemplary as Wenham would have us believe, and whether Sarah's is as obnoxious as he would have us believe.

Or again, while Wenham's discussion of the behavior of Abraham and Isaac in conjunction with the *Aqedah* incident is salutary (pp. 112–118), does not this text focus more, or at least as much, on God? Is not Genesis 22 as much a test for God as it is for Abraham? And if Isaac is a type of Christ for the NT writers (p. 117), is not also the ram? After all, who died? Similarly, while the famous passage (28:10–22) of Jacob at Bethel says much about Jacob (pp. 225–226), does it say anything about a God who binds himself unconditionally to a deceiver and an exploiter?

All of us, preacher and teacher alike, owe a deep debt of gratitude to Wenham for this concluding volume on Genesis. In my judgment, it is at the top of a number of Genesis commentaries written by authors whose working hypothesis is that all Scripture is God-breathed and profitable for doctrine and growth in righteousness.

Victor P. Hamilton  
Asbury College, Wilmore, KY

*The Song of Moses: A Theological Quarry.* By George A. F. Knight. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995, viii + 156 pp., \$12.99 paper.

To those familiar with the International Theological Commentary the name George A. F. Knight will be known as both editor and contributor. While the book being reviewed is not part of this series, the author has written it with the same aims: "to offer a theological interpretation of the Hebrew text; to include perspectives not limited to the thoughts and lifestyles of the 'Christian' West, reading the Hebrew Scriptures in the twin contexts of ancient Israel and our modern day; and to proclaim the biblical message as the revelation of God which, when rightly received, brings *shalom* to both the individual and the community" (p. vii).

The subject of the book is the Song of Moses found in Deut 32:1–43. Knight sees this passage as a quarry of theological truth from which later Biblical writers, both OT and NT, have borrowed and expanded (p. 13). He accepts these verses as the composition of the historical Moses of the thirteenth century BC; oral tradition preserved

these words until they were written down some three centuries later (p. 6). He believes that the original historical context has been lost but that the story context where the Song is found in the Hebrew text of the OT was carefully chosen for its theological intent by those who edited the book of Deuteronomy. He states that "this humanly conceived poem" (p. 145) written by Moses "employs the language and imagery of his day, for his vocabulary belongs also in the myths of the fertility cult of Ugarit, contemporary with himself" (p. 15). Moses demythologized and poeticized these concepts and presents "them to God as vehicles for his Word of life and love" (p. 16).

Using the NRSV as the text for his commentary, Knight proceeds verse by verse, citing the Dead Sea literature, LXX and targums as they relate to the theological issues being considered. His commentary reflects a wealth of insight into the Hebrew words and concepts. Among other words Knight seems to relish the concept of God as "the Rock" and finds *šālôm* also as a central theological truth. He is concerned that OT theology has been neglected up to about a century ago and believes that the result has not been good for Christian theology. He would defend the necessity of theologians being trained in the Hebrew language.

While much can be learned from Knight, this reviewer believes that he often loses sight of the meaning of his text and finds theological connections that seem far-fetched. One example is found in his discussion of Deut 32:15, which ends up with "Moses and Paul together" providing "the Church catholic with the theological content to the continuing ecumenical practice of infant baptism" (p. 61). Nor will everyone accept his association of *ʿādāmā* with "Mother Earth" (p. 137). Perhaps more pertinent to the text would have been a discussion of the "fear of God," the implications of "remembrance" or other such concepts.

Dwight E. Acomb  
St. Petersburg Christian University, Russia

*Judges 1–5: A New Translation and Commentary.* By Barnabas Lindars. Edited by A. D. H. Mayes. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1995, 302 pp., \$49.95.

Students of the book of Judges have been waiting for Lindars' commentary for a long time. Unfortunately, his scholarship came to an end with his death in 1991, after he had completed his study of only the first five chapters. Now we may speculate about what the rest of the commentary might have looked like. If Lindars' efforts on the first five chapters are any indication, his work on the book undoubtedly would have become the standard for a long time. As it stands, this volume is no small achievement.

Apart from the fact the commentary goes only to the end of chap. 5, it is obvious this is an unfinished work. One wishes in particular one had Lindars' introduction to the book. Instead one finds Mayes' helpful if short preface, highlighting the author's methodology and achievements. The author's own composition launches immediately into introductory observations on what Lindars calls "The Prelude" (1:1–2:5). For each unit treated the commentator provides a new translation, general introductory notes, and detailed exegetical comment. The editor, Mayes, has provided a bibliography of works cited at the front and an author index at the back.

While not oblivious to literary aspects of the Biblical text, Lindars makes little use of recent narrative studies on Judges like those by Polzin, Klein and Webb. Instead he follows a rather traditional historical-critical approach. Although he recognizes numerous levels of redaction, Lindars rejects Noth's notion of a continuous Deuteronomistic narrative encompassing Joshua–Kings. The inconsistencies among these (es-

pecially Joshua and Judges) are best explained by proposing a series of originally independent works that have been latterly brought together by a Deuteronomistic editor (DtrN).

The value of this volume may be compared to the original ICC OT volumes. Lindars' treatment of the narrative and the Song of Deborah, particularly his exegetical comments on Hebrew words and phrases, render this a superb reference tool for all who wrestle seriously with the text. Being a specialist in Septuagintal studies, the author made text-critical comments that are especially helpful. Like the original ICC series, the most glaring weakness of Lindars' work (apart from its unfinished character) is the lack of theological reflection. For this reason pastors and ministers will probably not be the primary purchasers, which is unfortunate. Commentaries like this answer many of the questions serious students of the Biblical text ask. The editor and the publishers are to be commended for posthumously publishing this volume, despite its incompleteness.

Daniel I. Block

The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, KY

*1–2 Chronicles: An Introduction and Commentary.* By Martin J. Selman. 2 volumes. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1994, 546 pp., \$11.99 paper.

This recent commentary on Chronicles is a welcome addition to the Tyndale series. While the Tyndale commentaries are usually aimed at readers lacking technical skills, it is immediately clear that Selman is a highly competent scholar who has interacted extensively with the most significant works in the field. Above all, this book is truly a commentary—that is, Selman comments on the message of the Chronicler rather than merely offering information about historical and cultural details mentioned in the text.

The format of the commentary is well designed: Each section has been provided with a heading summarizing the main point. There is a lengthy (56 pp.) and helpful introduction where Selman discusses the genre, message and composition of Chronicles. The introduction is particularly outstanding and highly perceptive when it deals with the major theological themes of Chronicles.

Selman's exegesis of the text itself is clear and carefully argued. He is to be highly commended for his full-length treatment of the genealogies in Chronicles, where he discusses their meaning and relationship to the rest of the book. Another helpful feature is his interaction with the condition of the text. Selman works with the ancient versions as well as the MT, and his text-critical judgments are generally sound; he also explains variations among the English versions.

Selman sees the Chronicler as an exegete of Scripture whose aim was "to offer an interpretation of the Bible as he knew it" (p. 26). His design was "to demonstrate that God's promises revealed in the Davidic covenant were as trustworthy and effective as when they were first given" (p. 26). In keeping with his view of the Chronicler as an exegete, Selman constantly cites parallel passages used by the Chronicler and highlights their similarities and differences for the reader.

Unlike many scholars, Selman is committed to the historical reliability of Chronicles. In general, he is willing to let difficult passages stand rather than harmonize them with Samuel–Kings (e.g. 1 Chr 21:5; 2 Chronicles 34). While he demonstrates that history was extremely important to the Chronicler, Selman also points out that the book is primarily a theology rather than a history of Israel (pp. 20–24).

One disappointing feature is Selman's tendency to downplay messianic and eschatological elements in Chronicles (p. 64). There are also a few places where additional comments would have been helpful, such as the discussion of 1 Chr 21:1-6; interaction with Willi or Sailhamer at this point would suggest rewarding possibilities for interpretation. All in all, however, this is a very fine commentary that will serve the needs of pastors and Bible students for years to come.

Michael A. Lyons  
Madison, WI

*Early Israelite Wisdom.* By Stuart Weeks. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994, 212 pp., \$39.95.

Every once in a while a book comes along that challenges the "assured results" of a particular field of inquiry. So impressive are the challenges of the book that one's perspective on the field of inquiry is significantly altered. Certainly, Stuart Weeks has presented such a challenge to the assured results of Israelite wisdom studies. More specifically, Weeks challenges the idea that wisdom literature developed as a means to train young bureaucrats in the administration of Israel (p. 1).

Weeks begins his challenge by examining the nature of non-Israelite sources of wisdom and whether they have impacted Israel's wisdom literature (pp. 6-19). Weeks is extremely cautious in his approach. He argues against a "parallelomania" that suggests that Israelite writers simply borrowed from other cultures (predominantly Egypt) to form their own wisdom literature corpus. In fact, Weeks states that "we cannot claim any extant text, except *Amenemope*, was itself known to the Israelite writers" (p. 7). Furthermore, Weeks concludes that before one can determine parallels between texts one must understand the context of the non-Israelite text. For example, Weeks argues that Egyptian instructions did not provide a guidebook to success but were primarily examples of classical literature read by pupils in the New Kingdom and Late Period (pp. 18-19). This precludes a parallel with Israelite wisdom literature.

In chaps. 2-3 Weeks examines the book of Proverbs in terms of its structure and its *Sitz im Leben*. His purpose is to emphasize that it is very difficult to find broad themes that provide a context for understanding proverbial collections (pp. 37-39). Weeks proposes a "near-neighbor analysis" of collections that focuses upon verbal, literary, and thematic links in the sentence literature (pp. 21-33). His conclusion is that redactors of Proverbs were motivated by esthetics and not by overarching themes (p. 33). This conclusion calls for reflection in the light of a continued emphasis upon canonical criticism, as well as obvious thematic inclusions within Proverbs as a whole (cf. "fear of the Lord" in 1:7; 9:10; 31:30). With the dismissal of broad thematic associations in the Proverbial literature, Weeks then moves to chap. 3, where he denies a court *Sitz im Leben* for Proverbs and any historical value to the Solomonic and Hezekiah superscriptions (cf. 1:1; 10:1; 25:1). The basis for rejecting a court *Sitz im Leben* is based primarily upon the infrequent "king sayings" in the collections (p. 50). Furthermore, the mention of Solomon and Hezekiah is based on traditions that associated these kings with wisdom.

Weeks continues his assault by appraising the approach of McKane, who maintains that Israel's early wisdom was primarily secular and found its expression in the empirical judgments of the politician (p. 57). According to McKane, a later redaction from a pietistic Yahweh tradition reinterpreted the earlier wisdom. Weeks, however, maintains that there is no evidence of widespread reinterpretation. Furthermore, evi-

dence from *Amenemope* suggests that there was from earliest times an emphasis upon the ability of man and the sovereignty of God (p. 67).

Weeks' most controversial argument is found in chap. 5. In essence, Weeks agrees with Whybray that the evidence for the existence of a class known as "wise men" is lacking in the Hebrew Bible (pp. 90–91). He attempts to discount evidence in Scripture for the existence of a class of wise men by examining texts such as Isa 19:11–12; Jer 50:35; 51:37; Est 1:13 (pp. 79–83). It seems to this reviewer that he ignores the plain meaning of texts in order to defend his view that there is no bureaucratic structure that undergirded the wisdom enterprise. Therefore, to be consistent, he argues against the view that there was a class of wise men that was part of the government. The same holds true in relationship to Isa 44:25–26 and Jer 18:18. It seems that Weeks goes too far in a positivistic approach to Scripture and thus fails to acknowledge that distinct groups are being mentioned in the text.

The remaining chapters of the book, chaps. 6–8, seem to address issues that for most wisdom scholars have already been decided: wisdom influence upon other texts, the relationship between Solomon and Egypt, and the existence of schools in ancient Israel. These chapters certainly continue pulling the threads related to the overall pattern of the book but seem redundant in the light of scholarship exhibited for example in the work of James L. Crenshaw.

The strength of Weeks' work certainly is the rigor of his methodology, but it is also a weakness of his work. While this reviewer appreciates the strict standards Weeks applies to the arguments of scholars, one almost senses an overly positivistic approach to the text that would stifle creativity and probable implications (e.g. Solomon as the founder of the wisdom tradition based on 1 Kings). Nevertheless, Weeks has given scholarship much to think about in relationship to the context of wisdom in ancient Israel. Some unfortunate editorial oversights make up one particularly obvious weakness of the book, especially noticeable at the top of p. 146.

Rick W. Byargeon  
New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, New Orleans, LA

*The Bitterness of Job: A Philosophical Reading.* By John T. Wilcox. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1994, 243 pp., \$37.50.

This text represents a contemporary philosophical approach to the ontological problems raised by the book of Job. There are many interesting facets to this work, not the least of which is its readability and accessibility to a wide audience, despite the relative difficulty of the subject matter. The author's curious but effective approach places *The Bitterness of Job* somewhere between a philosophical essay and a Bible commentary. Sources for the latter are (not unexpectedly) liberal, but they represent a reasoned position with adequate scholarship and helpful notation. Studies, for instance, on the origins of Leviathan and Behemoth are in themselves interesting, apart from the work's major focus.

The major strength of this work is its consistent and well-worked theme expressed in a creative and unpretentious way. The problem for Job seems to be one of attitude, an anger and bitterness toward God who is uniquely responsible for the sufferer's plight. This problem of the heart requires repentance and finds itself subtly interwoven throughout the Biblical text. The author thereby shows insight into Job that for most readers would remain elusive. It is the natural marriage between philosophy and

exegesis that makes the book both appealing and worthwhile. There is reference to other thinkers (Otto, Frost, Rawls, Spinoza), but their opinions serve only an illustrative purpose and do not dominate the discussion. Secondary themes concerning the unknowability of divine intention, the problem of evil, and the limits of human cognition are also dealt with in the same succinct manner. Also of note is a careful distinction between Job's honesty before God and his compatriots' hardened orthodoxy ("It's your fault, Job, because you transgressed a moral dictum or sinned in some way unknown to you").

It is this issue, in fact, that seems to be at the heart of Job's difficulty. The traditional view (with some modification as explained by the author) involves the just punishment of the guilty and the absence of malice toward the innocent.

The drama of Job revolves around the problem of ignorance and the inability of man to fathom the deep purposes of God. Wilcox therefore asserts that "a man is happiest when he knows that he is only a man, and can reconcile himself to the limits of his knowledge and power" (p. 209). In this sense Job's resentment exhibited itself as a lack of trust and his bitterness as a failure to submit to God's design for his life. Such is the stuff of Job's failure.

*The Bitterness of Job* is not an exhaustive work. It is a sophisticated think piece, a teaser that forces the reader into areas of interpretation not often explored. The book of Job, like Ecclesiastes, lends itself well to this approach. Yet within the framework of contemporary philosophical approaches to Biblical literature it does not have the radical content of a deconstructionist position and is more informed as a commentary than Harold Bloom's collection of essays entitled *Modern Critical Interpretations*, which stresses parallels in classical literature. On the other hand, Wilcox fails to summon a wide range of philosophical expression on the problem of suffering, including such obvious sources as Platonic dialogue and Heideggerian existentialist tradition. Perhaps even a tie to the suffering-servant motif in the book of Isaiah might have proven helpful.

Eliezer Maass  
Buffalo Grove, IL

*The Lord Reigns: A Theological Handbook to the Psalms.* By James L. Mays. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1994, xii + 159 pp., \$16.99 paper.

This work, intended as a companion and supplement to Mays' commentary on the Psalms in the Interpretation series (1994), consists of 14 chapters (ten of which were previously published elsewhere) organized into five sections. The first division, "The Liturgy of the Kingdom of God" (chaps. 1-2), sets forth what Mays believes is the theological heart of the Psalter: the proclamation *Yahweh mālak*, "The LORD reigns." This confession is the root metaphor that lies behind and transcends the theological variety found in the Psalter. The second and third sections, "Prayers of Need, Gratitude, and Trust" (chaps. 3-6) and "The Praise of the Lord" (chaps. 7-8), examine a variety of issues surrounding the interpretation of the laments and hymns of the Psalter, such as the identity of the "I" and the "enemy" in the psalms, and how the psalms can serve as a guide to prayer and praise. The fourth division, "David as Psalmist and Messiah" (chaps. 9-11), explores the significance that the figure of David has for the interpretation of the Psalter as a whole, as well as for the understanding of the Messiah in particular. In the final part of this book, "The Psalms as Book and Scripture" (chaps. 12-14), Mays interacts with the recent interest in the Psalter as a literary en-

tity. While Mays sees much potential in this approach, he also realizes that it is as fraught with problems as other approaches are. As a control, he suggests that the conclusions of the historical-critical method should "condition and qualify the implications of the literary approach" (p. 127). The book closes with a bibliographical postscript and an index of passages discussed.

On the whole, Mays succeeds in producing a handbook to the Psalter that demonstrates a theological acumen and spiritual sensitivity that at the same time does not sacrifice good scholarship. Mays also provides plenty of illustrations of his method, with detailed examinations of Psalms 2, 13, 100, and 118. The fact that the majority of the chapters were previously published, however, results in some overlap and lack of cohesion in this work. Nevertheless, there is much in this book to recommend it to students who are concerned with how the Psalter functions theologically in the life of the Church today.

Tyler F. Williams

Wycliffe College, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada

*Ezekiel and the Leaders of Israel.* By Iain M. Duguid. VTSup 56. Leiden: Brill, 1994, xi + 163 pp., \$57.25.

Preference for *nāšî*<sup>2</sup> in Ezekiel 40–48 has often been interpreted as evidence of antimonarchical bias. Duguid proposes that Ezekiel's view of leadership has a broader spectrum, which included kings and princes, priests and Levites, prophets and lay leaders. Those most responsible for the fall of Judah will have a marginal role in the future restored nation; those less culpable will have positions of honor.

Kings and princes are one of four leadership groups in Ezekiel. He finds the use of *nāšî*<sup>2</sup> and *melek* are not distinctly different from use outside of Ezekiel 1–39 (pp. 18–20), although there is a preference for *nāšî*<sup>2</sup> in describing the future Davidic ruler in chaps. 40–48 (p. 24). Evidence for a *nāšî*<sup>2</sup> stratum in Ezekiel 40–48, as proposed by Gese, is lacking and the *nāšî*<sup>2</sup> stratum a "myth" (p. 31). Kings who have used violence, oppression and injustice are condemned (p. 43). The future ruler will be a *nāšî*<sup>2</sup> who will rule by a restricted form of the kingly office (p. 57).

The Levites' restricted role is the result of their flawed leadership. They will no longer officiate in the cultic functions of the temple (p. 77–78). The Zadokite priests, although not sinless, were more faithful than the Levites and shall officiate in the future temple (p. 80). Evidence for a "Zadokite stratum" in chaps. 40–48, proposed by Gese, is insufficient and the Zadokite stratum also a "myth" (p. 90).

Ezekiel classifies prophets into two categories presented in chaps. 13–14: false prophets who divine lies, and true prophets who warn the people of sin and judgment (p. 91). Chapters 40–48 set forth the guidelines for worship in the restored kingdom in which there is no prophetic role.

Lay leaders were comprised of two groups: *sārîm*, a council appointed by the king, and *zēqēnîm*, heads of families and tribal leaders (p. 110). They were responsible for the idolatry and the departure of the glory of Yahweh from the temple (p. 131). Hence they will have a greatly reduced role in the future kingdom (p. 132).

Ezekiel's vision of the restored community presents a reordering of the whole society to create a utopian future for the nation (p. 139). His message was one of encouragement and hope while warning of sin as the root cause of the exile.

Duguid does not endorse Ezekiel as the author but he does provide evidence for a sixth-century date and for unity of authorship based on the prophet's coordinated

view of leadership in preexilic Israel and Judah (p. 142). While there are minor points of disagreement, this work takes the book of Ezekiel seriously and provides an excellent resolution to the question of the prophet's antimonarchical bias. Thus the work is a valuable contribution to the study of Ezekiel.

Lamar E. Cooper, Sr.  
Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Kansas City, MO

*Von Weltengagement zu Weltüberwindung: Theologische Positionen im Danielbuch.* By R. Stahl. Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 4. Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1994, 215 pp., \$28.25.

Late fall of 1989 is a date that remains in people's minds as a most significant one. It is the date of the fall of the infamous Berlin Wall. If it denotes for most people simply the beginning of the end of the communist hegemony in Europe, what must it mean to a former East German? And what must it mean to a theologian from there who reads the book of Daniel?

The answer to these questions can be found in this concise book written by a teacher of OT in Leipzig. It is not a detailed exegesis of Daniel, as is J. J. Collins' massive 1993 commentary (Hermeneia), though it contains many matters of exegesis too (e.g. an excursus on Ezekiel 1 and Daniel), nor does Stahl, as many would today, pay particular attention to its narratological and thus holistic features (as e.g. D. N. Fewell does in *Circle of Sovereignty* [1991]). Rather, we have vintage redaction-critical analysis leading to the conclusion that the whole book is a *Danielbibliothek*.

Stahl's aim is to show how various theological viewpoints came to bear upon the book's message, ending in the way Jewish apocalyptic interpreted the world in the second century BC. According to Stahl, the book has been refashioned some eight times, each time reflecting a different context. A closed group of priests from Jerusalem finally faced the challenge of assigning to their community a place and role in the arena of world events. Many former traditions were picked up, and a new sapiential understanding of the hidden connections between general history and their lives ensued. Thus we have an eschatological interpretation of former prophecies in the midst of their own new experiences with world powers.

Stahl's arguments are very detailed and require a keen knowledge of German critical analysis as well as of the German language. This book is not for beginners, and it deserves closer scrutiny than this short review regrettably affords.

A last and important point: This book distinguishes itself from all others this reviewer has seen on Daniel in that it contains many excellent applications to our times (the author speaks of *anthropologische Konstanz*), especially with regard to the "blessed hope," i.e. God's ultimate reign. Though we may disagree with Stahl's critical stance, any serious preacher of Daniel can only benefit from his most stimulating applications to modern-day power politics.

Daniel Schibler  
Vevey, Switzerland

*Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi.* By Paul L. Redditt. NCB. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995, xxviii + 196 pp., \$14.99 paper.

In this volume, Georgetown College (KY) professor Paul Redditt pays careful "attention to the messages of both the prophets themselves and of the redactors or

editors who arranged and supplemented those messages" (p. xxvii). Thus for each of these books Redditt has found what he considers to be clear examples of redaction. For example, he finds three levels of redaction in Zechariah 1–8, each reflecting a separate edition of the book (pp. 38–43). Further, Redditt uses his redactional analysis to draw out sociopolitical conclusions from each level of redaction (see his treatment of Malachi as a non-Zadokite Levite critical of the Jerusalem elite, pp. 149–157, 186–187).

Most readers of this commentary will concur that some redactional activity took place in the composition of these prophetic books. Thus Redditt's conclusions demand careful reflection. However, the extent of that redaction, and particularly its sociological implications for the postexilic community, will undoubtedly raise many questions. The lack of historical data from the postexilic period makes it difficult to advance many detailed conclusions about the sociological history of the text. In addition, in asserting that Zechariah 1–8 and 9–14 "arose separately from each other and underwent very different redactional histories" (p. 38) Redditt does not address the question of the book's unity.

Despite my reservations about Redditt's redactional conclusions, the strength of this volume is that it is text-centered. When commenting upon the text, Redditt does not get sidetracked with secondary issues. Instead, his focus is upon the most fundamental of exegetical questions: "What does the text mean?" In contrast to many modern commentaries that drone on and on, this volume may make many readers wish that the author would have written more (Haggai gets only 32 pages of comment, Malachi only 38). Redditt also provides helpful summaries at the end of each section and at the end of the book, which assist the reader in putting together the whole.

The editors of this series have set a difficult goal in trying to reach both the scholarly and ministerial community. Scholars will appreciate Redditt's extended bibliography but might be frustrated at the relative brevity of his comments. However, for the limited pages of comment there is a good amount of interaction with relevant sources.

Pastors will appreciate the clear explanation of the text, and especially a user-friendly approach to the Hebrew language, but might be frustrated by Redditt's oblique applications. For example, in summarizing Zechariah he writes, "The division within the post-exilic community raised a basic question: who was Israel? . . . In pressing their own cases, each group inevitably slighted or excluded others. No one of them saw the full truth. Therein lies perhaps the most important lesson for Zechariah 9–14 for today" (p. 145). Is this an apologetic for pluralism? One wishes that Redditt would have taken another paragraph to flesh out this cryptic remark. Further, Christian ministers looking for detailed comments on the messianic implications of these books (especially Zechariah 9–14) will have to look elsewhere.

A fair standard by which to evaluate any commentary, no matter what its targeted audience, is how it explains the text. If we apply this standard, Redditt has produced a thoroughly commendable work. In sum, despite the caveats offered here the book is a welcome addition to the corpus of commentaries on these oft-neglected minor prophets.

Neil O. Skjoldal  
Trinity International University, Miami, FL

*Zechariah 9–14 and Malachi: A Commentary.* By David L. Petersen. OTL. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1995, xxi + 233 pp., \$28.00.

This commentary is a sequel to *Haggai and Zechariah 1–8: A Commentary* (1984) in the same series and by the same author.

The introduction has sections on the three oracles of Zechariah 9–11, Zechariah 12–14, and Malachi; historical context; Persian-period Yahwism; the Persian period, including the international scene, Syria-Palestine, Persian imperial strategies in the Levant and Judahite social and religious structure; Zechariah 9–14; Malachi; and the text. This is then followed by the commentary on the three oracles. There are no indexes.

The strengths of the work are many. Petersen provides up-to-date treatments of the form-critical genres of the three oracles. He delineates the form-critical structure, the traditio-historical issues, the historical background, and the literary-critical perspectives of the various literary or rhetorical units. On the whole, he does solid exegetical work on the details of each pericope. He introduces archeological evidence where appropriate. The volume is remarkably free of printing errors. Finally, it is an unusually well-written commentary. It was a pleasure to read it because of its enjoyable English style. Petersen is obviously an excellent writer.

But there are also weaknesses. I looked in vain for messianic interpretations or applications. There is virtually no use of the NT, despite the fact that Zech 9:9; 11:13; 12:10; 13:7 are quoted in the NT. The same is true of Mal 1:2; 3:1. Perhaps Petersen does not do canonical exegesis or canonical theology.

Petersen also maintains that in spite of the presence of nations' names (e.g. in Zech 9:1–7) "there are no . . . readily identifiable historical events that lie behind these texts." Yet I have attempted to show that there are (see my commentary on Zechariah in the *Expositor's Bible Commentary*). He argues that "there is no specific individual, like a Haggai or a Zechariah, to whom the literature [of Zechariah 9–14 and Malachi] may be attributed." But again I have tried to demonstrate precisely the opposite for Zechariah 9–14. Baldwin and Merrill have done the same for Malachi. In evaluating Lamarche's hypothesis of the unity of Zechariah 9–14, Petersen observes that the hypothesis is based on the notion that a messianic royal figure is central to the message of those chapters. He then claims that "few scholars today hold this to be the case." But I suspect that the majority of evangelical scholars do hold it to be the case.

While I feel free to recommend Petersen's work because of its strengths, it needs to be balanced by such evangelical commentaries as Baldwin's, Merrill's, and even my own in the *Expositor's Bible Commentary*.

Kenneth L. Barker  
Lewisville, TX

*The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations.* Volume 1: *The Rule of the Community and Related Documents*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth *et al.* The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project 1. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck); Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1994, xxiii + 185 pp., \$90.00.

The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project (PTSDSSP), founded in 1985 to produce a comprehensive publication of the non-Biblical texts, has published the first volume of a projected ten-volume edition. Series editor James Charlesworth has assembled a team of scroll experts, which includes 20 of the approximately 50 official scroll editors, plus an additional 25 predominantly American scholars.

This first volume unites the *Rule of the Community* (1QS) and its more fragmentary copies from Cave 4. The primary text (1QS) as well as the Cave 4 fragments (4Q255–264) are edited by Charlesworth and E. Qimron. It is of note that the ten

Cave 4 manuscripts of the *Rule of the Community* have as yet to be published officially in the Oxford Press Discoveries series and that assigned editors Geza Vermes and Philip Alexander are not included on the Princeton team. In addition, Charlesworth edited a 1QS-like fragment (5Q11), while Charlesworth and L. Stuckenbruck cooperated on the *Rule of the Congregation* (1QSa) and *Blessings* (1QSB). L. Schiffman prepared the *Sectarian Rule* (5Q13) and *Ordinances and Rules* (4Q159 and 4Q513), and J. Milgrom the *Purification Rule* (4Q514).

The *Rule of the Community*, constituting nearly two-thirds of volume 1, is arguably the most important document found in the caves at Qumran. Originally published by Burrows, Trever and Brownlee in 1951, it is perhaps the earliest-known constitution of a religious order. Although the Hebrew text has been printed in several contexts and English translations abound, the strength of the current publication lies in the fact that this marks the first time that the Cave 1 manuscript has been published with its Cave 4 counterparts. The frequent variations between these manuscripts will significantly inform ongoing discussions concerning the evolution of the Dead Sea community. The current editors have chosen not to express an opinion in any detail on this relationship. This silence may cause some confusion for the uninitiated, but a challenge to make some sense of the data is in store for the expert.

The presentation of the texts, printed with Hebrew transcriptions on the left page faced by the English translation on the right, is welcome, allowing the reader quick cross-referencing. The English translation is by design literal rather than idiomatic. There is no commentary other than frequent footnotes that highlight textual, grammatical, lexical and, more rarely, exegetical issues. These footnotes, a boon to the expert, assume a knowledge of Hebrew and a familiarity with technical issues that will frustrate many. The Hebrew transcriptions are footnoted, noting scribal corrections or additions to the manuscript and, in 1QS, comparative textual information from overlapping texts.

In the section that treats the Cave 4 manuscripts of the *Rule of the Community*, variant Hebrew readings from the Cave 1 manuscript are footnoted to the English translation rather than the Hebrew transcription as was the custom in 1QS. This practice requires the reader to examine the footnote in Hebrew. Oftentimes, because the variant's diverse nature is not always evident from the English, it is then necessary to scan the facing page in an attempt to determine the Hebrew passage in question. This problem should be corrected in future volumes by footnoting the Hebrew variant directly to the Hebrew text.

The sigla used in this and future volumes are clearly explained in the foreword (pp. xi–xii), with one notable exception. As is explained on p. 54, a double square bracket (⌈⌋) is used to alert the reader to major horizontal joins. While it is a commendable decision to attempt to communicate especially those joins that are not actually physical but suggested either by context or exemplar, this particular method may not produce clear understanding. On one hand, the double square bracket has been used in other publications to indicate blank spaces (paragraphing). Also, as the editors admit, the siglum only signals horizontal joins; nothing has been provided to indicate the vertical component. The lack of photographic plates in the Princeton edition is understandable, but this type of physical data is difficult to communicate without a visual aid for reference and probably should not be attempted.

The broad range of literary genres of the more than 600 non-Biblical manuscripts, the occasionally curious decisions made in the original (1950s) assignment of sigla, and the uneven distribution of manuscripts among eleven caves have created a nightmare for any intuitive system of classification. Nevertheless, the organization of the present series has needlessly added additional puzzles. The decision to include the ordinance texts 4Q159 and 4Q513–514 with the *Rule of the Community* in this first volume is

somewhat unexpected. Perhaps 4Q251 *Halakhah* and 4Q265 *Serek* and *Damascus Document* would have been better choices. More troublesome is the determination to publish the *Damascus Document* with the *War Scroll* in upcoming volume 2 while relegating its fragmentary manuscripts to volume 3. It appears that a concern to produce volumes of similar size has been allowed to overrule a more helpful distribution of material.

Two essential indexes are provided, one listing all of the Qumran manuscripts by Q number and the second providing access by the names of the documents. These lists are both keyed to the distribution of the materials in the ten PTSDSSP volumes. A more current and complete list, recently published as the *Dead Sea Scrolls Catalogue* compiled by Stephen Reed with Marilyn Lundberg (Scholars, 1994), reveals a few minor changes that will need to be accounted for by Charlesworth and his contributors.

Finally, although the intent of the series is clearly directed to the manuscripts from the caves of Qumran, perhaps the editors should reassess the possibility of including texts from adjacent sites, such as Masada, Murabba'at and Nahal Hever.

Volume 1 of the Charlesworth Dead Sea Scrolls is a welcome addition to the ongoing task of making this amazing collection of Jewish materials accessible for study. Although its presentation is aimed at the expert, there is much that will be of value to anyone with an interest in OT interpretation, rabbinic studies or NT background. It is a must for any student attempting to stay abreast of this rapidly developing field. The editors are to be commended for their labors.

Martin G. Abegg, Jr.  
Trinity Western University, Langley, BC

*Theological Lexicon of the New Testament*. 3 vols. By Ceslas Spicq. Translated and Edited by James D. Ernest. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994, xlvi + 492; xi + 603; x + 691 pp., \$99.99.

Given the present NT lexicographic landscape, one notes the arrival of a new "theological lexicon" with guarded interest. Since the publication in 1993 of the third volume of the *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament* (*EDNT*; Eerdmans, 1990–93), English-speaking students of the NT have had at their disposal three theologically oriented multivolume Greek language studies: *EDNT*, the *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (*TDNT*; Eerdmans, 1964–76), and the *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology* (*NIDNTT*; Zondervan, 1975–78). Into this abundance has now come James D. Ernest's translation of Ceslas Spicq's *Notes de lexicographie néo-testamentaire*. On the practical side, one could be led to wonder about the value of buying yet another Greek resource. To put it crassly: If I already own, say, *NIDNTT*, should I spend my money on *TLNT*? On the theoretical side, one could be led to wonder whether this new "theological lexicon" will adequately address the linguistic concerns originally raised by James Barr about *TDNT* and not sufficiently accounted for in that set's proffered successors, *NIDNTT* and *EDNT*. This review will examine those questions.

*TLNT* represents the fruit of a lifetime of research by the late Ceslas Spicq. Much of the contents of the three volumes was culled by the author from his previous publications, especially his various commentaries and his three-volume work on ἀγάπη in the NT (ET: Herder, 1965). The articles reflect an enviable familiarity with extra-Biblical primary sources, in particular with papyrological and inscriptional evidence, and as well display a commendable grasp of a wide range of secondary literature (up to about 1980).

The general layout of *TLNT* is simple and accessible. It consists in the main of articles arranged alphabetically under a selection of Greek words (ca. 640 words in 382 articles). Each article begins with one or more English glosses distilled from the larger discussion in the article. Indexes of Greek words and English glosses appear at the back of the third volume, as does an index of ancient sources (this last is marred, however, by the omission of non-Jewish sources). A helpful feature is the cross-references to Strong, *TDNT*, *NIDNTT*, *EDNT*, Moulton and Milligan, Louw's and Nida's *Greek-English Lexicon*, BAGD, and Horsley's and Llewelyn's *New Documents* at the bottom of the initial pages of articles.

The articles themselves are uneven in content and utility, and this is compounded by the fact that they follow no regular format (beyond Title, Gloss, Article). Some seem to be taken directly from a commentary and not expanded for useful generality. Others are little more than strings of ancient references with brief comments. Still others, however, are very straightforward, readable, and helpful. In general, as the work of one man the contents of *TLNT* are remarkably full and detailed, though an editor's eye for consistent presentation would have benefited the project.

*TLNT* is to be especially highly praised as a resource for probing the extra-Biblical usage of certain NT words. In fact, it is here that Spicq himself believed he made his most useful contribution (1.viii). As such, it more than holds its own against *TDNT*, *NIDNTT* and especially *EDNT*. Many of the larger articles in *TLNT*, *TDNT*, and *NIDNTT* provide comparable analysis, but Spicq often presents several more, and more detailed, extra-Biblical examples.

Approximately 160 of the nearly 640 words in *TLNT* are not covered in *TDNT*, about 240 are not to be found in *NIDNTT*, and about 150 appear in neither *TDNT* nor *NIDNTT*. (Since *EDNT* includes virtually every noun, proper name, verb, adjective, and adverb in the Greek NT, I have not included it in this analysis.) The articles on these "extra" words tend to be brief and interesting; many of them provide engaging insights into Greco-Roman customs and society.

*TLNT* is thus a beneficial addition to either *TDNT* or *NIDNTT*, though its comparatively limited number of articles will probably not commend it above the other two as a first purchase. It is considerably fuller in its treatments than *EDNT*, but the latter is more accessible when dealing with individual verses. Intended use will decide between the two.

*TLNT* shares the linguistic inadequacies of its predecessor "theological lexicons" (or, as Moisés Silva would prefer, "lexical theologies"). Like *TDNT*, *NIDNTT* and (to a certain extent) *EDNT*, it purports to discuss the meaning of certain Greek words found in the NT while often instead either discussing theological concepts that are sometimes contextually related to those words or, at best, discussing the theological significance of passages containing those words. To be fair, Spicq is aware that this is what he is doing (cf. 1.vii), but he seems genuinely ignorant of Barr's stress on the difference between lexical semantics and theology. This may be partly due to the fact that most of the material in *TLNT* was gleaned by Spicq from his earlier publications, most of which predate Barr. The French publication of the lexicon, nevertheless, came a full seventeen years after that of Barr's *The Semantics of Biblical Language*; it would thus be hoped that Barr's concerns would at least find some sort of accounting in *TLNT*.

In a related way, Spicq often writes of the "religious sense" of a word in the NT or LXX when he means that the word is more or less occasionally found in discourse units (sentences or larger) that have religious significance. So he writes of the "religious sense" of ἐλπίζω in Matt 12:21; Luke 24:21; John 5:45, when in fact ἐλπίζω has no necessary sense in these places beyond "to anticipate, to trust, or to expect benefit from"—i.e., it makes the same semantic contribution here as it would in secular contexts. The

“religious” connotation of the verses comes from other words collocated with ἐλπίζω. Spicq goes on to state that the LXX effected “a veritable semantic revolution,” giving ἐλπῖς and ἐλπίζω “a strictly religious meaning.” Again, it is not ἐλπῖς and ἐλπίζω that have “religious meaning” in his examples but the discourse units to which they belong. This sort of thing is encountered repeatedly in *TLNT* (cf. e.g. 1.12, 72; 2.333–334, 424).

Similar lack of linguistic rigor appears in frequent, subtle appeals to etymology—particularly egregious are those to the etymology of a presumed Hebrew *Vorlage* to LXX usage such as *melek* for βασιλεύς, *sākar* for μισθός, or *bāṭah* for ἐλπῖς—and certain terminological miscues, such as calling Heb 4:12 a metaphorical use of διστομος and saying that μακάριος is “almost synonymous with ‘immortal’” in certain contexts (cf. also 2.432). Instances of “illegitimate totality transfer” are not difficult to find either. For example, it is doubtful whether Luke had all the supposed “religious connotations” of πρωτότοκος “in mind” when he wrote that Jesus was Mary’s firstborn (3.211; cf. also 3.148).

Apart from matters of detail, though, and following Barr’s critique of *TDNT*, one cannot even assume that one is getting an ideal *Begriffswörterbuch* in *TLNT*, since Spicq usually only deals with what Cotterell and Turner call discourse-concepts and not with broader, more general concepts. For example, Spicq studies καταλλαγή and καταλάσσω as they appear in the NT but not other passages that may bear on the idea of reconciliation in the NT and that do not contain those words. As such, as a *Begriffswörterbuch* it is incomplete. Should one want to use *TLNT* in this capacity, it would at least behoove that person to establish other words in the semantic domain of the concept, e.g. via Louw and Nida (though Spicq does occasionally refer to other articles in *TLNT*), and then read the articles on all those “words” as well.

*TLNT* is a useful set and should be consulted by anyone examining extra-Biblical usage of Greek words appearing in the Bible. It will reward the researcher with a vast store of information. Additionally, Spicq does provide exegetical insight in quite a few places. But, noting the foregoing discussion, the reader should accept the linguistic and theological conclusions drawn by Spicq with an element of suspicion. As *Begriffswörterbücher*, good Bible dictionaries or NT theologies can presently suffice. We still await a multi-volume Greek lexicon that discusses word usage in the second century BC through the second century AD (i.e. that focuses on synchronic analysis) and that attempts to elucidate from available material in a linguistically responsible manner the actual senses of important Greek words and phrases in the NT.

Alan Hultberg  
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

*A Biblical Theology of the New Testament*. Edited by Roy B. Zuck. Chicago: Moody, 1994, 487 pp., \$28.99.

Five faculty members from Dallas Theological Seminary (David K. Lowery, Darrell L. Bock, W. Hall Harris, Mark L. Bailey and Buist M. Fanning) have turned out a volume that is at once evangelical, scholarly and eminently readable. Taking a canonical approach, the writers’ goal (as Bock puts it) is not so much to synthesize the entire NT corpus as “to surface the basic theological structures and perspectives underlying the whole of [each Biblical] author’s work” (p. 16).

The emphasis is therefore on diversity rather than unity, though Bock hastens to add that within that diversity “an inherent unity emerges around the activity of God

through Jesus Christ" (p. 17). For each contributor this inherent unity is salvation-historical, rendering the volume's overall perspective (if not its detailed analysis) remarkably similar to that of Dallas Seminary's erstwhile evangelical adversary, the late George Eldon Ladd of Fuller Theological Seminary.

In this way the Dallas quintet demonstrates how far their seminary has moved from a number of its earlier dispensationalist distinctives, while at the same time holding to the core doctrines of Christian faith and the absolute integrity of Holy Writ. For example, dispensationalism's erstwhile litmus test, the pretribulation rapture, now appears to be an option rather than a necessity (pp. 293–295). On the other hand, dispensationalism's insistence on a national future for Israel is maintained (e.g. p. 239), though a radical dichotomy between Israel and the Church, and thus between the "kingdom of heaven" and the "kingdom of God," has given way to the obvious exegetical conclusion that Matthew used the terms synonymously (pp. 35–36).

Flaws are few in this fine work. Nevertheless, the present reviewer believes that no contributor sets forth a satisfactory positive relationship between the law and the gospel, such as Jesus set forth in Matt 5:17–19. Indeed, Lowery has almost certainly overstated the case when he refers to Christ's ministry as "abrogation of the law" (p. 402). In addition, on p. 268 the word "if" is omitted from a quotation of Rom 9:32, thereby changing the entire sense of Paul's statement regarding the relationship between the Mosaic law, faith and works. Finally, Fanning's notion that justification in James refers merely to "a demonstration of a righteous standing before God" (p. 429) does not convince, Calvin's precedent notwithstanding.

On the plus side, Lowery's engaging literary style deserves special mention. His opening chapter on Matthew's theology, for example, reads more like an adventure narrative than academic analysis. The rest of his colleagues likewise communicate clearly, making this book a welcome bridge between the scholarly community and men and women in the pew. Pastors engaged in sermon preparation will also want this volume alongside the NT as they prepare to preach the Word of life.

Ted Dorman  
Taylor University, Upland, IN

*Christian Origins and the Question of God. Volume 1: The New Testament and the People of God.* By N. T. Wright. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992, xix + 535 pp., n.p.

This massive, encyclopedic tome is the first of a five-volume project aimed at reconstructing the life of Jesus and the history of early Christianity. In it Wright lays the essential methodological and historical groundwork for his proposed treatments of the historical Jesus (volume 2), Paul (volume 3), the gospels (volume 4), and the theological conclusions necessitated by his historical and exegetical work (volume 5).

After surveying the current state of the discipline (part 1), Wright deals with the question of referential meaning in view of the postmodern hermeneutical challenge, the nature of historical research, especially as it relates to religious movements in antiquity, and the character of the NT documents themselves (part 2). Adopting the "critical realism" of Ben F. Meyer (cf. pp. 15–16, 32, 35–36, 62–64), Wright seeks to avoid the extremes of positivism on the one hand (pp. 34, 66) and of radical phenomenism, with its solipsism, on the other (pp. 35, 66, 88, 117). Because he takes history and its recounting seriously, Wright's basic heuristic tool for the study of both first-century Judaism and Christianity becomes their reconstructed "story," since stories encapsulate worldviews at a more fundamental level of knowing than explicitly formulated

beliefs. Yet Wright also analyzes their symbols, praxis, literature, theology and eschatology as expressions and articulations of these same worldviews (pp. 32, 37–39, 65, 112, 123–129).

Having laid out his cautious but optimistic hermeneutical convictions, Wright then reconstructs the history and worldview of first-century Judaism, including its major parties, worldview, belief system, and eschatology (part 3). For Wright, the main feature of first-century Judaism was its creational monotheism and corresponding story of Israel's history of election as the people of her covenant God, which in turn demanded a "restoration eschatology" (p. 272). As a result, first-century Judaism longed for a renewal of the covenant and deliverance from the exile in which she still lived as a sinful people under foreign domination and a corrupt temple. Only then, when Israel's God has become king to rule and judge the nations through Israel as the true Adam/humanity, will the world be redeemed (see his summaries of this paradigm on pp. 149, 243, 247, 251–252, 259–260, 268–273, 279, 291–301, 332). Thus the various sociopolitical revolutionary responses of the "religious" parties of the period all revolve around the key questions of Jewish identity and of one's proper response to the current situation of oppression—that is, who is a true member of the elect covenant people, and what does it mean to be faithful to this covenant? (p. 335).

Hence, Israel's salvific hope was not for some kind of "post-mortem bliss" but for a national liberation that would fulfill the expectations aroused by the exodus and the initial Maccabean victory (p. 170). And most importantly for Wright (contra Schweitzer and the Bultmann-Käsemann perspective on apocalyptic), this means that the Jewish expectation of the kingdom of God "has nothing to do with the world itself coming to an end," a "cosmological" and "anthropological dualism" that has more in common with stoicism than Judaism and results from a literalist misreading of symbolic, apocalyptic language (quotes from pp. 285, 297; cf. pp. 298–299, 321). Indeed, "within the main-line Jewish writings of this period, covering a wide range of styles, genres, political persuasions and theological perspectives, *there is virtually no evidence that Jews were expecting the end of the space-time universe*" (p. 333, italics his). Rather, the point of apocalyptic imagery is "to invest the space-time events of Israel's past, present and future with their full theological significance" (p. 286; cf. p. 333). Such imagery reflects a context of social deprivation (p. 287) as the subversive literature of an oppressed group (p. 288) and the conviction that, because Israel's God was also the creator, her national restoration "could not adequately be described without the use of cosmic imagery," including that of the "new creation" (p. 306). What was expected was not the end of the world but the end of the present world order (p. 299). This can be seen in the Jewish doctrine of the resurrection itself, which is part of the hope for national restoration and whose goal is not an immortality of the soul but a future participation in a renewed physical world with new physical bodies as a vindication of Israel's faithfulness (pp. 328–334, 336, 338). And though explicit references to the Messiah *per se* are infrequent, unsystematized, and vague (pp. 302, 308), with no monolithic "messianic expectation" among first-century Jews (p. 307), it is clear that "the main task of the Messiah . . . is the liberation of Israel, and her reinstatement as the true people of the creator god," based on the Messiah as a human agent of God who is often involved in military action and who restores or rebuilds the temple (p. 320).

Wright's portrayal of first-century Judaism is not "intentionally controversial" (p. 338), nor will most recent scholars find its main lines of development to be so. Rather, "any resulting controversy . . . is quite likely to arise not in relation to Judaism in itself but from the effect of this reconstruction upon readings of early Christianity" (p. 338), which Wright now begins in his initial treatment of the early Church from the crucifixion of Jesus (AD 30) to the martyrdom of Polycarp (AD 155/156) in

part 4. For as the corollary to his view of Jewish eschatology, Wright rejects as “grossly distorted” the common practice of studying the early Church in terms of an “apocalyptic Christianity” that anticipated an imminent end of the world and was filled with anxiety and/or change due to its ensuing disappointment (pp. 120, 342). He likewise questions the Jewish/Hellenist dichotomy so common today (p. 453) and rejects the recently renewed attempt to rediscover an early “Gnostic Christianity” (pp. 342–343). Instead, what is needed is “a full reappraisal of the nature and place of eschatology within early Christianity” (p. 343). Its centerpiece will be the early Christian conviction that Israel’s hope for restoration had now been fulfilled in Jesus, thereby radically redefining and challenging the locus of Israel’s hope (Jesus and his people are now the new temple), the content of her belief concerning how God would act to rescue his covenant people and the world (through the death/resurrection of one man, Jesus, and the mission of his Church as its most central characteristic), and the non-racial, nongeographical nature of the covenant community as the new and true “family of God,” with its theological rather than praxis-based boundary markers (e.g. pp. 350–352, 363–367). Jesus’ death/resurrection inaugurates “the real return from (Israel’s) real exile” (p. 400), the fulfillment of Israel’s covenant expectations, and the beginning of the age to come (p. 446), with the fall of Jerusalem becoming the apocalyptic expectation (pp. 462–463). Moreover, the early Christians were compelled to these conclusions by their own experience of the Spirit (p. 446).

For Wright, therefore, Jesus does not merely represent Israel and secure her future; Jesus embodies Israel and her history (p. 402) and in so doing, in effect, replaces her. To announce the resurrection “according to the Scriptures” is “to tell Israel’s story in the form of Jesus’ story” (pp. 400–401). The synoptic gospels are about “the whole history of Israel” coming to a climax in the history of Jesus (pp. 381, 397, 401–402), so that they “have the form of the story of Israel, now reworked in terms of a single human life” (p. 402). In his view, Paul tells again and again “the whole story of God, Israel, and the world as now *compressed* into the story of Jesus,” thus providing a “*subversive twist* at almost every point,” e.g. in his view of Torah as that which only convicts Israel of her sin in order to cast her away that the world might be redeemed (pp. 79, 405–406; italics mine). In Acts, Paul’s ministry in Rome (Acts 28:30–31) is “Luke’s *full* answer to the question the disciples asked of Jesus in Acts 1:6. Israel’s god *has* restored his kingdom for his people” (p. 375, italics mine). John and Hebrews also share this same story line and narrative world in which the form of retelling Israel’s story is now focused on Jesus (cf. p. 417). For the early Christians, Jesus, as the Messiah, “summed up Israel in himself” (p. 447).

Finally, Wright finishes where he began by raising the question of the meaning of the common noun “god” in view of his understanding of the development of early Christianity, especially the early Christian treatment of Jesus as divine (part 5). But as the transition to the works ahead, Wright here simply underscores his introductory point that early Judaism and Christianity come to represent distinct views of “god” and opposing truth claims. Wright concludes courageously that the student of early Judaism and Christianity must also face the fact that they both cannot be right (p. 475).

This work is 476 pages of small print and big ideas, well written, organized and integrated. Wright’s sober hermeneutic is surely to be welcomed, though his treatment of authorial intention is vague at times and he appears to commit the intentional fallacy when he argues for the need to recover an author’s intention behind the text (pp. 55–56), while his willingness to accept meanings that go beyond what the author explicitly had in mind at the time is also troubling (cf. p. 58). Contra Wright, the lack of unanimity among exegetes is no reason to jettison a more positivist search for the “right” and “true” meaning (cf. p. 66). On the other hand, in telling the story of

first-century Judaism Wright negotiates deftly through all the major scholarly views, which in and of itself is a significant accomplishment. His work here is extremely valuable as a compendium and evaluation of the current debates, since he focuses on what are indeed the central issues. But such a broad-ranging study also means that Wright's own paradigms for reading first-century Judaism will be measured by the more detailed works upon which he bases his study, especially those of Sanders, Hengel and Neusner. The main points of controversy will no doubt be his rightful rejection of the "atomistic positivism" that refuses to speak about "the overall first-century Jewish [and Christian] worldview" (pp. 119, 244), his more political reading of Pharisaism, his acceptance of Sanders' covenantal nomism as "conclusive" (pp. 237–238, 260), the pervasive emphasis on the continuation of the exile, his sociological explanations of theological debates within first-century Judaism, and his almost exclusively this-worldly reading of apocalyptic literature and imagery (cf. especially his thoroughly symbolic view of the son of man in Daniel 7 and his view that its apocalyptic use in the NT refers to the vindication of Jesus [=Israel] at his resurrection and in the destruction of Jerusalem, and not to his return; cf. pp. 291–292, 295–296, 461–463). Nevertheless, Wright's emphasis on the concrete sociopolitical and historical expectations of first-century Judaism is surely a needed corrective.

In contrast, his treatment of Christianity is vintage Wright. As in his earlier work on Paul, here too the central question remains whether, despite his use of the terminology of "inauguration" and a fulfillment yet to come, Wright has produced an over-realized eschatology along the lines of the earlier work of C. H. Dodd. One wonders in reading Wright if he has not done for Christianity what he maintains Josephus did for Rome: Whereas Josephus destroyed the "narrative grammar" of Israel's story by concluding that Israel's God had gone over to the Romans, with Jerusalem destroyed forever and Judaism dispersed (cf. p. 217), Wright pictures Israel's God as having gone over to the Christians, with no future hope for Israel as well. His replacement view of the relationship between Israel, Jesus, and the Church also leads him to a "reappraised" eschatology that sounds preterist, combined with a reestablishment in different categories of the traditional law/gospel categories (including even the traditional particularistic/inclusive contrast between Judaism and Christianity common in previous generations). Here too readers will be sent back to the sources in anticipation of Wright's own further exegesis and historical reconstruction.

Wright emphasizes that the verification of his epistemology is in what it produces, i.e. "the proof of the pudding is in the eating of it" (p. 45; cf. pp. 32, 57, 70). Thus far, though every element may not be digested, Wright's first course is a real feast. As a paradigmatic lens for reading the literature and movements of the period, Wright's introductory volume will prove invaluable as a point of orientation to the current debate and as a discussion starter for serious students.

Scott J. Hafemann  
Wheaton College, Wheaton, IL

*A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus.* By John P. Meier. 2 volumes. Anchor Bible Reference Library. New York: Doubleday, 1991, 484 pp., \$30.00; 1994, 1118 pp., \$35.00.

This classic work by Meier when completed will consist of three volumes. The first has the subtitle *The Roots of the Problem and the Person*. The first part, "Roots of the

Problem,” consists of seven chapters. The first chapter discusses “Basic Concepts: The Real Jesus and the Historical Jesus.” Here Meier discusses the terminology involved in Jesus research and points out that “the historical Jesus is not the real Jesus, but only a fragmentary hypothetical reconstruction of him by modern means of research” (p. 31). Chapters 2–5 involve an analysis of the sources available for the study of the life of Jesus. In chap. 2, “Sources: The Canonical Books of the New Testament,” Meier affirms the traditional understanding of the sources as involving Mark, Q, John, M and L. Chapter 3, “Sources: Josephus,” is devoted primarily to a discussion of the *Testimonium Flavianum* (*Ant.* 18.3.3). Meier argues for a basic core, minus the positive statements, going back to Josephus. Chapter 4, “Sources: Other Pagan and Jewish Writings,” consists of a succinct discussion of the references found in Tacitus, Suetonius, Pliny the Younger and the Talmudic materials. Chapter 5, “Sources: The *Agrapha* and the Apocryphal Gospels,” contains a helpful discussion of such alleged sources as the *Gospel of Peter* (“betrays a knowledge of, at the very least, Matthew, probably Mark and Luke, and possibly John” [p. 117]), the hypothetical “Cross” gospel (“bears telltale marks of dependence on the Synoptics” [p. 117]), the *Secret Gospel of Mark* (“To use such a small fragment of dubious origins to rewrite the history of Jesus and the gospel tradition is to lean on a reed” [p. 121]), and the *Gospel of Thomas* (“the Synoptic-like sayings . . . are in fact dependent on the Synoptic Gospels” [p. 139]). He concludes that “the four canonical Gospels turn out to be the only large documents containing significant blocks of material relevant to a quest for the historical Jesus” (p. 139).

Chapter 6 is devoted to “Criteria: How Do We Decide What Comes from Jesus?” Meier refers to two kinds of criteria for authenticity. Under “Primary Criteria,” the first criterion discussed is the criterion of embarrassment. This involves material that would have been an embarrassment to the early Church’s beliefs and thinking about Jesus. Examples of this would be Jesus’ experiencing a baptism of repentance and Mark 13:32, where Jesus claims ignorance over knowing the time of the end. Since such materials were an embarrassment to the Christian understanding of Jesus’ sinlessness and omniscience, they could not have arisen in the Church but must be authentic, according to Meier. Next Meier discusses the criteria of discontinuity, multiple attestation, coherence, and rejection and execution. The first three are well known. The last involves the necessity of Jesus’ teaching and acts being consistent with the fact that he was rejected and put to death. A second group of criteria is called “Secondary (or Dubious) Criteria” because their use in demonstrating the authenticity of gospel materials is more questionable. These include the criteria of traces of Aramaic, Palestinian environment, vividness of narration, tendencies of the synoptic tradition, and historical presumption. The last involves the issue concerning where the burden of proof lies. Chapter 7 serves as a conclusion to part 1 and focuses on the importance of the quest for the historical Jesus.

Part 2 of this volume consists of four chapters dealing with the “Roots of the Person.” Chapter 8, “In the Beginning . . . The Origins of Jesus of Nazareth,” discusses, among other things, the possibility of Jesus’ Davidic sonship, which Meier thinks should be taken seriously, and the virginal conception. The latter involves a lengthy discussion in which he concludes that “decisions on this tradition, limited within the NT to the Infancy Narratives, will largely be made on the basis of one’s philosophical views about the miraculous and the weight one gives to later Church teaching” (p. 230). Chapter 9, “In the Interim . . . Part I: Language, Education, and Socioeconomic Status,” argues that Jesus was probably trilingual in understanding but not in his teaching, which was primarily if not exclusively in Aramaic, that he was literate, and that he

was economically the equivalent of "a blue-collar worker in lower-middle-class America" (p. 282). Chapter 10, "In the Interim . . . Part 2: Family, Marital Status, and Status as a Layman," contains a lengthy discussion on the "brothers and sisters" of Jesus. He concludes that "hence, from a purely philological and historical point of view, the most probable opinion is that the brothers and sisters of Jesus were his siblings" (p. 332). He also states that the more probable hypothesis is that Jesus remained celibate (p. 345). Chapter 11, which concludes the first volume, is entitled "'In the Fifteenth Year' . . . A Chronology of Jesus' Life." It is a succinct and excellent discussion of the chronological issues involved in the study of Jesus' life. Meier concludes that Jesus was probably born ca. 7 or 6 BC in Nazareth (!), began his ministry at the end of AD 27 or the beginning of 28, and was crucified in 30.

This volume concludes with maps of Palestine and Galilee in Jesus' day, charts of the family of Herod the Great and the regnal years of the Roman emperors, a list of abbreviations used in this work (pp. 439–457), an index of Scriptures, an author index and an index of subjects.

Volume 2 has the subtitle *Mentor, Message, and Miracles*, which reveals the three parts into which this volume is divided. In a very helpful introduction, Meier explains the length of his work as due to (1) being a part of the Anchor Bible Reference Library and thus needing to present a broad and representative sampling of opinions, (2) seeking to interact and contribute to the third quest of the historical Jesus, (3) realizing that all too often in the past weighty questions of the historicity of the material have been described "in a few sentences or at times simply with an airy wave of the hand," and (4) needing to deal with the issue of Jesus' miracles. The method used throughout involves the five primary criteria for authenticity discussed in chap. 7 of volume 1.

Part 1, "Mentor," consists of two chapters, "John Without Jesus: The Baptist in His Own Rite" (chap. 12) and "Jesus With and Without John" (chap. 13). This lengthy focus on John the Baptist is due to his being the "greatest single influence on Jesus' ministry." John is understood by Meier as a first-century Jewish prophet with an eschatological message who made a great impact on the nation. His once-for-all baptism marks him off from Qumran, and Meier warns against seeing a romantic connection between the two. After discussing various views concerning their relationship, he concludes that Jesus probably belonged for a time to the inner circle of John's disciples but that he later pursued his own mission. In his own mission Jesus never gave up the eschatological proclamation of God's future coming in judgment nor the practice of baptism. Jesus did, however, move from the preaching of an imminent fiery judgment to more of an emphasis on the mercy of God.

Part 2, "Message," consists of three chapters devoted to "The Kingdom of God: God Coming in Power to Rule." Chapter 14 covers "Background," chap. 15 "Jesus' Proclamation of a Future Kingdom," and chap. 16 "The Kingdom Already Present." Meier maintains that the heart of Jesus' teaching involved the proclamation of the kingdom of God. As the subtitles of these chapters indicate, he sees in Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom of God both an eschatological "not yet" and a present "now." He rejects the extremes of a noneschatological understanding of the kingdom, found in nineteenth-century liberalism, at times in C. H. Dodd, and now in such modern writers as Borg and Crossan. He also rejects the purely future or consistent eschatological understanding of the kingdom of Weiss, Schweitzer and, more recently, E. P. Sanders. Instead of understanding the term "kingdom" statically, Meier sees it as being dynamic in nature. As a result the kingdom or reign of God can permit a stage in which the eschat-

ological drama has already begun and in which "strategic battles [are] already won" as well as a stage in which the consummation and "final victory [is] still to come."

Part 3, "Miracles," consists of seven chapters and makes up the largest part of this volume (pp. 509–1038). The chapters are as follows: "Miracles and the Modern Mind" (chap. 17), "Miracles and Ancient Minds" (chap. 18), "The Historicity of Jesus' Miracles: The Global Question" (chap. 19), "Jesus' Exorcisms" (chap. 20), "Jesus' Healings" (chap. 21), "Raising the Dead" (chap. 22), "The So-Called Nature Miracles" (chap. 23). In chap. 17 Meier argues that a positive or negative judgment concerning the miracles of Jesus is ultimately beyond the ability of the historian *qua* historian. Such a decision is always a philosophical or theological one. Concerning the statements of Bultmann and others, who disavow the miracles on the grounds that a modern, educated person living in a day of electric lights and present-day science can never believe in miracles, Meier points out that only 6 percent of Americans hold such a view. Unless 94 percent of Americans are therefore to be labeled as "unscientific," people today not only can believe but the majority do believe in the possibility of miracles. It is therefore patently incorrect for academics to state that "no modern person can believe in miracles."

A discussion of the content of all these chapters is impossible within the scope of this review. A helpful summary of them is found in a portion of chap. 23 entitled "Summing up the Gospel Miracles" (pp. 967–970). Here Meier concludes that all the nature miracles, with the possible exception of the feeding of the multitude, "appear to have been created by the early church to serve various theological purposes" (p. 970). On the other hand, "the statement that Jesus acted as and was viewed as an exorcist and healer during his public ministry has as much historical corroboration as almost any other statement we can make about the Jesus of history" (*ibid.*). His "miracle-working activity [furthermore] played an integral part in his being able to attract attention" (*ibid.*). Thus he concludes: "Any historian who seeks to portray the historical Jesus without giving due weight to his fame as a miracle-worker is not delineating this strange and complex Jew, but rather a domesticated Jesus reminiscent of the bland moralist created by Thomas Jefferson" (*ibid.*).

The second volume ends with a "Conclusion to Volume Two," which sets the stage for volume 3, the same maps, charts, and list of abbreviations found in the first volume, and Scripture, author and subject indexes.

How does one evaluate a work of this size and magnitude? A discussion of Meier's treatment of each individual subject or Biblical passage is impossible, so we must satisfy ourselves with an overview of the work as a whole. On the back pages of these two volumes are various endorsements. The first one for each volume reads: "Meier's work will for generations serve as *the* guide on the quest for the historical Jesus" and "An instant and indispensable classic." I have no qualms agreeing with both. This work is must reading for scholars and serious students on the life of Christ. These are not works, however, that most people will find useful. Average laypeople simply are not interested in reading such an immense and technical work, but they are not the targeted audience. The scholar and serious student, on the other hand, will always find a learned discussion of the key issues, a careful presentation and critique of the various views, and a heavily documented set of footnotes. Meier presents a middle-of-the-road position in most instances. The radical positions of the Jesus Seminar are clearly shown to be what they are: the radical and eccentric views of extremists. Evangelicals will, however, find in these volumes a critique of their positions and views as well. Certainly Meier's conclusions concerning the miracles of Jesus are more negative than evangelicals would like to see. Nevertheless,

for the serious student interested in studying the issues involved it is hard to think of a better place to go than these two volumes. It is with great anticipation that we look forward to the appearance of the third and final volume of this magisterial work.

Robert H. Stein  
Bethel Theological Seminary, St. Paul, MN

*This Jesus: Martyr, Lord, Messiah.* By Markus Bockmuehl. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1994, xi + 242 pp., \$19.95 paper.

On his way to Jerusalem for a sabbatical leave, the author of this book happened upon the sensational volume on Jesus by A. N. Wilson and, by the time he had gotten to Jerusalem, Markus Bockmuehl had decided to respond to Wilson by studying the historical Jesus during his sabbatical. He abandoned the original project, and this book is the result of his sabbatical. We should probably be grateful for his change of plans. *This Jesus*, a title taken from Acts 2:36, contends that the current rash of books on Jesus—and their number continues to pile up monthly—consistently assume or argue a discontinuity between the Jesus of history and the Christ of faith (going back to the seminal study of Martin Kähler). Bockmuehl's theory is that "an authentic link between Jesus of Nazareth and the exalted Christ is in fact *theologically indispensable* for Christianity" (p. 167, italics his). "For good or ill," he continues, "the creed and credibility of Christianity remain irrevocably bound up with the person of Jesus of Nazareth" (p. 167). Thus Bockmuehl opines that it is "odd that in so many books on Jesus we should be required to choose between two flavours of discourse: either history or christology, but not both" (p. 146). His book fires off a missive that contends that "the earthly Jesus and the exalted Lord were *one and the same*" (p. 152, italics mine).

In coming to this conclusion on the essential continuity between the historical Jesus and the Christ of the Church, our author ponders seven questions: (1) Where did Jesus come from? (2) Was Jesus the Messiah? (3) Why did Jesus predict the temple's destruction? (4) Did Jesus fail? (5) Was Jesus a Christian? (6) How did Jesus pray? and (7) Why was Jesus exalted to heaven? For each of these seven questions the author shows an adequate grasp of both the evidence and the scholarship. He weaves his way to a consistent conclusion: There is continuity between the earthly Jesus and what Christians of all ages have come to believe about him. Never wanting to be found guilty of apologetical enthusiasm, Bockmuehl is cautious about his conclusions and careful in his inferences, but he still comes to what amounts to a traditional, orthodox presentation of NT Christology.

I have several reservations about this book. First, in his chapters on Jesus as Messiah and his prediction of the temple's destruction the author does not articulate clearly enough the national and ethnic nature of Jewish expectation and understanding of history. Put differently, I find it surprising that Bockmuehl has not interacted enough with the scholarship represented, and generated, by G. B. Caird's Ethel M. Wood Lecture of 1965 (*Jesus and the Jewish Nation*). This conclusion has been integral to discussions of Jesus of late. Second, at times the essential conclusion of the book (orthodox Christology and continuity between Jesus and the Christ) oversteps what was actually demonstrated in the individual chapters. In particular, when Bockmuehl finishes his chapter on whether or not Jesus was the Messiah he contends that he was—"with a qualified but unambiguous yes" (p. 59, italics his). Apart from what "qualified but unambiguous" means (I would have thought "qualified" would lead to

some form of "ambiguity"), this conclusion (however accurate it may be for a first-century Jewish context) falls short of the major inferences drawn for the book. This ambiguity, on his part, arises (I think) from the manner in which the book proceeds: The author interacts with evidence and scholarship, with a careful eye on theology. It is (probably too) difficult to put all these things into a reasonable shape, in such a short compass, that satisfies both theological and scholarly approaches. Third, I am disappointed that certain topics were omitted from a central place: What did Jesus mean by the kingdom? What are Jesus' ethical teachings, and are they valuable today? Did Jesus perform miracles? Fourth, in an international context like ours I must register disappointment for Bockmuehl's not interacting enough with the Jesus Seminar and with the major voices in this country's discussion, such as Marcus Borg and Richard Horsley, nor does he interact with the intense study of the Q Seminar (including James Robinson, John Kloppenborg and Burton Mack). While I have great respect for British scholarship (especially the works of J. D. G. Dunn, C. F. D. Moule, G. B. Caird and G. N. Stanton), this book is harmed by its preoccupation with work done in Great Britain.

However, there was much about this book that I liked. His study on whether or not Jesus failed is marked by an historical sensitivity and a perception of theological implications. The book surveys a massive amount of detail in a readable format, and I think I could use this book in both undergraduate and graduate settings. I am in agreement with the essential theory: There is massive continuity between the historical Jesus and the Christ of faith. Further, Bockmuehl both summarizes and extends the excellent work of B. F. Meyer on Jesus' view of the end. In many ways this book will prove to be a useful textbook, not just for what it concludes but for raising critical questions that all students ask.

Scot McKnight  
North Park College, Chicago, IL

*Christ and the Bible*. By John Wenham. 3d ed. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994, 222 pp., \$10.99 paper.

The first edition of *Christ and the Bible* appeared in 1972. In the present edition the author advances his discussion, especially regarding the text of the NT. Wenham is well known for his recent reappraisal of the Markan hypothesis, *Redating Matthew, Mark and Luke*, as well as his earlier treatment of the resurrection narratives, *Easter Enigma*.

Chapter 1 deals with Jesus' view of the OT, showing how the mind of Jesus was "saturated with the Old Testament" (p. 36), whose authority he never questioned (though he often had to defend it against popular misinterpretations, as in the antitheses of Matt 5:17-48). Chapter 2 takes up Jesus' authority as a teacher and his claims to be divine, while chap. 3 answers objections to these claims (e.g. Jesus lived in a prescientific age; belief in demons is no longer tenable; David cannot be the author of Psalm 110, as Jesus asserted). Chapter 4 treats the NT writers' use of the OT (viz., the OT comprises the very oracles of God, is God-breathed, and is "Scripture") and shows how problems in the NT usage (e.g., references to noncanonical literature) are purely imaginary. Chapter 5 deals with Jesus' training of the apostles to carry on his work of teaching and guidance, while chap. 6 treats the problem of the limits of the Biblical canon (its 66 books can be confidently received as truth). Finally, chap. 7 takes up the problem of the reliability of the Biblical text (despite a textually uncertain "fringe," we

have an accurate text) and in particular challenges the validity of modern critical texts of the NT.

This is an excellent book by a seasoned scholar. Many critics will be shocked to read such statements as “the once-repudiated Byzantine text has a better claim to approximate the original than the modern eclectic texts” (p. 10) or to see a modern scholar defending the authenticity of the last twelve verses of Mark. Such critics would do well to rethink their views in the light of Wenham’s lucid arguments.

David Alan Black  
La Mirada, CA

*Parables as Subversive Speech: Jesus as Pedagogue of the Oppressed.* By William R. Herzog, II. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1994, 299 pp., \$19.99 paper.

Many new volumes on parable studies have appeared in recent years. Most of these are tied to some type of literary or narrative approach, seeking to understand the gospel parables within the literary frameworks in which they appear. William R. Herzog, II, dean and professor at Colgate Rochester Divinity School, has made a presentation that “swims against the current” of these literary approaches (p. 40). Herzog seeks to recover the original parables of Jesus and interpret them through a modern paradigm, the work of Brazilian educator and literacy advocate Paulo Freire. The result is unlike anything you will read in other recent parable studies.

Herzog thinks that most parable interpretations are inadequate. Traditional interpretations have relied on “theology” (theology + allegory), which is a “selective investing of the parable with theological values” (p. 80). All of the presentations of the parables by the gospel authors have done this, according to Herzog, and he seeks to recover the primitive state of the parable before this theologizing process appended theological values to them.

Current parable interpretations fail for another reason in Herzog’s estimation. This is because they portray Jesus in a way that lacks explanatory power as to why he was executed as a political criminal. Herzog refuses to see the parables of Jesus as vehicles of spiritual or religious teaching, but rather as “codifications,” a type of social analysis designed “to expose the contradictions between the actual situation of [their] hearers and the Torah of God’s justice” (p. 28). These parables/codifications expose the exploitative methods of the ruling elites in their oppression of the peasant and artisan classes of first-century Palestine. Thus the parables are “subversive speech,” for they incite revolt against this exploitation. For this reason Jesus was executed with full cooperation between the temple elites, the wealthy Jewish landowners, and the Roman overlords.

Herzog’s method reveals some startling results. For example, in the parable of the talents (which Herzog names “The Vulnerability of the Whistle-blower”) the third servant, who buries his master’s treasure, is the “hero” (p. 167), because he exposes the master’s coldhearted greed and exploitative desires.

This work contains primary logical gaps that will bother many readers. For example, Herzog never grapples adequately with the social situation of the historical Jesus himself. For Herzog’s program to work, Jesus must be seen as a prototype of the modern liberation sociologist who has inexplicably transcended his social role as the son of a despised person of the artisan class. Somehow this moderately educated peasant/artisan was able to gain the large view of the oppressive social systems of his day

and work to bring his fellow peasants to a self-realization of the same. But logical gaps aside, this is a fascinating study of the social backgrounds and dynamics that may have existed during early first-century Palestine. There is much to disagree with here but also much to gain by a careful reading.

Mark S. Krause

Puget Sound Christian College, Edmonds, WA

*Not Ashamed of the Gospel: New Testament Interpretations of the Death of Christ.* By Morna D. Hooker. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995, 143 pp., \$10.99 paper.

In this slim volume, Morna Hooker, Lady Margaret professor of divinity at the University of Cambridge, makes a helpful contribution to our understanding of the significance of Christ's death. Her differentiated, Biblical-theological approach is particularly commendable when dealing with a topic that is often treated in an atemporal and merely systematic fashion. The chapters on Paul, Mark and John, clearly the best portions of the book, were first given as lectures; the ones on Matthew, Luke-Acts, Hebrews and I Peter/1 John/Revelation were added for this present publication. For students of Jesus or of NT theology, this is a welcome source of information, and it is one that is less intimidating than, for example, Raymond Brown's recent two-volume tome *The Death of the Messiah*.

By way of critique, three points merit special attention. First, Hooker's total exclusion of Jesus' understanding of his own death will leave many evangelical readers unsatisfied. Is it really justified, or even entirely possible, to discuss what, for example, Mark thinks of Jesus' death without reference to Jesus' self-understanding? Second, in relation to widely held views on Jesus' death Hooker's is not an entirely conventional treatment. Most notably, she dismisses the notions of substitutionary atonement and propitiation regarding Christ's death. Hooker rather expresses Christ's death in terms of a "sharing of experiences" (i.e., union with Christ in his death, burial, and resurrection; cf. e.g. Romans 6), Christ having died, "not instead of the human race, but as their representative." Also, she prefers the term "expiation" to "propitiation." Third, some of the author's individual judgments are subject to debate, such as her contention that Matthew's resurrection stories are "full of improbabilities" or her reference to Luke's "scanty geographical knowledge."

These criticisms, however, should not detract from the fact that this book retains its value as a concise and informative summary of the distinctive interpretations of Jesus' death by the different NT writers. If the above cautions are kept in mind, the work may be commended as supplementary reading for classes on the subject.

Andreas J. Köstenberger

Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Wake Forest, NC

*The Quest for Q.* By David Catchpole. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1993, xv + 344 pp., \$44.95.

The Jesus Seminar and the "third quest" of the historical Jesus have once again brought the synoptic gospels to the front pages of our newspapers and newsmagazines. This collection of previously published articles, which have been extensively supple-

mented and, in some cases drastically revised, by the St. Luke's Foundation professor of theological studies and head of the department of theology at the University of Exeter, represents a condensation of a prodigious amount of research and reflection on the collection of the sayings of Jesus that scholars know as Q. The book is so condensed, in fact, that it is virtually impossible to read without the use of a Greek synopsis.

The ten chapters of the book are an amazingly thorough and profound analysis of selected individual parts of Q, though the author does not tell us why he has selected the particular sayings he has. The first chapter (and by far the longest: 60 pages) is an analysis of 16 Q sayings to defend the existence of Q against the argument of M. D. Goulder and others that dispenses with Q and insists instead that Luke used Matthew, though he was not successful in correcting all the serious internal tensions in the earlier gospel. My work with this material has led me to agree with Goulder that Matthew is later than Luke. The other nine chapters are detailed discussions of anywhere from two to ten individual pericopes that contain Q material in some form: the beginning of Q, the inaugural discourse (sermon on the mount/plain), reproof and reconciliation, the mission charge, the whole people of God, prayer and the kingdom, the Law and the Prophets, tradition and temple, and faith.

For students of the synoptic gospels, Catchpole's book is indispensable. He is an outstanding defender of the view that the Q hypothesis enables us coherently to reconstruct the history of the synoptic tradition in a way that the hypothetical Lucan use of Matthew does not. Every line of the book represents a digest of an enviably thorough analysis of, and reflection on, every facet of individual sayings and even words. He is thoroughly familiar with all the relevant British and German literature on Q; American scholars, including a number of evangelicals, are also occasionally cited. At times Catchpole speaks of "discordances" and early and later strata where some will feel they do not exist. But this is only a minor criticism of a superb work of scholarship.

Leslie R. Keylock  
Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, IL

*The Book of Proverbs: A Survey of Modern Study.* By R. N. Whybray. Leiden: Brill, 1995, 184 pp., \$71.50.

Long recognized as an expert in the field, R. N. Whybray has written a succinct history and assessment of academic trends focusing specifically on the book of Proverbs. He does this by briefly summarizing the main features of books and articles that have been influential in the scholarly research on Proverbs. It is a welcome addition to a field of study that is only recently getting the attention it deserves. This book excludes an overall discussion of the interrelated area of wisdom literature in general, limiting the discussion to Proverbs scholarship over the last century. The approach is to set out chronologically the developments and discoveries related to this field. This approach leads to a great deal of repetition due to one book or article being referred to and summarized in more than one chapter. The author states in the preface that he is aware of this problem and has sought to avoid it as much as possible. The main drawback with it centers more on an inadequate reference system in the book rather than the repetition. A helpful feature of the book is that the names of scholars under discussion are in upper-case type, making the names stand out from the text.

Whybray divides the book into seven chapters. The first chapter treats origins and background studies beginning with mid-nineteenth-century scholars. The discov-

ery and publication of the Egyptian instruction of *Amenope* (more commonly spelled *Amenemope*) fueled much of the discussion, leading many to seek a foreign origin and international setting for wisdom materials. Also important in this part of the discussion is the role of the royal court and the social background of Proverbs, along with the question of the existence of schools, the origin of folk wisdom and lastly the recent tendencies in comparative studies of Proverbs with African preliterate societies.

Chapter 2 deals with literary and structural matters in Proverbs 10–29. Here theories of literary development are discussed, along with types of proverbs and the arrangement of these chapters. Chapter 3 does much the same thing with Proverbs 1–9 and 22:17–24:22(34). Particularly helpful in this discussion are the presentations of Egyptian influence on Proverbs 1–9, of trends in viewing the figure of Wisdom in Proverbs 8, and the various views of the similarities between *Amen(em)ope* and Prov 22:17–24:22. An article that might have been added as a balance to the lopsided discussion of Egyptian influence on Proverbs is John Day's "Foreign Semitic Influence on the Wisdom of Israel and its Appropriation in the Book of Proverbs" in *Wisdom in Ancient Israel* (ed. J. Day, R. P. Gordon, H. G. M. Williamson; Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1995) 55–70, although Whybray's book was published the same year, making access to it difficult.

Chapter 4 treats Proverbs 30–31, giving attention primarily to the numerical sayings in 30:15–33 and the acrostic in 31:10–31.

Chapter 5 discusses ideas and theology. In this chapter Whybray lists ten basic positions that most scholars are agreed upon regarding Proverbs, and ten problem areas (pp. 112–114). Following this is a discussion of the debate over some of the problems and suggested solutions over the last 100 years. In many ways this is the most informative chapter of the book but sounds very repetitious, since many of the names and ideas have been mentioned earlier. Because this chapter is so enmeshed with the previous chapters a reader might wish for a more effective way of finding where a topic had been treated in other parts of the book. Expansion of the topical index, more extensive footnotes or an in-text reference system would have been helpful in this regard.

Chapters 6–7 are relatively short discussions of the dates of the book of Proverbs and the text and versions respectively. The chapter on dates in particular is testimony to the wide range of opinions possible in a given area of scholarship, especially where there is little hard evidence. One of the values of this chapter is to see the growing trend away from the evolutionary assumptions that held OT scholarship in a stranglehold for several decades. Those who held these assumptions claimed that proverbs "evolved" from one-line sayings to two-line sayings and then to multiline "essays" as seen, e.g., in Proverbs 1–9, thus making it possible to determine the redactional history behind the text. Another area where this assumption is being slowly refuted is in the distinction between "secular" proverbs (those without a divine reference) and "religious" sayings (those that contain a reference to God or Yahweh). "Secular" proverbs were viewed as older, with "religious" sayings developing later, or divine references were added to secular sayings. More current scholarship has shown that ancient societies did not draw hard and fast lines between these two categories. Chapter 7 has a very brief discussion of textual criticism in general and then lists the relevant studies on Proverbs that have focused on comparative philology, especially regarding Ugaritic. The most extensive discussion in this chapter revolves around the LXX and its value in comparison to the MT.

Whybray includes an extensive though noncomprehensive bibliography on Proverbs. In an appendix he lists several other works that contain bibliographies on Proverbs, though most of them are on the more general field of OT wisdom literature

rather than focusing on Proverbs in particular. A scholar who surprisingly was left out of the discussion completely was the late David A. Hubbard, whose journal articles, articles in *ISBE* and other reference works, and commentary on Proverbs (Word, 1989; see the review by J. C. Whytock, *JETS* 37 [1994] 140) have been very helpful to this reviewer in the past.

Whybray's book is indispensable to someone doing scholarly research on the book of Proverbs or related issues. However, it assumes a certain level of knowledge and virtually requires the reader to have a background in wisdom literature or a working familiarity with the scholarship behind the book of Proverbs in order to follow the discussion. Unfortunately the high price tag assures it of having a limited distribution.

This book is the first in a new series edited by Robert Morgan called the History of Biblical Interpretation, and several projected volumes are listed for future publication. If these live up to the same standard as Whybray's book this will be a welcome and valuable series.

In reading this book one can see the progress of modern scholarship in shedding light on the book of Proverbs and its background, as well as the areas that are still in need of further research. Delineation of areas still in doubt may provide a stimulus for future research in a field that in some ways still suffers from neglect.

Daniel P. Bricker  
Pasadena, CA

*The Soul of the American University: From Protestant Establishment to Established Nonbelief.* By George M. Marsden. New York: Oxford University, 1994, 462 pp., \$35.00.

As a former Campus Crusade for Christ staff member, I have often wondered why university ministries have so little impact on the intellectual life of the modern academy. Even in instances where there is widespread student and faculty support for Christian causes, the life of the university remains distantly removed from evangelical spiritual life. This has led some evangelical leaders, including B. Bright and P. Robertson, to attempt to build their own Christian universities, which might prove to be a witness to the academic community at large. The question of how the modern university developed from Protestant consensus to what Marsden rightly calls "established nonbelief" is an important question for all those interested in the integration of faith and academic disciplines.

Marsden has proved himself to be one of the foremost scholars on the history of fundamentalism and evangelicalism. In this volume he traces the development of the religious life of the university, beginning with Harvard in the seventeenth century. In this early era a nonsectarian Protestant perspective dominated the American academic scene. University life remained the domain of the privileged few up through the end of the nineteenth century. The religious perspectives of these institutions reflected the Protestant consensus of the American elite as a whole.

Early perspectives on the role of religion in university life were divided between two camps: The Jeffersonian camp preferred a nonsectarian Protestantism that allowed for significant diversity in religious affairs; and the anti-Jeffersonians desired that the early colleges promote the education and training of clergy for specific denominational purposes. In the early years of the republic, the anti-Jeffersonians maintained control over higher education. Both groups shared a suspicion of Roman Catholicism,

and Protestants controlled every aspect of the American educational system from the primary and secondary schools up to institutions of higher learning. As late as the 1840s clergy governed two-thirds of all state-sponsored institutions and four-fifths of denominational colleges. Faculty in such schools were mostly generalists who promoted a Christian or Protestant perspective in all their classes.

Marsden also traces the development of the conflict between science and religion, which was a major factor in the rise of American fundamentalism. In the ante-bellum years, Protestants believed that science and religion went hand in hand. Scottish common-sense realism was particularly influential. The common-sense realists attacked the skepticism of D. Hume and argued that most people hold to basic beliefs, such as the verifiability of empirical data. Because the Christian faith was supported by such data as publicly witnessed miracles, fulfilled prophecy, etc., there was a strong sense of an empirical basis for Christianity.

By the 1850s, although evangelical Protestants still controlled the halls of higher learning, subtle changes began to take shape that would alter the intellectual landscape after the Civil War. First, clerical training was relegated to the divinity schools and was no longer the primary purpose of the colleges. Second, in accommodation to Enlightenment thought, moral philosophy was becoming more important than theology, and the authority of scientific inquiry was gaining dominance. Third, churches were becoming only a minority rather than a majority of the constituency of the colleges. Although there was no conscious, central plan for such changes, each university and college assumed a distinctive character with specific leaders playing major roles in the changing scene of higher education.

A large portion of Marsden's book is devoted to the specific stories of major educational institutions, replete with detailed discussions of the major personalities who fostered the secularization of the academy. Marsden also argues that the 1920s were a watershed period in the pluralization of the university scene as the modernist-fundamentalist controversy reached full force in the Scopes trial. The militancy of American fundamentalism rallied many liberal Protestants to the side of agnosticism in the promotion of academic freedom. This was an era of rapid expansion of enrollment in secondary schools as well as in the colleges. From 1910 to 1930 college enrollment tripled, the majority of the increase coming in the state universities. Protestants saw the need to minister to their own students at denominational schools and to set up campus ministries at the universities.

The specialization of departments and professional schools and the growth of funding for university-based research were major factors in this move to pluralization. By the 1940s universities were becoming "conglomerates of loosely related practical concerns without any particular center." Christianity, moreover, "seemed relevant to only one segment of the university, undergraduate education, and only to a fragment of that" (p. 340).

Marsden also chronicles the secularization of student life starting with the Prohibition era. He discusses the rise of Greek houses, which served a quasi-religious function while representing really a deist form of religion. Marsden also summarizes the history of religious life in Black colleges and includes an important section on the role of Jews in American university life.

After World War II, Marsden argues, the universities were much more inclusive and the concept of the Judeo-Christian heritage became the liberal cultural ideal. He wonders what this tradition really represents. At best it is a liberal cultural ideal and has little to do with evangelical faith. By this point "the academy was defined as a scientific enterprise that might be complemented by higher humanistic ideals. These

ideals might be associated with organized religion, but except for some of their moral teachings, they should be regarded as private and kept from interfering with the main business of the university" (p. 366). This statement accurately summarizes the current state of affairs and indicates why it is so difficult to make inroads for Christ in such an entrenched system.

Marsden is critical of the contemporary prejudice against religious belief in American academic life and advocates a true pluralism in which all personal beliefs will be respected instead of discouraged. He argues that evangelical Protestantism is no threat to the notion of academic freedom as long as personal belief remains voluntary.

This book is a monumental achievement by one of America's foremost experts on evangelicalism. The work could have been more evenly distributed to reflect developments after World War II more completely. To do so, however, would have made the book almost impossibly long.

Martin I. Klauber

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

*Reason in the Balance.* by Phillip E. Johnson. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1995, 245 pp., n.p.

Johnson is assuredly one of America's intellectual elite—a graduate of Harvard and Chicago, onetime law clerk in the United States Supreme Court for Chief Justice Earl Warren, and more than 20 years a distinguished law professor at University of California—Berkeley's Boalt School of Law.

Yet no scholar has more courageously and more competently challenged the reigning naturalistic presupposition and antisupernatural hostility that dominate contemporary science. Darwinian evolutionists have been unable to ignore him and—more significantly—unable to refute him.

In *Darwin on Trial* (1991) Johnson's keen legal mind assessed the empirical evidence (or lack of it) for neo-Darwinian evolution. Darwinism, he concludes, is actually based on speculative philosophy—more specifically, the metaphysics of naturalism. The currently established American religious philosophy, he insists, is absolutism in evolutionary science and selective relativism in morals.

In this present volume Johnson shows that naturalism effectively dominates not only contemporary science but the humanities as well, including law and education. Its champions promote the claim that naturalism is based on reason and that naturalistic reasoning undergirds science, whereas they demean theism—the existence of a supernatural mind and will—as based on nonrational faith.

Johnson engages leading orthodox evolutionists including Weinberg, Gould, Sagan, Dawkins, Crick and Rorty, who consider God nonexistent and the universe and man as purposeless and unguided. Scientific naturalists, he notes, do not claim to have disproved God's existence, but they do claim to have demonstrated that God as Creator is superfluous. Naturalistic theory has marginalized God in academia and in society generally. It has impacted judicial philosophy. It disdains the traditional ethics of sex and the family, implying that man has created God.

Johnson's prime interest is in establishing the invalidity of the naturalistic thesis that today defines rationality and science in academe and considers irrational the premise that God is real. He briefly affirms his alternative: Biblical theism summarized in the opening verses of the gospel of John. He identifies his view as that of a "theistic realist" who assumes that a purposive God created the universe and all its creatures, with

observable empirical consequences of orderliness, design and predictability. He disqualifies the claim that purposeless forces account for origins and for biological history.

Distressing Johnson as much as the exaggerated claims of neo-Darwinists is the fact that professing Christian scholars—not excluding evangelicals—accept evolutionary theory as gospel. Many even insist their belief in evolution is “based on evidence.” Some argue that methodological naturalism is appropriate in science. But Johnson challenges theistic evolutionists who deplore metaphysical naturalism and yet subscribe to methodological naturalism as essential to science: “Most Christian theists with respectable academic appointments will enthusiastically unite with agnostics to defend the exclusion of intelligent design from science” (p. 90).

Even Christian colleges and seminaries tend to make concessions to mainstream naturalism, Johnson laments. He criticizes “theistic naturalism” like that of N. Murphy of Fuller Theological Seminary, which he contends is more concerned with cultural power than with truth. He replies to the view of H. Van Till of Calvin College as concessive to naturalistic philosophy: “Seminarians trained in naturalistic thinking enter the ministry in droves with the mission of saving Christianity by leading it into an accommodation with modernism” (p. 203). “Christian educators tend to go on presenting ‘evolution’ as if all that agreement with the scientific establishment requires is a certain flexibility in interpreting the details of Genesis” (p. 189). But once Christian institutions accept naturalistic metaphysics they “inevitably repeat the process of secularization that the formerly Christian universities completed years ago” (p. 202).

Johnson effectively scores the point that the task of formulating a compelling case for the ontological reality of God is nullified in advance if intelligible reality is screened through naturalistic scientific method.

Johnson’s presentation excels in internal criticism, but external criticism awaits meticulous formulation. He dismisses coherence as a test of philosophical truth, properly so in my view, but insists instead on correspondence to objective reality. But if truth is correspondence to objective reality, how do we know the objective reality to which truth corresponds? Johnson calls for logical implication and inference, yet the alternative of logical consistency as a negative test of truth is not developed. But he is on solid ground in insisting that absolute truth is a theistic concept irreconcilable with modernist metaphysics.

Carl F. H. Henry  
Watertown, WI

*Foundations for Biblical Interpretation.* Edited by David S. Dockery, Kenneth A. Mathews, and Robert B. Sloan. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1994, 614 pp., n.p.

In another world *Foundations for Biblical Interpretation*, Southern Baptists’ latest and perhaps best contribution to Biblical hermeneutics, might have been subtitled “Everything you always wanted to know about hermeneutics—but were afraid it might get too complicated.” Rather than require the reader to acquire the necessary linguistic knowledge beforehand, the authors include succinct summaries of the current state of the discipline of linguistics as they weave their way through the ins and outs of Biblical interpretation.

This “complete library of tools and resources”—with prolegomenon chapters on revelation, inspiration and authority, and history of interpretation, in addition to parallel

treatments of the OT and NT including chapters on archeology, canonicity, textual/historical/literary criticism, and cultural/religious/political background—is noteworthy for its emphasis on literary criticism, a discipline closely related to linguistics at the top of the hierarchy of language. Linguistics beyond the sentence level is so close to literary criticism that there is overlap between the two disciplines.

The book also helpfully explains the historical shift from a concentration on historical criticism in the study of texts to an emphasis on literary criticism. This is a movement of emphasis from part to whole. While historical criticism concerned itself more with the context of writing and taking the text apart, literary criticism concerns itself more with the writing itself and keeping it together. If the error (in the extreme) of historical criticism is an overconcentration on “only one interpretation” (authorial intent), then the error of literary criticism (taken to an extreme) would be an overemphasis on the interpreter (reader-response). In other words, historical criticism tends to make the author primary while literary criticism sometimes makes the interpreter primary—although at its best literary criticism sticks to the text instead. The best approach, at least for Biblical interpretation in which authoritative inspiration is the guiding premise, seems to be to make the text primary, the author secondary, and the interpreter tertiary.

The distinction between exegesis and exposition is another important point made in this book, which explains the distinction as that which Hirsch is known for making in secular hermeneutics with the concepts of “meaning” and “significance.” Exegesis corresponds to meaning in that it concerns itself with the interpretation of the text, while exposition is closer to significance in the sense that it involves the applications of the text. So the traditional “one interpretation, many applications” follows from the distinction between hermeneutics as the theory of interpretation, exegesis as the practice of interpretation, and exposition as the practice of applying the interpretation of the text. The principles (hermeneutics) are used by the interpreter to discover what the author meant (exegesis, meaning, one interpretation) for the ancient audience in order to know what the text means (exposition, significance, many applications) for the modern audience.

About half of the chapter writers are Southern Baptists while the rest represent a broad cross section of evangelicals. The publishing of this excellent overview of the discipline of hermeneutics is indicative of the positive direction the SBC has taken over the last 15 years and places Southern Baptists among the best in current conservative evangelical scholarship.

David R. Couric  
University of Texas at Arlington, Dallas, TX

*Healing the Earth: A Theocentric Perspective on Environmental Problems and Their Solutions.* By Richard A. Young. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1994, 333 pp., n.p. paper. *The Earth is the Lord's: Christians and the Environment.* Edited by Richard D. Land and Louis A. Moore. Nashville: Broadman, 1992, 207 pp., n.p. paper.

L. White probably did us quite a favor when he claimed Christianity was to blame for our environmental problems. His attack of almost 30 years ago has prompted numerous responses by Christians, beginning with F. Schaeffer's excellent *Pollution and the Death of Man* and continuing through the works under review. A new chap-

ter of Christian theology and ethics is in development. Unfortunately the contributions are of uneven quality.

Young takes up White's challenge and claims that the roots of an improper relation to nature are found more in the Enlightenment and the scientific revolution than in Christianity. He claims the theme of stewardship of nature has usually not been totally absent from Christian teaching, but post-Enlightenment science and philosophy normally see nature as something to exploit and use. This is a good response, but the way Young frames it leads in a dubious direction and is based on questionable assumptions.

Young thinks that the solution to the supposed ecological crisis will not be scientific or technological but will come only by means of "a massive paradigm shift away from anthropocentrism" (p. 124). He thinks the attitudes of Americans and Europeans toward nature are "deplorable." Further, "there is no real concern with depletion of nonrenewable resources or the overflowing of landfills . . . . No one questions that materialism and affluence are closely connected with environmental degradation" (p. 82). The only reason anyone cares for the environment is for selfish, anthropocentric reasons. Even Christian theology has become anthropocentric, as seen in the Reformation doctrine of justification by faith.

A few days spent traveling in the former Soviet Union should cure one of such naiveté. The Russian revolution was the greatest "paradigm shift away from anthropocentrism" ever attempted, and it led to some of the highest pollution levels in the world, far worse than in the west. In the west the combination of intelligent self-interest, wealth, and high technology has led to incredible strides in cleaning up the environment. All of these were missing in the former Soviet Union, where people die young from high pollution levels.

As nice as it would be to abolish original sin, neither baptism, conversion, nor a supposed environmental crisis will cure us. The best we can hope for is a political-economic-environmental system that is powered by intelligent self-interest. Then good landfills follow. That is why the Reformers thought we need to be justified by faith, not works.

In spite of Young's basic theological mistakes he provides some helpful exegesis of relevant Biblical passages and is clear that one does not need to be a pantheist or new ager to be concerned about the earth. His surveys of Christian attitudes toward the environment show that we are not more holy than the rest of the world, just forgiven.

Land and Moore have collected some very good essays from a Southern Baptist Christian life seminar. I enjoyed M. Erickson's thoughtful essays on the "Biblical Theology of Ecology" and the "Biblical Ethics of Ecology." He nicely shows God's concern for nature and how all of human culture is based on the human control of nature. One of his statements is worth quoting in any context: "If, however, we perform an act of kindness, we do not decrease what we have or are, we increase it."

Because of the huge influence of new-age beliefs in environmental literature, R. Bush nicely argues that new agers are out of touch with the environment. G. Leazer presented one of the best short expositions and critiques of new-age thought that I have read. I was glad to see a scientific article by R. Irvin included in this book. Without solid scientific work all our theorizing about the environment remains docetic.

Allowing for a few small lapses, such as thinking that recycling household garbage will have a major environmental impact or that we are about to run out of natu-

ral resources, Land and Moore's group has made a good contribution to evangelical environmental thought. I hope more will follow.

Thomas K. Johnson  
International Institute for Christian Studies, Minsk, Belarus, C.I.S.

*The Impact of Evolutionary Theory: A Christian View.* By Russell Maatman. Sioux Center: Dordt College, 1993, 318 pp., \$12.95 paper.

This book examines empirical, philosophical and metaphysical issues that devolve from evolutionary thinking with a particular emphasis on the dualistic science-religion assumptions adopted by most Christians. The first seven chapters present an overview of the creation-evolution controversy. Comparing and contrasting "design" and "scientific" scenarios, they trace the history of scientific thought from ancient Greece and Egypt to modern times. The next four chapters focus on the issues of human origins and evolution. They analyze rational and revelational paradigms in revelation (general and special) and scientific methodologies in the context of the natural sciences. The last three chapters move from the realm of natural science and look to the impact and consequences of evolutionary thinking on the social or human sciences of psychology, sociology, religion, economics and the arts.

Both as the generally preferred model of origins and as a worldview, evolution has been around long enough that if it were good science we should be able to see its evidence in the light of textbook explanations of the scientific method. To the extent that evolutionary thinking has permeated the social and human sciences, we should be able to demonstrate its benefits. Building on his previous works, Maatman takes us beyond a mere critique of models of origins (both evolutionary and creationist). He takes the models apart to show us how we arrived at the present state of scientific rationalism, what is really going on when one purports to advocate a scientific position, the logical outcomes, and the flaws and shortcomings of evolutionary thinking. He also has given us more than just an academic analysis of some of the relevant issues. He has gotten inside science. Admittedly Maatman is writing as a committed Christian to fellow Christians, but in doing so he has avoided both the polemics frequently associated with critiques of evolutionary theory and the irenic compromise.

The book's primary strengths lie in Maatman's commitment to special revelation and the meticulous manner in which he builds his argument. When presenting scientific matters he carefully distinguishes the various disciplines and does not allow analyses, conclusions and inferences appropriate to one discipline to slide into another. Those who are interested only in conclusions could read only the last chapter, but they are not likely to learn anything new and would certainly miss the best elements. One would have to search at length to find a clearer and more succinct overview of the philosophical and historical background than is developed in the opening chapters. Likewise in the chapter on Revelation, Maatman has identified the heart of the problem and the specific challenge for Christians: "Special revelation opens up general revelation. To the extent that our scientific activity, no matter which science, neglects that relation, we go along a path that leads to wrong conclusions" (p. 127).

Weaknesses in this book are few, the most noticeable being the lack of attention to process studies in philosophy and theology. Process theology is probably the best example of special revelation being almost completely subverted by evolutionary speculation in the natural and human sciences with the bizarre result that nature, man and God are evolving continuously together. Contrary to Maatman's premise

that a misleading worldview leads to an evolutionary understanding of origins (p. 2), I think that his book and history show that an uncritical acceptance of evolution results in a misleading and distorted worldview. This book is superior to most others currently available and a must read for anyone, Christian or non-Christian, who is interested in the creation-evolution debate.

Kenneth Benesh

The Libraries of the Claremont Colleges, Claremont, CA

*Jus Divinum Regiminis Ecclesiastici: The Divine Right of Church Government.* Edited by David W. Hall. Dallas: Naphtali, 1995, 282 pp., \$39.95/\$19.95.

Hall has edited an interesting volume drawn from the era of the *Westminster Confession*. His intention is to call the American Church to a more Biblical sense of the life of the Church. Originally drafted in 1646, while the Westminster Assembly was meeting, the *Jus Divinum* provides a helpful insight concerning the Assembly's true intentions. It strongly supports the Presbyterian form of church government and was originally published anonymously and attributed to "Sundry Ministers of Christ within the City of London." Hall believes that the authors were part of the Assembly or at least sympathetic to it. He speculates that the publication was anonymous because the Erastian-leaning government prevented the Westminster divines from publishing any of their findings prior to submission to Parliament.

The *Jus Divinum* argues that true ecclesiastical or ministerial power is spiritual and is opposed to the power of the state to use the sword. The authors argued that spiritual power is not merely advisory, but that proper discipline should be enforced within the church. There are two kinds of church power: (1) magisterial power, which belongs properly to God alone and is often usurped by princes or popes; and (2) subordinate ministerial power, which God delegates to humans. The power of church officials is not dependent upon the congregation, and it is intended primarily to please Christ.

The *Jus Divinum* then describes the differences between the power of the state and the power of church officers. Hall asserts that in Erastianism one can understand the true intent of the Westminster divines. The power of the state is always "around" the sacred and never in it. Ecclesiastical power deals with spiritual matters such as the administration of the sacraments, preaching the Word, admonition, ordination of presbyters, and excommunication. Both the Church and the state possess their own coercive powers. The authors objected to excessive interference of the state into matters that were properly the domain of church officials.

Hall concludes that the *Jus Divinum* view was the majority view at Westminster even though there was a strong minority of Erastians present. The authors of the *Jus Divinum* were attempting to find a middle way between the independents and the Erastians.

This is a helpful edition of an important text in the history of Presbyterian polity. Hall's introduction provides the parameters for the original discussion in its proper context, and he uses the text to support the Presbyterian system in the Church today.

Martin I. Klauber

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

*Three Crucial Questions About Jesus.* By Murray J. Harris. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994, 120 pp., n.p. paper.

Harris is well known in academic circles for his writings on the nature of Christ's resurrection body. One might suppose, on seeing the title of this book, that the volume would shed further light on that topic. It does not. It is actually an apologetic work aimed at those who have questions about the person of Jesus. It addresses three concerns respectively in three chapters: "that Jesus did not exist, that he did not rise from the dead, and that he is not divine" (p. 9).

Chapter 1 begins with an historical review of ancient non-Christian sources—Thal-lus, Pliny the Younger, Tacitus and Suetonius—as "witnesses for the defense." Murray's conclusion is that "the most significant historical evidence outside the New Testament does in fact validate the four Gospels on this basic issue of the existence of Jesus of Nazareth" (p. 29).

Chapter 2 takes the form of a meeting of the Debating Society of Oxford University, with three students arguing the affirmative of the proposition "that Jesus Christ did not rise from the dead" and three the negative. Both sides present traditional apologetic material (such as the swoon theory, wrong-tomb visitation, stolen body, hallucinations, etc.). Of particular interest to many is the material dealing with the Shroud of Turin and the Nazareth decree by Claudius on the violation of tombs. The conclusion of the chapter comes from the negative side, that Jesus "is unique, in a category of his own, both as a historical figure and as an ever-present person" (p. 64).

Chapter 3 summarizes NT teaching on the deity of Jesus. Once again some very traditional apologetic categories are employed: divine status accorded Jesus, divine functions exercised by Jesus and the divine title "God" used of Jesus. Murray concludes that "there can be no doubt that the early Christians believed in his full divinity as an essential ingredient of their teaching" (p. 103).

An epilogue and an appendix complete the book. The former draws together the information of the chapters with an appropriate evangelistic appeal. The appendix is a harmonization of the resurrection narratives.

The book is typical of popular apologetic works, reminiscent of many that have been on the market in the last few decades. While it is well done, one wonders in this postmodern age how much influence it will exert on a nonbelieving public that has little use for absolute and rational truth claims.

David L. Smith  
Providence Theological Seminary, Otterburne, MB, Canada

*Let the Reader Understand: A Guide to Interpreting and Applying the Bible.* By Dan McCartney and Charles Clayton. Wheaton: Victor/Scripture, 1994, 360 pp., \$15.99 paper.

The authors of this hermeneutical study achieve a way out of the "hermeneutical spiral" by bridging the chasm between the Holy Spirit's spiritual support and our own human "interpretative humility" in interpreting the Bible. The book has many purposes: (1) to examine how our presuppositions and general knowledge provide a context within which we understand the Bible, (2) to present a multitude of interpretative theories, (3) to demonstrate some techniques and methods of interpretation, and (4) to reveal how interpretation of the Bible addresses the question of applying it practically in worship and witnessing. The authors never retreat from discovering

truth, the plain or literal meaning of Scripture, and they extend the inquiry into the problems raised by Criswell's *Why I Believe the Bible Is Literally True*. Their polemic against postmodern theories like deconstructionism, reader-response criticism, and liberal theological theories never forsakes philosophical understanding and clear explanation of some very abstract authors like Derrida, Saussure, Rorty, Ricoeur, and Gadamer. Eventually, the authors develop a hermeneutic that fuses limited "human horizons" with an unlimited divine transcendence. As a counterargument against postmodern rhetoric and discourse, this book becomes a valuable apologetic tool for understanding pervasive phenomena like cultural relativity, subjectivism and nihilism. Christian scholars acknowledge the inherent ambiguity of the text, the variety of meanings a word, phrase, or sentence might contain, but only from their understanding of a comprehensive context of knowledge, knowing that they strive toward a realistic goal of revelation of knowledge and wisdom on the progressive "spiral of understanding." Thus they do not "embrace ambiguity forever."

The book can be used effectively in apologetics, language analysis and hermeneutics, though the general reader might find the reading difficult if the reader has not discovered some of the thinkers in the text. This volume is well organized into sections, using decimal significations in order to refer to different sections of the book during discussions. There are good explanations of figures of speech, including many examples from Biblical references. Although philosophical theories of interpretation dominate the book, the authors could have discussed more literary theory and application. The strength of the book is the stress upon obedience to the Word, even though McCartney and Clayton are not fearful of pointing out errors in our reasoning and interpretation. The index of Scriptures is helpful for correlating specific Biblical passages for analysis. While there is an index of names included, there is no subject index. Although each term is defined clearly and extensively, a vocabulary list in an index would help the reader. Furthermore, if each term were boldfaced in the book the reader could find definitions more easily. Although the notes in the text are helpful for further readings and comments, the authors included no bibliography.

Recognizing our human "interpretative humility," McCartney and Clayton guide the reader to a fusion of human horizons with a transcendent Trinity, as knowledge is revealed, not re-veiled, to us as part of God's purpose and plan.

Harvey E. Solganick  
LeTourneau University, Dallas Baptist University,  
Dallas Christian College, Dallas, TX

*Revival and Revivalism: The Making and Marring of American Evangelicalism, 1750-1858.* By Iain H. Murray. Carlisle: Banner of Truth, 1994, 455 pp., \$27.95.

This book fills a gap in the study of American Church history by giving us a comprehensive survey of the major evangelical revivals in America, from 1750 (following the Great Awakening) through the revival of 1858. In doing so Murray not only chronicles the spiritual renewals of this period but also traces the transition from the colonial era's Calvinism to the pragmatic Arminianism that marked much of the Second Great Awakening.

Murray begins by reviewing the ministries of some of the colonial period's leading clergymen involved in revivals, including S. Davies, J. Witherspoon and D. Jarratt. Of special interest is his account of many lesser-known men of this era, not only along the Atlantic coast but also in such frontier areas as western Pennsylvania. Of value

also is his review of the "Great Revival" in Virginia and elsewhere beginning about 1787. Unlike some historians, Murray contends that "there was no general prevalence of irreligion towards the end of the eighteenth century" in America, although he acknowledges most churches were in spiritual decline.

His main focus, however, is the Second Great Awakening. Noting the surprising paucity of contemporary literature, he delves into what is available to give the reader a comprehensive survey of its early years, beginning about the turn of the nineteenth century. Of critical importance, he contends, is the fact that (with the exception of the Kentucky camp meetings) there was a continuity in theology and method between the revivals that broke out during the first decade or so of the nineteenth century and those of earlier eras. This was due to the prevailing Calvinistic theology of most denominations (with the exception of the Methodists), which saw revivals and conversion as the sovereign act of God that could not be manipulated or organized into existence.

The single most important individual in changing that position among the American churches, Murray concludes, was C. Finney. Although tutored by a Presbyterian after his conversion, from the first Finney showed anti-Calvinistic inclinations. His introduction of "new measures" into evangelism did not simply mark a change in methods but was squarely based on a new theology of evangelism and conversion that rejected Calvinism's stress on human depravity and emphasized instead the ability of each human to decide for Christ. In Finney's view the basic barrier to conversion was the will, and the right use of "means" could affect the human will and lead to conversion. In Murray's terms, with Finney revival gave way to revivalism.

Finney was a theologian who understood the implications of his methods, and Murray traces the course of Finney's theological controversies with such leading contemporaries as L. Beecher, G. Spring and A. Nettleton. The final rupture of the Presbyterian Church in 1838, far from being merely a conflict of personalities, was a result of Finney's influence, although others (such as Yale's N. Taylor) also played a part. Over time some variation of the new evangelical theology replaced the older Calvinism in virtually every denomination.

Murray writes not simply as a descriptive historian. As a Calvinist he believes passionately that something very important was lost during the Second Great Awakening and that much of the shallowness of contemporary evangelicalism can be traced to that loss. He has little interest in the social impact of the awakenings; his concern instead is to awaken the American Church to its lost theological heritage. Those who do not share his historical or theological perspectives will be put off by that concern, but it should not blind them to the book's value as a record of an important part of our history. Nor should it keep those of us who are evangelicals (including Calvinists like myself) from reexamining the weak theological foundations of much modern evangelism and church life.

The book would have been strengthened if Murray had made use of unpublished archival sources, as well as the files of religious newspapers from the period. It remains, however, a valuable survey of an important topic.

John N. Akers  
Billy Graham Evangelistic Association, Montreat, NC

*New Perspectives on Historical Theology: Essays in Memory of John Meyendorff*. Edited by Bradley Nassif. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996, 379 pp., n.p.

Nassif, president of the Society for the Study of Eastern Orthodoxy and Evangelicalism, has long been attempting to bridge the gap between these rich theological and ecclesiastical communities. He is the leading voice emerging in the worlds of Eastern Orthodoxy and American evangelicalism today. His latest effort is a series of essays in memory of J. Meyendorff, Nassif's doctoral mentor at Fordham and long-time professor at St. Vladimir's Seminary. Nassif demonstrates genuine affection for Meyendorff, as do all the authors who knew him. The book is a tribute to Meyendorff's ecumenical efforts to help western believers appreciate eastern traditions.

Nassif has brilliantly brought together an impressive lineup of international scholars from a variety of theological backgrounds that includes Orthodox, Roman Catholic, and Protestant. This volume examines the theme of continuity and change throughout the history of the Church. With such broad intentions, Nassif admits that the contributors by no means seek to bring an exhaustive view of this theme but to carve out their own niches. As in many collections of essays, the editor provided the overall framework and permitted significant latitude to the contributors.

The book is divided into five sections. The first, which includes a brief contribution by J. Pelikan, is devoted to tributes to Meyendorff as well as the rich heritage of the Russian Orthodox Church. The other sections are devoted to history, theology, spirituality and liturgy, and finally Scripture and exegesis.

In the section devoted to theology, I found T. P. Weber's article on evangelical orthodoxy particularly interesting. He discusses the recent move of many prominent evangelical leaders to Eastern Orthodoxy, most notably F. Schaeffer (son of the late F. Schaeffer) and P. Gillquist (formerly with Campus Crusade for Christ). Gillquist was one of the pioneering "Crusaders" in the 1960s who became frustrated with the institution of the Church but also lamented the problems inherent in a parachurch movement. Seeking for a return to the purity of the early Church, Gillquist and his followers discovered that the apostolic Church was liturgical, sacramental, hierarchical, and conciliar. The movement away from Campus Crusade and toward Eastern Orthodoxy spanned a couple of decades, the Antiochian Evangelical Orthodox Mission eventually becoming part of the Orthodox Church in America. Gillquist and his followers have added the distinctive evangelical traits of evangelism and discipleship and have shown that the Orthodox movement can develop distinctively American roots. Weber's analysis of that historic alliance provides a much-needed critique. It distinguishes "pop" evangelicalism (i.e. Gillquist and followers) from the more serious sort of "ecumenical orthodoxy" advocated by Nassif, Meyendorff, Florovsky and other Orthodox scholars.

Nassif, a specialist in patristics and eastern tradition, includes an article on the Antiochian school of exegesis. He advances our knowledge of Antiochene exegesis by demonstrating that they interpreted Scripture not only according to the letter of the text but also according to its spirit. Their spiritual hermeneutic permitted them to find Christological meanings that were congruent with the literal sense of the text.

K. Froehlich contributes an interesting article on the development of Pauline exegesis throughout the history of the Church. He argues that the Pauline format became the example that medieval scholastics such as Aquinas used in their own *quaestio* method. Thomas saw Paul as the master of scholastic presentation. Luther, by contrast, emphasized Paul's antiheretical bias against the semi-Pelagianism of the late-medieval Church. Froehlich concludes that the Church has interpreted Paul throughout

the centuries in ways designed to meet specific theological currents. NT scholars, therefore, will find his essay useful for providing a modern synthesis of Pauline studies.

H. P. Scanlin discusses the use of the OT canon within Eastern Orthodoxy, arguing that all Scripture that focuses on the dynamic relationship with revelation is of canonical authority. Any Scripture, including the Apocrypha, that is used in liturgy and worship is deemed canonical. This reflects the vision of the presence and purpose of God within history and within the life of the Church. This chapter is one of only a handful of valuable studies available on the text and boundaries of the OT canon in the eastern churches.

B. McGinn traces descriptions of God as *agapē* and as *erōs* throughout the history of the Church from Origin to Aquinas. McGinn counters the misconception of scholars such as Nygren and Ogden that the God of Aquinas is static by pointing to St. Thomas' description of the erotic love of God. McGinn's chief contribution is to reformulate the issue, not merely to set the record straight but also to help Christians understand the true meaning of Christian mysticism.

There are several other interesting essays, including that of V. Kesich who traces the history of religious discord in Bosnia. G. Wainwright addresses "Tradition and the Spirit of Faith in a Methodist Perspective." G. H. Ettliger points out the importance of tradition to the life of the Church. R. Norris, Jr., reflects on the importance of the theology of Chalcedon. Norris' essay will certainly be quoted as an authoritative interpretation of the Chalcedonian *Definition* concerning the two natures of Christ. Other key subjects are addressed by such distinguished authors as A. Dulles, R. Wilken and R. Taft.

Nassif should be congratulated for gathering such a fine group of scholars to contribute to this fascinating volume. This book can be used as a supplemental text for survey courses in Church history, theology, and Biblical exegesis. It will illuminate vital issues that typically cannot be covered fully in class lectures or in a survey text. It is a fitting memorial to Meyendorff, who gave so much to the Christian Church as a whole in all its traditional forms.

Martin I. Klauber

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

*Law & Providence in Joseph Bellamy's New England.* By Mark Valeri. New York: Oxford University, 1994, 205 pp., n.p.

Making use of a wide variety of sources, including some of Bellamy's unpublished manuscripts, Valeri attempts to show the popularity and influence of Bellamy's New Divinity Theology and its application to public life in New England in the mid-1700s. "Bellamy turned to law as an answer to questions about God's relation to the social order. . . . The New Divinity originally spread because of its sensitivity to the human dilemmas of life in later colonial New England" (p. 7). Stating the reason for the neglect of Bellamy's influence, Valeri writes, "Many have passed over Bellamy's, New England's leading Calvinist from 1750 to 1780, because his period has been regarded chiefly as prelude to Calvinism's demise in the freewheeling, entrepreneurial, and Arminian culture of the early national era" (p. 5).

The book is divided into five chapters. The chapter on conversion discusses Bellamy's early years. At Yale Bellamy was confronted with controversy from three factions: the Old Lights, Anglicanism and the New Lights. Bellamy identified himself with the latter. "They came to see themselves as a band of like-minded reformers, the

truly converted within a corrupt standing order" (p. 13). Valeri describes Bellamy's teaching emphasis as one that brought out the inner experiences of conversion and his differences from the Old Lights.

The next chapter, on law, deals with the problems following the revivals. Bellamy strongly objected to the antinomian teachers. To combat them he places emphasis on "law based" theology, not belief only. This section provides a good description of the struggles Bellamy encountered.

In the chapter on original sin Valeri discusses the debate that took place on the topic of human depravity. The chapter on the wisdom of God deals with Bellamy's understanding and explanation of the events of the war in North America. In it Bellamy links following the moral law with God's favor on New England: "The law, in other words, did indeed mediate God's response to himself and the world; it defined the character of divine activity" (p. 120).

In the final chapter, on revolution, Valeri successfully argues that Bellamy's theology had intentional social implications. "Despite the claims of scholars who have interpreted his New Divinity as apolitical, Bellamy's theology in fact culminated in a validation of worldly activism and armed rebellion" (p. 141).

Timothy J. Axford  
Elgin, IL

*In Face of Mystery: A Constructive Theology.* By Gordon D. Kaufman. Cambridge: Harvard University, 1995, 509 pp., \$17.95 paper.

For something construed as a "constructive theology," this work by Kaufman is most aptly titled. Though claiming to be a "theo-logy," *In Face of Mystery* leaves us only with a "cosmic serendipitous creativity which manifests itself in the evolutionary-historical trajectory that has brought humanity into being and continues to sustain it in being." To this "cosmic serendipitous creativity," with the help of the later Wittgenstein, Kaufman magnanimously gives the symbolic, western cultural name "God."

By means of his Kantian, Ritschlian, neo-Tillichian, Wittgensteinian, postmodernist and historicist accounting of the ultimate mystery of the world, from what happens to be a western and ostensibly Christian perspective, Kaufman repeatedly emphasizes his intention to provide "orientation to women and men in today's world with all of its problems." In order to achieve this end, he believes that he must "re-construct (de-construct?) the traditional conception of God" and the "Christian-four-part categorial scheme"—God/world/human/Christ—in face of our current situation. He calls this a necessarily "imaginative task," the outcome of which ought to be a comprehensive and coherent picture of "humanity in the world under God."

In the first of the five parts of this work, Kaufman sets forth his assumptions, concerns, method and goals. Almost from the outset he makes it clear that his own metaphysical "decisions" are grounded in the current volatilities in western culture and world issues. Though truth in the traditional sense does not exist and all assertions or claims for truth (notably and especially religious truths) are culture-bound and relative, Kaufman decides as a western, white, male "Christian" to construct a theology to give orientation for our current situation. Then, claiming that the concepts "God" and "Christ" are too problematic and difficult to begin his reconceptualization of the four-part Christian monotheistic scheme, he spends much time paving the way to and grounding his own formulations of "God" and "Christ" by unpacking the more basic concept of human existence in the world. Through it all Kaufman emphasizes

that what he is attempting has always been a part of theological work—taking what happens to be the tradition of the Christian worldview and criticizing, reorienting and reconstructing the religious symbols. But unlike previous generations, Kaufman asserts that this must now be done in full awareness that this is only an interpretation of the mystery of life.

The methodological-metaphysical foundation to Kaufman's movement of thought is the continuity provided by his six "steps of faith." The first is the choice to move from merely phenomenal levels to explanatory metaphysical levels of conceptualization. The second step is the choice to see the whole in "cosmic" terms, cosmic evolution. Third is the willingness to see the "more," the unexpected "directionality" of the cosmos, the "serendipitous cosmic creativity." The fourth "step of faith" creates greater specificity. It is the recognition of a particular "trajectory" of "serendipitous creativity" toward that process that eventually led to human culture and responsibility. This step is later connected in part to his "wider Christology." The fifth step is the decision to connect the traditional symbol "God" to the "serendipitous creativity" that is the ground of our evolving, developing humanization. Finally in the term "Christ," a term traditionally (and, says Kaufman, wrongfully and idolatrously) connected to the historical person Jesus of Nazareth, we may choose to see the clue, the key to rightly understanding both "God" and human existence and their relation. Here Kaufman clarifies his earlier point that "Christ" is not actually a fourth part of Christian monotheism but the hermeneutical key for properly understanding the other three—at least from a western and Christian worldview as set within the larger pluralism of the world.

In response let me say first that this volume contains several commendable elements. Kaufman is fairly honest about the fact that his reconstruction of the "God" concept is not the traditional Christian view and that he himself is not a Christian theologian in any usual sense of the term. The problem is that he simultaneously tries to fit that very difference into the theological task of the Christian theologian as though he is doing what has always been done. Further, he has long recognized the role of imagination in the pursuit of truth in any kind of endeavor. The problem is that Kaufman's use of imagination is all too close to the popular sense of fabricating that which we know is not real. Finally, Kaufman is correct in using the triadic human/world/God monotheistic worldview as a basis for his theological work because theological work does arise as a secondary faith response to these very relations. Yet Kaufman has it all backwards. As a result any "God" concept that Kaufman may tenuously discern arises—as for all theological liberalism—out of the human sense of self. Consequently all true God-world-human distinctions arising out of creation and redemption in Jesus Christ are lost in an amorphous, hyperpanentheistic "serendipitous creativity."

Despite his claims to the contrary, Kaufman is utterly relativistic. Pluralism appears to be his one truth. Furthermore, Kaufman's "God" is a "creator" who cannot create, an "expresser" who cannot reveal, a directing creativity without the slightest clue to our existence or to good or evil. "God" is but an utterly immanent movement of evolutionary creativity. Yet to such a "God" Kaufman calls us to devotion. His "wider Christology" has lost the man Jesus to Christ-images of humane meaning and to the larger directionality toward cosmic order and humanization. Kaufman, like all theological liberals, is scandalized by the particularity of the one man Jesus and the incarnational, historical physicality of the Word. Kaufman's theology is nothing more, finally, than a self-conscious cosmic construal, an obvious metaphysical propaganda, intended as an ecological-political opiate. Kaufman's theology is at last only an exercise in pragmatic metaphysics, a more philosophically sophisticated example of what

the ancient Romans did in their deification of Caesar. At best this makes Kaufman an idolater who lacks the Nietzschean courage to declare his own loss of all faith and meaning.

John D. Morrison  
Liberty University, Lynchburg, VA

*Progressive Dispensationalism*. By Craig A. Blaising and Darrell L. Bock. Wheaton: Victor, 1993, 336 pp., \$19.95.

*Progressive Dispensationalism* is a refreshing contribution to serious communication between differing evangelical scholars on the issue of dispensationalism. The authors maintain dispensationalism as a distinct and correct approach to the progressive unfolding of Biblical revelation. However, they boldly challenge classical dispensationalists (Darby, Chafer, Scofield) and revised dispensationalists (McClain, Walvoord, Ryrie, Pentecost, Toussaint) to reconsider Biblical texts and interpretative objections historically held by more covenantal perspectives, yet without embracing covenantalism. Sufficient differences emerge to designate "progressive dispensationalism" as a new school of dispensationalism, introduced formally at the 1991 ETS meeting.

The outline is to the point. Part 1, by Blaising, historically classifies and surveys different varieties of dispensationalism (classical, revised, and progressive), comparing and contrasting their differences. Part 2, by Bock, narrates hermeneutical issues necessary to the discussion, including presuppositions and principles. Part 3, by Blaising, expounds progressive dispensational views on Biblical theology, Biblical covenants, and the kingdom of God, all in both OT and NT contexts. The final chapter creatively applies progressive dispensational views to theological and ministerial issues.

Admitting that "revised dispensationalism is the dispensationalism that most people have come to know" (p. 56), the authors further modify this view. Progressive dispensationalism's "major distinctive is found in its conception of the progressive accomplishment and revelation of a holistic and unified redemption" (p. 56). This includes a greater recognition of the Church's initial fulfillment of the prophesied eschatological kingdom of God, a clearer admission that the NT teaches the inaugurated presence of that prophesied eschatological kingdom, and the typological fulfillment of the divine-human Messiah as a divine exalted king (presently) as well as an earthly Davidic king (future millennium). Two resurrections separated by a literal millennium before final judgment are retained. The resulting plan of redemption gives more attention to present new-covenant blessings for Jew and Gentile than previous dispensational authors, yet reserves the final fulfillment to Israel in literal physical blessings.

As a constructive criticism, this reviewer would like to see a better exegesis and interpretation of texts like Rom 2:26–29, Gal 3:29 and Rom 9:6–8 (see "us," 9:24), which all seem to teach that uncircumcised Gentiles become "true" Jews, children of Abraham descended through Isaac (as much as any Jewish believer; Gal 4:28), and part of the Israel of God (Gal 6:16 and Phil 3:3 were not discussed). The authors teach equal new-covenant blessings upon Jew and Gentile in the present Churchly manifestation of the kingdom of God but return to the Jew-Gentile distinction in the millennial blessings. The issue of how the Gentile believer can become a true Jew, Abraham's "seed" through Isaac, and be included in "Israel and Judah" in new-covenant membership (Heb 8:8), yet be distinguished from the Jewish believer again in the millennium blessings to Israel alone, is not explained adequately (p. 210).

Another hermeneutical issue needs further attention by the authors: typology. They need to reexamine what interpretive principle should determine final NT fulfillments of OT prophetic types concerning the new covenant and kingdom. Should the OT prophetic form determine finally how the NT fulfillment must take place in a literalistic one-to-one correspondence, thus projecting literally unfulfilled elements into a Jewish millennial kingdom? Or should the NT fulfillment and explanations take hermeneutical priority as an inspired, clearer commentary of how the OT is fulfilled in it, refusing to require a one-to-one correspondence unless the NT explicitly so requires? The application of typological exegesis depends much upon which Testament takes hermeneutical priority in determining how the OT is fulfilled in the NT.

If one were a classical or revised dispensationalist, one might feel that major principles of dispensationalism had been compromised and that little separates the progressive dispensationalist from eventually developing into an historical premillennialist. If one were a covenantalist, one might rejoice that dispensationalists are reconsidering long-held covenantal views regarding the covenants and the importance of the Church in its relationship to the present kingdom of God. In either case, progressive dispensationalism opens the door to renewed and substantive theological discussion between differing evangelical brethren that has long been barred by differing kingdom, Church, and future-of-Israel views.

It is highly recommended and heartily welcomed to the ongoing discussion.

Fred A. Malone  
First Baptist Church, Clinton, LA

*Philosophers Who Believe.* Edited by Kelly James Clark. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1993, 284 pp., \$24.95.

Eleven spiritual autobiographies were written for this collection. Each one is quite different, yet each one constitutes a window on the soul of a philosopher of note. B. Mitchell leads off. With touching understatement, he writes of the importance of a woman friend and of the crisis of war. Next comes A. Plantinga's portrayal of the events of his life from his fateful decision as an undergraduate to study philosophy at Calvin College to his current interests at Notre Dame. He concludes with a discussion of what it means to be a Christian philosopher. J. Rist's overview begins with his parents and early school days, before moving to an outline of the steps leading to his interest in Plotinus, "a hard-core metaphysician," and of the way in which his concern about abortion led him to the Christian faith. He concludes with thoughts about being a Roman Catholic in a modern university.

S. Davis' chapter is the one in which evangelicals will take the most comfort, in that all the evangelical bases are covered: conversion experience, Christian summer camp, college and seminary, and an account of how God's providential hand worked to secure his present position. Also noteworthy are his comments about being an evangelical in the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.). In the following chapter, the shortest, N. Rescher writes about his Quaker roots, his conversion to Roman Catholicism, and his reasons for believing both that philosophy needs Christianity and that Christianity needs philosophy.

With F. Suppe's entry, the collection shifts gears, from the cautious reserve of the philosophers to the searing honesty of a contemplative. Suppe's story presents an

abusive childhood, a conversion to Christianity, a falling away, and a reconversion as the backdrop for his struggles with homosexuality and masturbation. Along the way, Suppe presents a dialectical relationship between faith and philosophy. He finds that "philosophy, especially philosophical theology, is hazardous to faith," though he is committed to integrating the two.

The remaining essays shift back again. R. Swinburne portrays Aquinas as his model for the grounding of Christian theology in the best secular knowledge at hand. M. Adler speaks of Thomas as well, but with the twist that Adler admits to being a "pagan Thomist" for many years, one who came to faith only after a serious illness. T. Penelhum describes a long period of ambivalence, a turn toward Christianity, and a subsequent period of faith—but with ambivalence and uncertainty persisting. L. Zagzebski's chapter includes pointed comments about women in the American Philosophical Association, faith and practical wisdom, philosophy as a vocation, and the "politically correct version of Christianity."

N. Wolterstorff's final entry is self-consciously postliberal in its emphasis on the communal influences that have shaped his life. It becomes a poignantly personal recounting of his coming to terms with social injustice, his grief over the death of his son, and his reflections on the suffering love of God.

Each of these stories is engaging in its own way, presenting a journey across terrain all will recognize—if not always identify with. Together they comprise an important collection for those working in philosophy, apologetics, or with an interest in spiritual autobiography. They provide an invaluable resource for anyone concerned about faith in scholarly circles.

William D. Eisenhower  
St. Andrews Presbyterian Church, Redondo Beach, CA

*Integrative Theology*. Vol. 3. *Spirit-given Life: God's People Present and Future*. By Gordon R. Lewis and Bruce A. Demarest. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994, 576 pp., \$34.99.

This is the third and final volume of a theological work that integrates the historical, Biblical, systematic, apologetic and practical fields. It covers soteriology, ecclesiology and eschatology.

Each chapter begins by stating a theological problem and surveys the answers proposed from various theological perspectives. These sections include concise but adequate sketches of the history of theology. On the whole the authors fairly portray the diverse theological perspectives they survey. Next, Biblical teaching on the issue is presented in canonical order rather than systematically and is followed by systematic formulations based on the Biblical material. Separating the Biblical and systematic sections creates some redundancy. It also might lead the student to believe that exegesis and theology should be separated. The authors then offer apologetic interaction between their theological perspective and other positions. This is accomplished by presenting common objections to the authors' theological perspectives and to their answers. They end with practical applications for Christian life and service for each doctrine. The divisions and subheadings of the chapters make the content easily accessible. The endnotes for each chapter contain a wealth of primary-source and corollary information.

One of the great strengths of this volume is the interaction between theological perspectives on the issues discussed. Even on issues where I disagree theologically with the authors I got a clear and accurate picture of the issues and differences between varying perspectives.

Another strong point is the clear response given to often-asked pastoral, apologetic and practical questions. These questions make theology applicable to life and ministry. They are questions asked repeatedly by students and church members.

The authors deal with the topic of soteriology under the heading of "Personal Transformation." They defend a modified Calvinism similar to that of M. Erickson regarding the *ordo salutis*, designated infralapsarianism (pp. 56–57; see also volume 1, chap. 8). It is not necessary to defend a double predestination because all are fallen and depraved; therefore no reprobation of the nonelect is necessary. The "truly reformed" see this as no Calvinism at all.

According to Lewis and Demarest, God's free will and that of humankind are incompatible concepts. They portray Arminianism as a view that emphasizes human ability to the exclusion of God's free work of grace. This view and their picture of the Wesleyan/Arminian concept of prevenient grace is far more extensive than many moderate Arminians like myself accept. Their quotations of Wesley are selected to make their point. The authors do, however, believe that Christians are real agents who actively work together with the Spirit in Christian living. To say that the Christian life is "all of God," to them sounds pious but is "unbiblical and unrealistic" (p. 214). Concerning perseverance, they relegate such passages as Heb 6:4–6 to the category of a hypothetical warning against an actual impossibility. Their explanation that such passages accomplish "an important divine strategy for achieving believer's perseverance in the faith" is unconvincing (pp. 204–205). Some key passages in the perseverance debate go unaddressed.

The authors deal with ecclesiology under the heading of "Social Transformation." There is an excellent survey of types of church government. Their arguments for immersion are typically Baptist. Chapter 6 is especially helpful in defining what they call "spiritual-institutional theology," as differentiated from covenant, dispensational, kingdom, promise-fulfillment, and liberation theology. They claim that spirit-institutional theology, as a "multi-track" theology, best integrates the Biblical points of all these "single-theme" theologies and best deals with the continuities and discontinuities between covenant administrations and communities.

The final section deals with eschatology, which they designate "Future Culmination." Their viewpoint is clearly nondispensational and premillennial. I found myself asking at several points, "When do they believe the 'rapture' and 'second coming' occur?" This confusion is partially explained when the authors disclose a difference of opinion between them on the precise timing of the rapture in relation to the tribulation (p. 422).

On the whole this volume is well written. It is a valuable and useful tool for the study and teaching of theology.

Harold F. Carl  
Houston Graduate School of Theology, Houston, TX

*Moralists and Modernizers: America's Pre-Civil War Reformers.* By Stephen Mintz. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1995, 179 pp., n.p. paper.

Few subjects have intrigued American social historians in recent decades as much as the explosion in social reform movements that swept the young nation roughly from the War of 1812 to the beginning of the Civil War. The purpose of the present volume—a title in The American Moment series of topical monographs—is to survey these reform movements and to analyze the reasons for their existence.

Mintz succeeds well in giving a brief overview of the major reform movements, which ran the gamut from antislavery and temperance to urban poverty, mental illness and women's rights. This will be particularly useful to those not familiar with this facet of American history. He also summarizes well the major social and moral conditions that gave rise to the reform movements—conditions that at times were nothing less than appalling, particularly in the cities. He rightly notes that virtually all of the major reform efforts had their roots in the religious movements of the period, especially the evangelical revivals of the Second Great Awakening.

Mintz is less successful in identifying the reasons behind the reform impulse. He contends the reformers' motives were often complex and attempts to take a mediating course between those historians who have stressed the reformers' benevolent motives and those who contended they were only interested in exercising social control over others. His discussion at this point is sketchy, however, and the reader is still left to wonder why men and women committed to reform were willing to face apathy, failure, hostility and even death because of their work. More attention to those of the period who spoke of the "disinterested benevolence" of the gospel message would have been helpful.

Mintz's attempt in a brief epilogue to link the reform movements of the first half of the nineteenth century with twentieth-century liberalism is also unconvincing. Nevertheless, the book outlines well the bold attempts of evangelicals and others to reshape American society during that period. It also highlights their frequent failure to reach their idealistic goals and their ultimate abdication of many areas of reform (such as education, insane asylums and prisons) to governmental control—a shift that raises questions about the Christian's relationship to social reform that are still with us.

John N. Akers

Billy Graham Evangelistic Association, Montreat, NC

*Calvin and the Rhetoric of Piety.* By Serene Jones. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1995, 238 pp., n.p.

With the spate of recent publications on the life and work of J. Calvin, Jones has amazingly produced a truly fresh perspective on the Genevan Reformer. Her intent is to portray him as an artist rather than as a theologian. Calvin's form of art was his use of rhetorical language in the *Institutes*. Jones provides a line-by-line *explication de texte* of the *Institutes* in order to show how carefully Calvin practiced his craft. Her intention is to interpret Calvin much as a literary critic might read Rabelais or de Montaigne. Jones, a theologian in her own right, pays special attention to Calvin's use of the Bible as well as to his references to the major medieval sources. She also discusses the usefulness of Calvin's theology for the contemporary believer.

The major goal of any trained rhetorician in the sixteenth century was to move one's audience toward a desired end through the eloquent use of language. Careful turns of phrase could make an argument much more effective. Jones concludes that, for Calvin, every word and sentence was carefully crafted and designed for specific audiences. On this score Jones dispels the notion that Calvin was a cold and calculated theologian. She points out the practical and pastoral nature of the *Institutes*. Calvin's use of metaphor was so effective that his readers were moved toward personal piety and religious devotion. In fact Calvin's use of rhetoric provides the contemporary pastor an example of how to address the relevant issues of the day and provides the basis for combining propositional truth with esthetics and social praxis.

Calvin's rhetorical style includes a healthy integration of theology and politics. He is deftly able to address a wide audience, including kings and nobles, as well as members of his own parish. Calvin's theology, therefore, assumes a broader context and cannot be separated from the larger social and political life of his times.

Calvin's use of rhetoric also shows that his theology is not limited to presenting a set of propositional truths about God. Theology is thereby not limited to a creed or a doctrinal statement. Calvin's use of rhetoric shows that theology can mold our sentiments and experiences, not just our beliefs. Calvin uses rhetoric to develop a spirit of praise for God and to uplift the piety of his readers. This approach shows the double purpose of theological discourse. It is not merely the witness to God's revelation in the Bible but also serves to move the Christian to a deeper personal commitment to God.

Jones concludes by arguing that it is tempting to portray Calvin as either a villain or a hero. Calvin was, after all, an incredibly complex man. He was not only the strict disciplinarian who recommended execution for Servetus but also one who protected the faith and laid the groundwork for the Reformed movement. Jones opts to describe Calvin as more of a hero whose use of language helped to shape his community. Calvin's work also reflects the perspectives of the various segments of his audience, which included the "Genevan merchants, the despised Scholastics, the erudite humanists, the eager students, the evangelical French parishioners." Jones has succeeded in providing a different view of Calvin than we have seen before, one that shows him in the context of his own society and culture.

Martin I. Klauber

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

*The Impact of the Reformation.* By Heiko O. Oberman. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994, 274 pp., \$19.99 paper.

Oberman's aim in this work is to examine the Reformation in terms of the social history of ideas, which includes a mixture of social and intellectual history, and seeks, thereby, to redress the greater weight given to social history alone in recent decades. In the preface Oberman outlines how he came to recognize this need. He was teaching at Harvard from 1958 to 1966, when he returned to his native Europe to teach at Tübingen until 1984. At that time he returned to the United States to the University of Arizona where he continues to work.

The transatlantic journeys are important for the tendencies Oberman witnessed in which too much weight was given to social history at the expense of intellectual history. Since 1977 Oberman has advocated the marriage of the two to account for

the unique conditions in which specific ideas are born and to appreciate the following time when people appropriate various ideas for themselves and begin to act upon them. Oberman summarizes this process: "conditions-program-impact."

Between 1984 and 1994, with this approach in mind, Oberman wrote most of the articles that appear in this book under four headings. The first, "Points of Departure," includes discussions of the *via antiqua* and *via moderna* as they relate to the early Reformation, along with articles on J. von Staupitz's ecclesiology and theology.

The second section, "The Impact of Luther," includes a rational and welcome discussion of eschatology and scatology in Luther's writings. The latter, of course, has been the source of much criticism by those wishing to call into doubt Luther's mental and spiritual soundness. Oberman also addresses Luther's impact upon the German conscious and conscience, focusing on the Nazi co-optation of Luther for its own purposes in the years leading up to World War II.

This last theme is built upon in the third section, "The Growth of Antisemitism," in which Luther's own changing attitudes toward the Jews are contrasted with those of Reuchlin and Erasmus. Oberman underscores the extreme sensitivity needed in any discussion of anti-Semitism after the Holocaust, and he himself brings this to his treatment of the above figures, as well as to his examination of the growth of anti-Semitism in the late medieval period as Jews proved "stubborn" to efforts to convert them to Christianity.

"Problems and Perspectives," the fourth section, explores some of the remaining difficulties and viewpoints in Reformation scholarship. Of particular interest is his treatment of the thesis that the new learning fostered in both the Renaissance and Reformation either never had an impact or died out quickly in certain areas because it never succeeded in appealing to the mass of common folk. Oberman includes a balanced treatment of the proper place of the Virgin Mary in the evangelical mind, originally published in 1964, which remains timely in light of the continuing attempts toward rapprochement between Catholics and Protestants. The book concludes with a brief article written for the opening of a conference on American-German relations as approached by both American and German scholars, journalists, and politicians. Here Oberman expresses an interest in testing the caricatures held by each group of the other—for example, the view that Americans are interested only in "know-how" while Germans are more concerned with "being-by." Oberman has not added to this article

PRINTER: AD #4  
Westminster/John Knox

Darius Y. Panahpour  
University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA