

BOOK REVIEWS

The Literary Structure of the Old Testament: A Commentary on Genesis–Malachi. By David A. Dorsey. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1999, 330 pp., \$34.99.

The title of this book is enticing for those who have come to appreciate the literary artistry of the OT. One question that came to my mind immediately after seeing this book was, What exactly was the author intending to accomplish? Was he going to demonstrate that there was one or perhaps several macro-structures in the whole of the OT, or was he going to deal with the micro-structures within each book of the OT? Intriguingly, he has combined something of both approaches. Dorsey argues that Genesis–Joshua forms a Hexateuch (p. 47), but he also deals with the micro-structures within each of the remaining books of the OT.

Dorsey organizes his book into seven units. Unit 1 is an introduction to the book, and more importantly an introduction to the subject of literary analysis of the OT. Unit 2, “Book of the Law of Moses,” is a discussion of Genesis–Joshua. Unit 3, “Historical Books,” covers Judges–Esther following the order of the English Bible. Unit 4, “Poetic Books,” includes Job–Song of Songs. Unit 5, “Major Prophets,” deals with Isaiah–Daniel and includes Lamentations, which could logically be treated with the poetical books since Dorsey recognizes it as poetry. Unit 6, “Minor Prophets,” surveys the twelve minor prophets. Unit 7, “Conclusion,” is a brief discussion of some of the elements of literary structure that need further study.

Seminary or university students and teachers will especially benefit from the introduction. Dorsey gives a brief overview of the research into the literary structure of the books of the OT starting with the unit markers v (*samek*) and p (*peh*), which “pre-date the Mishnah (third century A.D.)” (p. 18) and concludes with the present-day literary studies. He then adopts Muilenburg’s view that “the first step in analyzing the structure of an Old Testament book is to identify its constituent units” (p. 21). This alone is not new or surprising. What is surprising is the amount of material packed in to five pages of text and footnotes dealing with the OT techniques for signaling the beginning and ending of literary units. Dorsey then continues on with an overview of the various ways in which units of text may relate to each other (e.g. linear a-b-c; parallel a-b-c-a'-b'-c'; symmetric a-b-c-b'-a'; and various sub-categories). Even more helpful is the section dealing with the relation between structure and meaning. For instance, Dorsey points out that, “In parallel schemes with an odd number of units, the final unit’s strategic position is further accented when it is the composition’s only unmatched unit (a-b-c || a'-b'-c' || d)” (p. 40). These aspects of the book alone are worth the purchase price for the student of literary structure.

One unusual aspect of this book is its argument for a “Hexateuch” (pp. 47–102). According to Dorsey, the books from Genesis to Joshua form one giant chiasm (pp. 47, 101) with the treaty at Sinai (Exod 19:3–Num 10:10) forming the central element. A number of points can be made regarding Dorsey’s analysis. First, Dorsey recognizes that at least one part of his chiastic structure is weak. His C and C' elements on p. 101 are (1) the story of Isaac (Gen 21:8–28:4) and (2) Moses’ final exhortation and death (Deuteronomy 27–34). The possible connections between the two passages are (1) the death of Abraham (and Sarah) with the death of Moses and (2) “the theme of life and

death." The theme of life and death is seen in the exhortation by Moses to choose life and the sacrifice of Isaac, which does seem to be weak. Second, A and A' seem weak as well. The A element (Genesis 1–11) is the division of territory to the various nations (Genesis 10) and the introduction of Terah, Nahor, and Abraham (Genesis 11). The A' element (Joshua 13–24) is the division of the land to the Israelite tribes (Joshua 13–21) and the mention of Terah, Nahor, and Abraham (Josh 24:1–33). But in order to make the chiasm work, Genesis 1–9 and Joshua 22–23 are not considered in the structure as presented by Dorsey. Third, Dorsey says literary structures should be recognizable to native readers of the Hebrew Bible (p. 25), but the suggestion that readers of the Hebrew Bible would notice seven parallel items on either side of the Sinai covenant (the mid-point of the chiasm) when they have to keep them in mind the great expanse across the six books that comprise Genesis–Joshua is not convincing. Nonetheless, Dorsey has demonstrated that there are connections between Joshua and the Pentateuch that should be taken seriously, and for that reason his work should be commended.

A few other elements are also worthy of note. First, of the 317 structures identified by Dorsey, 261 are chiasms. Second, there are no indexes in the book. This limits its usefulness as a reference book. Third, the bibliography is only suggestive of the range of material consulted by Dorsey. If readers want to locate materials consulted by the author, they will have to dig through the footnotes. Finally, as far as I can determine, no other author has made an attempt to analyze the structures within every book of the OT. This alone makes the book valuable as a one-volume resource for anyone attempting to analyze the structure of OT books.

Terrance A. Clarke

The University of Wales/Spurgeon's College, London, UK

A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar. By Christo H. J. van der Merwe, Jackie A. Naudé, and Jan Kroeze. Biblical Languages: Hebrew 3. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999, 404 pp., \$29.95 paper.

Three South African scholars have combined to produce a Hebrew reference grammar targeted at exegetes and Bible translators at the intermediate level. After introductory chapters reviewing the history of Hebrew grammar study (chap. 1), the alphabet, and Masoretic signs (chap. 2), they offer an overview of "Word, Clause and Text in Biblical Hebrew" (chap. 3). Three lengthy chapters then follow, on the verb (chap. 4), noun (chap. 5), and other word classes (prepositions, conjunctions, adverbs, predicators of existence, interrogatives, discourse markers, interjections: chap. 6). The volume concludes with an up-to-date treatment of word order (chap. 7). A 19-page glossary of terms will be especially useful for many students, given that much of the terminology is taken from modern linguistics (e.g. *allophone*, *cataphor*, *constituent*, *fronting*, *valency*), in addition to classical grammars (e.g. *casus pendens*, *epexegetical*, *gnomic perfect*, *plusquamperfect*, *status constructus*). A follow-up volume is planned, dealing with categories above the word level, such as "inter-sentence relationships, text types, speech acts and socio-linguistic conventions" (p. 11).

The authors are all very conversant with Hebrew grammar and the literature surrounding it, and widely published themselves (the bibliography lists 18 works among them, 12 by van der Merwe). In contrast to more exhaustive works such as Waltke and O'Connor's, they do not engage in running discussions with other scholars. They typically give one example for each form or function discussed, not the several found in Waltke-O'Connor (keeping in mind their target audience). They often prefer traditional terms, concepts, or explanations even when they are aware of more recent and

precise ones, primarily for practical, didactic reasons. Thus, for example, they use the terms *perfect*, *imperfect*, and *waw consecutive*, rather than more linguistically precise ones (even though they are aware of these). Their discussion of the perfect treats the verb's action as completed, although they confuse matters by interchanging the terms *complete* and *completed* (cf. Waltke and O'Connor, for whom the two terms capture crucial distinctions). They do not discuss the preterite at all, whether in connection with *yiqtol* or *wayyiqtol* forms.

The discussions are normally very clear and helpful, and jargon is kept to a minimum. Typically, words or phrases are discussed in terms of their morphology, syntax, semantics, and pragmatics. The authors highlight their discussions of construct relationships, pronouns, focus particles, word order, and some conjunctions as places where they have incorporated recent advances in grammatical research (often their own work). I found their discussions of focus particles and word order to be the most helpful of these. Their catalogue and discussions of many prepositions and conjunctions is also very useful. Occasionally the prose is very dense and technical, as here: "This construction has a *discourse active referent* as fronted subject and a proposition that has a pluperfect or preperfect relationship with the main line of the narrative" (p. 254).

In sum, this work is a very helpful introduction to and review of Biblical Hebrew from three linguistically sophisticated scholars. It will be useful to other scholars if used alongside more detailed, standard reference works, such as Waltke-O'Connor, GKC, and Joüon-Muraoka. It is more up to date and linguistically informed than a similar, recent work by M. J. A. Horsnell, *A Review and Reference Grammar for Biblical Hebrew* (reviewed in *JETS* 44 [2001] 132–34). It will also be useful to Bible translators, whether the lone translator in a remote outpost working on a language with 5,000 speakers or a high-powered translation committee working on the latest English translation. As for working exegetes, it would be a useful second grammar to own (after their first-year grammars), more affordable and accessible than the exhaustive reference grammars just cited.

David M. Howard, Jr.
Bethel Theological Seminary, St. Paul, MN

An Introduction to Aramaic. By Frederick E. Greenspahn. SBL Resources for Biblical Study 38. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999, xi + 230 pp., \$54.95 paper.

I awaited the arrival of *An Introduction to Aramaic* with great anticipation. Franz Rosenthal's *A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic* (1963) and Alger F. John's *A Short Grammar of Biblical Aramaic* (1972) are outdated and certainly not user-friendly. Greenspahn's pedagogical philosophy is sound and consistent. The volume is based on the assumption that the student has a working knowledge of Biblical Hebrew (pp. ix, 2–4). Following "A Brief History of Aramaic" (pp. 5–7), the author commences the workbook format characteristic of his *Introduction* (p. x). Space is provided for the student's answers to exercises at the end of each chapter. The various forms of exercise include translation (Aramaic to English and English to Aramaic), transcription, description, identification, and completion (including the filling of charts). The workbook format, however, suffers from the absence of a convenient way to remove and submit the exercises for grading. Perhaps a loose-leaf format with holes for a three-ring binder would be a practical improvement for future editions.

Greenspahn's employment of Jer 10:11 to demonstrate similarities between Aramaic and Hebrew (pp. 8–10) was a pleasant surprise, since I include just such an

exercise in the first day's lesson plan for Biblical Aramaic. With the exception of Daniel 7, the author uses abridged texts of the Aramaic portions of Ezra and Daniel to reinforce each chapter's lesson in the language. His intent in such abridgement is to limit "the quantity of new vocabulary to . . . manageable portions" (p. x). As the last Biblical text to be translated, the unabridged text of Daniel 7 is covered in a masterful running exercise (chap. 27). With the Biblical texts covered, the author then guides the student through some brief but variable studies of the following extra-Biblical materials: inscriptions from Zinjirli, Jerusalem, and 'Ein Gedi, a letter from Elephantine and a letter by Bar Kochba, a portion of the Genesis Apocryphon from the Dead Sea Scrolls, a passage from *Genesis Rabbah* in the Midrash, and Genesis 22 from Targum Jonathan. These are welcome additions providing students with the opportunity to apply their knowledge of Aramaic to extra-Biblical materials frequently cited in specialized OT studies.

The "Afterword" provides a brief survey of available reference works useful for continuing Aramaic studies. Greenspahn lists lexicons, commentaries, grammars, collections of inscriptions, publications of Aramaic materials among the Dead Sea Scrolls, reference works for the targumim, Syriac reference works, and surveys of the Aramaic language. W. B. Stevenson's *Grammar of Palestinian Jewish Aramaic*, 2nd ed., ed. J. A. Emerton (1962; reprinted 2000) should be added to his recommendations for the study of the targumim. The book concludes with the requisite paradigms and glossary.

The overall quality of the volume is diminished by: (1) the price (exorbitant considering its workbook-style layout); (2) the numerous English-to-Aramaic translation exercises (a methodological distraction since the goal is to translate from existing Aramaic texts rather than to create new ones); (3) the abridged Biblical texts (negating the otherwise self-contained nature of the volume); (4) the employment of an asterisk to indicate footnotes (rather than marking hypothetical forms—the asterisk's normal use in Semitic studies); and (5) inconsistencies within the text (detrimental to its user-friendly status and overall quality). Examples of the last include inconsistent representations of grammatical terms by their abbreviations in the vocabulary listings. Imperfects are referred to by *imperfect*, *imperf.*, *imf*, and *impf*; participles are referred to by *participle*, *part.*, *ptcl*, *ptc*, and *ptcpl*; and perfects are referred to by *perfect*, *perf.*, *pfct*, and *pf*.

Vocabulary entries could be improved in a number of instances. For example, דְּכַרְנִיָּהּ (p. 16) should be listed as דְּכַרְנִיָּא. It also would prove helpful to students if there were some indication that בְּעַל occurs in Biblical Aramaic only in the compound בְּעַל-טַעַם (p. 21). Unmarked hypothetical forms in charts and vocabulary listings (p. ix) also might confuse students. Such a case occurs with the chart giving the forms for *queen* (p. 26). The chart and the accompanying footnote do not give the student an accurate view of the word's usage: מְלִיקָה does not occur with either the ך or the ך ending in Biblical Aramaic (the word only occurs in Dan 5:10, in the plural).

William D. Barrick
The Master's Seminary, Sun Valley, CA

Judges, Ruth. By Daniel I. Block, NAC. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1999, 767 pp., n.p.

Daniel Block's commentary on Judges and Ruth is superbly written, comprehensive in scope, and insightful in its analysis of the literary, historical, and theological features of these two closely related OT books. Block's interaction with scholarly literature on nearly every aspect of the interpretation of Judges and Ruth not only provides

the reader with his own conclusions, but also with a useful compendium of resources for considering alternative viewpoints on the topics under discussion. Block deals effectively with both the meaning of the book for those for whom it was originally written, as well as its meaning for the Church at the beginning of the 21st century.

Block regards the book of Judges as a "prophetic book" rather than a "political tractate" (p. 58). In connection with this he cautions against attributing a promonarchic significance to the phrase "In those days Israel had no king" that occurs four times in the last five chapters of the book (17:6; 18:1; 19:1; 21:25). He argues that the author's purpose was to demonstrate that subsequent to the death of Joshua the nation of Israel became thoroughly Canaanized during the period of the settlement. The author's goal was to arouse his own generation to "abandon all forms of paganism and return to Yahweh" (p. 58). In Block's view the historical context for this call for reformation was the "long, spiritual ruinous reign of Manasseh" (p. 66), and he suggests that the writer was a Judahite "schooled in the Torah of Moses, particularly in the book of Deuteronomy" who lived during that troubling time (p. 67).

In the "Introduction" (pp. 21–72), Block addresses the historical and religious background to the book, provides a survey of modern theories of its composition, discusses the book's theme and purpose as well as the time and place of its writing, gives a brief history of its interpretation, and then concludes with some comments on the Hebrew text. In the commentary itself, Block divides the book of Judges into three sections (Introduction, Body, Climax) and organizes his discussion of each section around the theme, "the Canaanization of the nation of Israel in the premonarchic period."

Block's discussion of the Biblical text is lucid and thorough, including observations on such things as rhetorical structure, points of grammar and syntax, questions concerning the best English rendering of numerous Hebrew terms and expressions, as well as the historical and theological significance of this period in the early history of Israel. Many of the narrative units are concluded with a section entitled "Theological and Practical Implications." These discussions contain useful insights into how the reader can find the significance that these narratives may have for God's people who live in a time and culture far removed from that of this early period of Israel's history. Unfortunately there is no listing of these discussions in either the Table of Contents or the Index (they may be found on pp. 108, 116, 134, 141, 155, 171, 175, 245, 307, 320, 334, 375, 385, 418, 436, 448, 470, 514, 542, 567, 583).

Many issues surface in this commentary that might be singled out for further comment. One such topic is the matter of "patriarchy" that has become a focal point of much disputation in the numerous feminist readings of the OT in the past 20 years or so. There is, of course, abundant fodder in Judges for arguing that the patriarchal culture of ancient Israel led to the mistreatment and dehumanization of women. Outstanding among the examples often cited are Jephthah's sacrificing of his daughter in fulfillment of his vow (Judg 11:30–40), Samson's self-serving relationship with both his Philistine wife and with Delilah (Judges 14–16), and the abuse and eventual dismemberment of the concubine of a Levite who was traveling through the territory of Benjamin (Judges 19). Block argues, however, that these examples do "not represent normal patriarchy," but rather, as in the case of Jephthah, "patriarchy at its worst . . . expressed in the twisted and exploitative rule of the father" (p. 378). Nevertheless, Block contends that because of the disrepute into which the term "patriarchy" has fallen, due in some measure to the "modern connotations of abuse and exploitation inherent in the element 'archy,'" it may be necessary to "abandon the word" (p. 379). For this reason Block suggests that the term "patricentric" be substituted for "patriarchy" because this term "corresponds more closely to the Israelite model reflected in the expression . . . 'house of the father,' and allows for the biblical ideal, which emphasizes the responsibility of the father for the welfare of the household rather than his power over its members" (p. 94, n. 68). This is a helpful suggestion, and Block

works out his perspective in constructive ways in his treatment of the many cases where the use of “patriarchy” arises in the book of Judges (see e.g. pp. 387, 470–71, 542, 43, 583–84).

A second matter that merits mention is Block’s observation that the judges are portrayed more as obstacles to the finding of valid solutions for Israel’s problems (especially their Canaanization) than they are as answers to Israel’s real needs (p. 118). He comments, “Far from being solutions to the Canaanization of Israelite thought and ethic, Gideon, Jephthah, and Samson were themselves all parts of the problem. These are not noblemen; they are ‘antiheroes’” (p. 194). For this reason Block argues that the book does not reflect a mechanical sort of implementation of the Deuteronomic formula in which obedience brings blessing and disobedience brings curse. Instead of these, the book demonstrates that in spite of the disobedience and failures of Israel and her leaders, God still chooses to act in gracious ways to deliver and preserve the nation. Israel’s survival is “attributable entirely to the gracious heart of their covenant Sovereign. He deals mercifully with them, not because they deserve it in any way but because of his long-range mission of mercy for the world” (p. 141). In keeping with this perspective, Block’s reading of the book yields few if any glimmers of true piety and faithfulness on the part of either the people or their leaders during this time, with the possible exception of Deborah (p. 246). Block presents carefully reasoned arguments for the mostly negative conclusions that he draws, but the result is a consistently negative picture of the religious life of Israel and its leaders during this time, with few if any glimmers of genuine piety to be found in the entire book.

In contrast to the book of Judges, Block finds that the book of Ruth “highlights the presence and nature of genuine spirituality during this same period” (p. 589). He suggests that the author of Ruth may have been “familiar with the premonarchic period as a distinct era and that this idyllic account may have been deliberately composed against the darkness of the period as it is portrayed in the Book of Judges” (p. 596). This would mean that Ruth was not written before the “latter half of the seventh century B.C.” and most likely was composed during the reign of Josiah (540–609 BC) in which one finds a “renaissance” of the Davidic dynasty (p. 596). Block regards the book as “a historiographic document” that describes “real experiences of real people in real times at real places” and he classifies it as an “independent historiographic short story” (p. 603). The primary purpose of the story is to demonstrate how God was providentially at work “to produce David the king from the depressing and chaotic Israelite environment during the days of the judges” (p. 610). Writing during a time of the resurgence of the house of David under Josiah the “narrator tells his readers that the same LORD who raised up the house of David in these most unlikely circumstances has preserved it all these years in fulfillment of his promise to David in 2 Samuel 7” (p. 615). Block’s discussion of Ruth is characterized by the same clarity and thoroughness as is his commentary on Judges.

All in all this is an excellent commentary. In my opinion, it is without question the best commentary available on the books of Judges and Ruth from a solidly evangelical perspective.

J. Robert Vannoy
Biblical Theological Seminary, Hatfield, PA

Ezra and Nehemiah. By Gordon F. Davies. Berit Olam. Collegeville: Liturgical, 1999, 170 pp., \$29.95.

The Berit Olam commentary series is part of the current positive trend in OT scholarship of focusing on the final form of the text. Edited and written primarily by

Catholic scholars, the series has the following goal: "The readings of the books of the Hebrew Bible offered here all focus on the final form of the texts, approaching them as literary works, recognizing that the craft of poetry and storytelling that the ancient Hebrew world provided can be found in them and that their truth can be better appreciated with a fuller understanding of that art" (back cover).

Gordan Davies's particular approach to Ezra–Nehemiah (he views them as one unit) is that of rhetorical criticism. He begins the book with a brief introduction in which he explains his method and seeks to defend his methodology. He then divides the combined text of Ezra–Nehemiah into eight literary units, and discusses each unit. For each chapter he presents a "Literal Translation," followed by an analysis under the headings of "Introduction," "Rhetorical Situation," "Rhetorical Audience," "Rhetorical Strategies," "Stylistic Devices," and "Conclusions."

Davies acknowledges the complexity of the material in Ezra–Nehemiah and the accompanying issues of historiography, but he argues that the central issues and organizing principles of Ezra–Nehemiah are theological. Rhetorical criticism, he argues, can help to unlock these issues and principles. Due to his emphasis on rhetorical criticism, he focuses primarily on speeches and prayers; indeed, he skips several chapters completely (Ezra 2–3, 8). However, he makes a disclaimer, stating that the book is not really a complete commentary but more of a "prolegomenon" to Ezra–Nehemiah studies.

Davies's work is a helpful addition to the field. He offers fresh insight into the structure and the associated theology of Ezra and Nehemiah. The strength of the book is in its analysis of the large theological picture presented in these books. Those seeking a commentary that focuses on the main argument of these books will find this work interesting and worthwhile.

On the negative side, Davies is not convincing in his case that employing Greek rhetorical analysis is valid for studying Hebrew material. Furthermore, even if it were methodologically valid, the highly technical terms of rhetorical criticism tend to obscure his discussion of the text rather than to clarify it. Davies's analysis of the theological impact of the text is helpful, but his presentation of the technical aspects of rhetorical criticism is not. In addition, I did not find his method of putting the "literal translation" into poetic-like "sense lines" to be helpful; it seemed to give a poetic sense to narrative texts. Also, in accordance with his objective, Davies focuses more on rhetorical structure than on standard exegetical details. Those looking for a commentary to help in the small details of Hebrew exegesis (word studies, for example) will be disappointed.

All in all, however, this work makes a positive contribution to the field of Ezra–Nehemiah studies. There are other commentaries that discuss historical issues and exegetical details. There are not many that focus on the relationship between structure and theology. Those seeking a fresh work that presents a theological overview of Ezra and Nehemiah will want to consider this interesting volume.

J. Daniel Hays
Ouachita Baptist University, Arkadelphia, AR

The Book of Job: A Short Reading. By Roland E. Murphy. New York: Paulist, 1999, 137 pp., \$14.95 paper.

Murphy suggests that this succinct commentary is particularly geared for those outside of academia hoping it will "prompt a more intense but leisurely reading" (p. 2). However, almost anyone interested in Job can profit from this readable work, regardless of expertise.

An introduction discusses authorship, historicity of the character Job, date of composition, wisdom as the prevailing genre for Job, and the surrounding ancient Near Eastern context. The commentary proper proceeds in five chapters and is then followed by two reflective chapters. Murphy wisely determines not to get bogged down in critical issues. Accepting the unity of the text based in part on irony woven throughout the book, Murphy does indeed address critical issues lucidly and efficiently, but at a manageable degree.

A particular strength of this book is the final two chapters. In his "After-Thoughts" Murphy discusses the history of interpretation from Gregory the Great to Calvin and reviews current works on Job by Gutiérrez, Vogels, and Girard. A distillation of Murphy's conclusions on several important issues in Job is then rounded out by a brief review of critical issues pertaining to the final cycle of speeches. The final chapter ("Does the Book of Job Have a Theology?") treats God, creation, world-view, retribution, and spirituality as found in Job. A final *postil* leads Murphy humbly to question his own ability to interpret Job, wondering aloud if one must suffer as Job did in order to comprehend the book fully.

Somewhat disappointing was the treatment given to chap. 28. Given Murphy's place in wisdom research, one would hope (expect?) a chapter dedicated to this pivotal chapter. Instead it is somewhat awkwardly slipped into the "Third Cycle" without so much as a subheading. A strange question mark is inexplicably found near the chapter designation. The many references to apocryphal works and Murphy's insistence that Job is a fictional character may limit its readership within conservative circles. Further, in keeping with much of Joban scholarship, Murphy emphasizes Job's "combative" and "courage" before God over against his more traditionally accepted steadfastness.

However, Murphy's well-respected scholarship within diverse circles alone suggests that the book should serve as a fine introductory entrée into Joban studies for years to come. It would greatly complement a fuller commentary on Job in a course devoted to Job, or alone as a brief survey in a broader course in wisdom literature. Those in ministry will particularly benefit from Murphy's compact but thoughtful and balanced perspectives on a difficult book.

Tim Johnson
Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI

Psalms. Vol. 1: *Psalms 1–72*. By S. Edward Tesh and Walter D. Zorn. The College Press NIV Commentary: Old Testament Series. Joplin: College Press, 1999, 483 pp., n.p. *Psalms*. By Craig C. Broyles. NIBC 11. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999, xvi + 539 pp., n.p. paper.

The redactional history behind the commentary by Tesh and Zorn may explain many of its features. Tesh's work on a two-volume commentary on the Psalter was about three-quarters complete when Parkinson's disease prevented him from writing further. (Tesh died in 1999.) Zorn will complete the second volume but the present work (covering Psalms 1–72) is substantially from Tesh's pen. Zorn's editorial activity focused on revising the comments to make them consistent with the NIV rather than the KJV, which Tesh used as his base English text. Yet the commentary still breathes the air of the KJV, for good and ill. Zorn writes that "Tesh's comments have a rich vocabulary and style that mimics the KJV which most agree has never been matched for the Psalms" (p. 12). This is true, but at times the style (to this reviewer's ears) is too florid and a little dated.

The strengths of this commentary do not lie in its engagement with recent scholarship. Tesh's dialogue is primarily with scholars of the 1950s through to the early 1980s. One clear example is the introductory section on the classification of psalms (pp. 52–70). Here Tesh interacts only with Gunkel's system of classification. While defending the usefulness of this discussion, Zorn's editorial note helps explain the limitations of the commentary both at this point and elsewhere: more modern classification systems (e.g. Craigie and Gerstenberger) are not mentioned because "Tesh's arguments and discussions are with the older commentaries and scholars of the Psalms" (p. 54). Not surprisingly, there is very little interaction with the recent debate over the "shape and shaping" of the Psalter. Fortunately, Zorn plans to rectify this situation in an introduction to the second volume (p. 41).

The introduction also includes a discussion of Hebrew poetry, an outline of Psalms 1–72 (of homiletical value rather than a description of the "shape" of the Psalter), and a bibliography. Its primary focus, however, is on the question of the origins of the Psalms (pp. 24–40). Here Tesh provides a summary of the history of Psalms scholarship over the last century and a half, organized under five headings: "Distinctively Individual Productions" ("the traditional view"), "Late Compositions Accompanying Advanced Judaism" (Psalms interpretation under the influence of late 19th-century literary analysis), "Forms of Liturgy in Ritualistic Worship" (the influence of Gunkel and Mowinckel), "Songs for All Seasons" (the Psalter as a collection of hymns and devotions with "timeless" relevance), and "A Collection of Collections" (more recent interest in the redaction of the Psalter).

While Tesh does not give an explicit statement of his own methodology, his approach to individual psalms is a fairly traditional verse-by-verse exposition that is sensitive both to their ancient Israelite, and especially Davidic, setting and to Christian application. (It would have been helpful if he had been more methodologically self-conscious as to how readers move from the former to the latter.) Unfortunately, there is a certain unevenness in the treatment of exegetical issues. Some texts are dealt with in detail while equally or more difficult passages are treated with surprising brevity (e.g. compare the discussion of "Kiss the Son" in Ps 2:12 with the brief treatment of "You are my son" in 2:7). While the exegesis is generally solid, this commentary might be more useful for homiletical or even devotional purposes.

Broyles's commentary, on the other hand, is strongest at the points where Tesh is weak. Faced with the daunting task of producing a single-volume commentary on the whole Psalter, Broyles manages to deal judiciously with most of the major exegetical cruxes. His commentary is a model of conciseness and clarity with an impressively high level of interaction with recent scholarship. It also contains enough moments of creative insight to make it much more than just an abbreviated recitation of previous scholarship.

Broyles's treatment of many of the classic issues in Psalms interpretation is structured by his answer to the basic question, "What is a psalm?" (p. 1). For him, the psalms are not "descriptive poems"—"private reflections of poets on a recent, private experience"—but "prescriptive liturgies," which are intended "to guide the expression of Yahweh's worshipers in prayer and praise" (p. 3). With this emphasis on the Psalms as liturgy, issues of authorship and historical setting are not crucial to interpretation (p. 4). Broyles recognizes that once the psalms began to be incorporated into Israel's Scriptures, new ways of reading them became possible (e.g. psalms as literature, Davidic prayer, prophecy; pp. 6–7), but he chooses to focus on their original use as liturgies (pp. 5–9). Therefore, the primary question put to each psalm is, What place did it have in Israel's worship (p. 9)? Accordingly, Broyles's categorization of psalms is controlled by this interest in their function in Israel's worship. While some psalms are intended for teaching and reading (e.g. wisdom psalms), the majority fall into

liturgical categories such as temple entry liturgies, hymns, corporate and individual prayer psalms, thanksgivings, and royal psalms (pp. 9–22).

A good example of Broyles's "liturgical reading" can be seen in his treatment of Psalm 51. Here he does not accept the superscript's invitation to connect the psalm back to the life of David. He regards this Davidic setting as secondary, "one that helps readers (not worshippers) to see their use illustrated in other parts of biblical literature" (p. 226). (Compare this with Tesh, pp. 364–74, who does read the psalm in connection with the Bathsheba episode.)

The strength of Broyles's approach is that by focusing on psalms as liturgies he sheds light on the "reading that is most remote to modern readers" (p. 8). Undoubtedly, this is a major contribution, especially in the light of recent increased interest in the role of corporate worship in the life of the church (pp. 8–9). The most significant limitation arises from Broyles's decision to read the Psalter apart from its canonical meaning—reading "as liturgy" rather than "as Scripture." Broyles is aware that he is doing this, so it would be unfair to regard this as a weakness, but by focusing on the precanonical function of psalms, he (necessarily) has to ignore the complex question of how the Psalter functions as Scripture, which is, after all, the form in which the church has received it. A second limitation, related to the first, is that Broyles does not really wrestle with the question of why (and ultimately, how) the Church can use the Psalter in Christian worship. To frame the question differently, On what basis may Christians use ancient *Israelite* liturgy in worshiping the God who has revealed himself in Jesus Christ? These are questions the commentary provokes rather than answers.

Each commentary has its own distinctive value, but readers of this *Journal* will probably find Broyles's work the more useful. In fact, they will be hard-pressed to find a better single-volume commentary on the Psalms.

Douglas J. Green
Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, PA

The Search for Quotation: Verbal Parallels in the Prophets. By Richard Schultz. JSOTSup 180. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999, 341 pp., \$85.00.

This book is a study of the phenomenon of quotation. Anyone as yet unconvinced of the complexity of issues related to "quotation" need only read Schultz's treatment of this fascinating literary phenomenon. To label this topic complex is to be guilty of the highest degree of understatement. As Schultz carefully and exhaustively demonstrates, the study of quotation is littered with poorly defined terminology, unsubstantiated assumptions, and the nagging sense that although one knows such a thing exists, it is notoriously difficult to establish exactly when one can responsibly speak of the presence of quotation in a text.

Although the primary focus of the book is an investigation into the occurrence and nature of quotation in prophetic literature, Schultz does not limit his discussion to this genre. His goal, as stated in the Introduction, is to "help to move the discussion of prophetic quotation beyond the current methodological impasse to a new appreciation of this versatile and powerful element of prophetic rhetoric" (p. 10).

Part 1 is devoted to a survey of past studies of quotation within the field of OT prophetic literature. To this end, Schultz begins with an extensive survey of past scholarship related to the question of quotation and prophecy (chap. 1). He attempts to demonstrate that despite frequent scholarly activity related to the existence of al-

leged (or potential quotations) in prophetic books, there is no consensus as to what constitutes a quotation. Beginning with Ewald (1840) and continuing through the more recent work of Sommer (1994) and Willey (1997), Schultz concludes that (1) there is a consistent lack of awareness or appreciation for the work of earlier scholars (pp. 18, 41–42), and (2) despite increasing sophistication in the criteria used to identify quotations, there is a high degree of subjectivity involved (e.g. p. 49). As a result, scholars are often either reinventing the wheel, rather than building on previous work, or they adopt methods that are guaranteed to reinforce a priori commitments (e.g. authorship or date). In the end little progress is made toward an understanding of the nature and function of prophetic quotation. Although these studies make use of alleged quotations, the majority are concerned with other issues (such as authorship and date). Schultz's criticism will resonate with anyone who has dealt with scholarly edifices of authorship and date that are built on nothing more than the shaky foundation of ambiguous criteria and flimsy evidence, which are held together by little more than the mortar of presupposition (see e.g. pp. 109–12).

In part 2, Schultz investigates the use of quotation in non-prophetic literature. Once again the reader is confronted by the complexity of the issue. One contributing factor is the nature of proverbial and cultic language. When a word, phrase, or saying circulates as part of proverbial vocabulary, it is nearly impossible to establish when an author using it is in actuality quoting a previous author. This same difficulty attaches to the use of well-known religious and cultic terms. Without some means for establishing the reality of quotation, it is fruitless to investigate the motives for such alleged literary borrowing (p. 178). Although scholars have attempted to develop criteria for the identification of quotation (see e.g. pp. 175–76, 180), no consensus as yet exists.

Even if the slippery issue of quotation were settled, the questions of intent and purpose of such quotation remain (p. 117). Schultz surveys a number of suggestions for the use of quotation in part 2. His survey of ancient Near Eastern literature, which includes Egyptian, Mesopotamian, and Ugaritic in addition to early Judaism, acknowledges the widespread presence of the phenomenon while reinforcing the impression of the complexity of the topic. Examples of suggested purposes for quotation include (1) rhetorical effect (p. 121), (2) an attempt to preserve and/or modify existing ideas and values (p. 143), and (3) the desire to contemporize an authoritative teaching, because of "the conviction that God's word is reliable" (pp. 170–71). Even these few examples serve to illustrate the difficulty attached to the study of quotation. Even if one were to claim a given text contains a quotation, one is still a long way from determining the function or purpose of it. Schultz completes part 2 with a look at quotation in Western literature (pp. 181–204), a brief defense of his "indiscriminate" approach (pp. 204–5), and a list of ten insights derived from parts 1 and 2 (pp. 205–7).

Part 3 is devoted to an attempt to develop a new approach to prophetic quotation. Schultz begins this section with a definition of quotation (p. 221) and a summary of his proposed model (pp. 222–39). The substance of this new approach is found in the following suggestions: (1) "the use of two complementary criteria (verbal and syntactical correspondence and contextual awareness), (2) a twofold analysis (diachronic and synchronic), and (3) an acknowledgment of the multi-functionality of quotation (p. 222).

In this proposal, Schultz uses "diachronic" to refer to the approach concerned with questions of historical influence, origin, and literary dependence, which are frequently quite speculative. "Synchronic" refers to an approach that focuses on the final canonical form of the text. As Schultz observes, "To analyze prophetic quotation synchronically is to shift the attention from the question of who quoted whom, when, and for

what reason (author-centered) to the question of how such repeated language functions within texts, to examine its literary workings (reader-centered)" (pp. 232–33). Although one might question the value of the parenthetical designations (I would see synchronic as more text-centered), the emphasis on the final form, which we possess, is more salutary than the emphasis on any hypothetical process of textual development.

There are, according to Schultz, several important implications of this approach for any study of prophetic quotation. The first of these is the need to distinguish between *internal* and *external* verbal parallels (p. 233). A second implication involves the need to focus on a "quotation's effect rather than its origin." This effect within the book may be indicative of editorial purpose (pp. 233–34). A third implication acknowledges that "quotation will share some of the features of other types of repeated language, such as refrains, formulae and topoi" (p. 234). Lastly, it is essential that one compare parallel texts and their respective contexts. The degree of agreement and divergence is important for proper interpretation (p. 235).

Schultz also identifies a number of aspects of literary analysis that he thinks need to be associated with any analysis of prophetic quotation. First, quotation is a matter of "conscious stylistic choice" and does not necessarily imply "deficient creativity" (p. 236). Second, the issue of reader competence is raised by the use of quotation. Although there is "significant semantic loss" in any failure to detect quotation, this does not often make the text meaningless (pp. 236–37). Finally, the synchronic approach recognizes the importance of the "reading process" (p. 237).

Schultz completes this chapter with an appeal to an "inclusive" approach. Such an approach will be able to benefit from the strengths and contributions of both the diachronic and synchronic methods without being confined by the weaknesses of either (pp. 237–39).

Chapter 8 presents detailed studies of several texts in which quotation allegedly occurs (Isa 11:69 and 65:25; Isa 8:15 and 28:13; Isa 40:3, 57:14 and 62:10–11; Isa 2:2–4 and Mic 4:1–3; and Isaiah 15–16 and Jeremiah 48). Schultz takes the reader through an application of his proposed method and summarizes the contributions to understanding achieved through his approach.

Schultz displays an admirable familiarity with the significant works related to his chosen line of inquiry. He covers the ground from numerous perspectives (from the "traditional" methods of critical Biblical scholarship to the more recent perspectives of semiotics and structuralism) and, when appropriate, he offers a brief and important critique of the assumptions and shortcomings of a number of these approaches. Although this is surely far from the final word on this topic, *The Search for Quotation* provides a valuable contribution to the study of quotation.

Mark Rapinchuk

College of the Ozarks, Pt. Lookout, MO

Isaiah: An Introduction & Commentary. By J. Alex Motyer. TOTC. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1999, 408 pp., \$13.00 paper.

This commentary has been in preparation for 30 years—Motyer's earlier commentary (*The Prophecy of Isaiah*, 1993) was initially the beginnings of this work that became too large for the Tyndale Old Testament Commentary series. This commentary is a more manageable size and gives a good general overview of the book of Isaiah, as well as helpful homiletical insights, but unfortunately lacks much of the more recent research in Isaiah from the last twenty years.

Motyer's overall purpose of reading the book of Isaiah as a unified whole (pp. 27–28) is commendable. The commentary is clear, concise, and peppered throughout with his British wit and sense of humor. A sample of Motyer's masterful skill in combining homiletical material with exegetical insights can be seen in his discussion of Isa 1:30: "The equivalent today is a sound economy and a growing gross national product. These have ever been the chosen god of the natural man" (p. 50).

Even with these positive elements, however, Motyer maintains several literary and exegetical peculiarities that make his book much less valuable. (1) He divides the book after chap. 37 instead of following the common division after chap. 39. Motyer suggests that R. E. Clements does something similar in dividing the text between chaps. 35 and 36. However, for Clements to suggest a bridge consisting of Isaiah 36–39 between the Assyrian and the Babylonian sections is more reasonable than a division between chaps. 37 and 38, especially since Isa 38:6 makes it clear that Hezekiah's illness occurs during the events of 701 BC described in the previous chapters. (2) For one so keenly aware of literary structure, it is surprising that Motyer groups together chaps. 1–5 and 6–12 in the earlier part of the book of Isaiah. Several scholars have noted the more logical divisions of this part of the book as follows: chap. 1: Introduction to the entire book; chaps. 2–4 begin and end with a glorious picture of Israel's deliverance, but in between describe her present corrupt state (a structure that Motyer himself notes on p. 41); chaps. 5–12: a polystrophe that begins with the song of the vineyard (5:1–7) and ends with a song of thanksgiving (12:1–6). See A. Laato, *Who is Immanuel? The Rise and the Foundering of Isaiah's Messianic Expectations*, Ph.D. Dissertation, Åbo Akademi (Åbo: Åbo Academy Press, 1988); and P. D. Wegner, *An Examination of Kingship and Messianic Expectation in Isaiah 1–35* (Lewistown: Edwin Mellen, 1992). (3) Motyer also divides Isaiah 40–48 into three parts, thereby losing the middle climax of Cyrus in this unit. What is equally surprising is the title he assigns to Isa 44:24–48:22, "The Great Deliverance: The Work of Cyrus," since Cyrus's deliverance has been previously mentioned twice (41:2–4, 25) and perhaps a third time (42:1–7). Few scholars divide Isaiah 40–48, which ends with the fitting refrain in Isa 48:22, "There is no peace for the wicked," says the Lord."

In addition to these variances in the literary structure of the book, there are several exegetical questions, of which I mention only three. (1) Isa 5:17 (p. 64) should probably be translated as "and strangers will eat in the waste places of the fat (i.e. wealthy)." It is doubtful that the noun *gērîm* should mean "tramps" as Motyer suggests, since the concept of tramps or hobos would be foreign to this society and the word has a much broader range of meaning (including, for example, resident foreigners). However, it does not seem necessary to emend the text to "lambs" as J. N. Oswalt suggests (*Isaiah* 1:157). A more reasonable solution is to understand that, when God punishes Israel, the land will be vacant so that anyone will be able to come and use the land even though they do not own it (thus *gērîm*). (2) Motyer argues that the phrase *naḥâ ʿal* in Isa 7:2 (p. 75) cannot apply to the Syrian and Ephraimite alliance since the root *nûaḥ* plus *ʿal* generally means "to subdue." Instead he traces the word to the root *naḥâ* "to settle or swarm" which has an Akkadian cognate with a similar meaning (see J. Emerton, *ZAW* 81 [1969]: 188–89). However, it is not really necessary to search out such an obscure root since the word could indeed come from the common root *nûaḥ*, which would explain the feminine form in this passage and mean "to rest or settle upon the land" (see *HALOT* II:679–80). The phrase *naḥâ ʿal* corresponds exactly to the same phrase in Isa 11:1 where the spirit rests upon a coming deliverer (it is interesting that Motyer does not mention Isa 11:1 here, though he appears to understand the phrase in this verse to mean "resting upon" this person; see p. 103). (3) On p. 79, Motyer's discussion of *ʿalmâ* or "young girl" apparently does not take into account J. H. Walton's

argument that *‘almâ* may refer to a married woman (see Isa 54:4; *NIDOTTE* III:415–19). Motyer is consistent in seeing Immanuel in Isa 7:14 and 8:8 as a reference to the Messiah who inherits the broken-down kingdom of Ahaz. However, because the context of Isa 7:14 and 8:8 is clearly the Assyrian invasion of 734–732 BC, it seems preferable to view them as near fulfillments that create prophetic patterns that are further developed in Christ (see Wegner, *Kingship and Messianic Expectation*).

Nowhere are solid word studies and good exegesis more necessary to interpreting a book than Isaiah. In general, Motyer’s commentary is a nice blend of homiletical and exegetical material, but it seems to be lacking somewhat in its literary criticism and exegetical foundation. While there is still much to uncover in the richness and in parts the meaning of the book of Isaiah, Motyer’s work is a fine beginning point.

Paul D. Wegner
Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, IL

The Theology of the Apostles: The Development of New Testament Theology. By Adolf Schlatter. Translated by Andreas Köstenberger. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1999, 453 pp., \$39.99.

This is the second of a two-volume NT theology. The first was published in English in 1997 as *The History of the Christ: The Foundation of New Testament Theology*. The German editions from which Köstenberger has rendered these translations originally appeared in the early 1920s. Because Schlatter focused on history and the text itself rather than academic fads that spring up and then fade away, his NT theology retains value despite the passage of time.

Schlatter begins vol. 2 by taking stock of “The Disciples’ Vantage Point at the Beginning of Their Work” (pp. 27–50). This section attempts to describe the theological convictions of Jesus’ followers in the immediate wake of the Easter events. Schlatter is convinced that “in the movement leading from Jesus to the Gentile church the leading role belongs to the men who had received Jesus’ commission and produced Jewish Christianity” (p. 50). As a result, in the next section (“The Convictions Upheld by Jesus’ Followers,” pp. 51–185) Schlatter examines in sequence 1 Peter, the Gospel of Matthew, the epistle of James, the epistle of Jude, and the writings from John’s hand (the Gospel, epistles, and Revelation, in Schlatter’s view).

The third section is “The Calling of the Nations through Paul” (pp. 187–321). Like other sections, this one consists of concentrated discussion that mediates the fruit of Schlatter’s acute historical and theological observation. It is not a methodical treatment of Paul in the sense of a chronological unfolding of his views or an inventory of the teaching of each Pauline letter. Rather, Schlatter walks the reader through a series of topics that, taken together, comprise a synthetic cross-section of Paul’s doctrine. Schlatter thinks that Paul’s writings were not written to furnish a system, nor do they lend themselves to tidy systematic explication. If he is correct in this, then the somewhat random-sounding topical focuses of this section may be justified: “Paul’s Task,” “Christ’s Gift,” “God’s Presence in Christ,” “The Church,” “Conditions Affecting Pauline Teaching.” The blandness of these subheadings conceals the intensely analytical and insightful content that each section contains. For example, under “Christ’s Gift” there are thoughtful accounts of justification, liberation from the law, reconciliation, sanctification, calling, and election. The general nature of the subheadings also conceals the unpredictable and often fascinating tack that Schlatter takes on a given topic. For example, under “Conditions Affecting Pauline Teaching” Schlatter treats “Jesus and Paul,” “The Relationships between Paul’s Convictions and His Con-

version," "Internal Struggles in Christianity," and "Stages in the Formation of Pauline Teaching." And to illustrate how specific Schlatter's analysis is, under "Stages in the Formation of Pauline Teaching" one finds these five sub-subheadings: "The Similarity between the Thessalonian Correspondence and the Major Epistles," "Jesus' Divinity in Colossians and Ephesians," "The Church in the Epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians," "The Office in the Pastoral Epistles," and "The Boundary between Authentic and Gnostic Christianity according to the Pastoral Epistles."

It was probably a misjudgment not to print a comprehensive table of contents so that all levels of subheadings could have been surveyed at once. As it is, not until actually wading through the book does the reader realize the riches that are on hand.

Following the Paul division, two others conclude the book. First is "The Share of Apostolic Associates in Doctrinal Formulation" (pp. 323–59). Here Schlatter treats the theology of Mark, Luke, Acts, Hebrews, and 2 Peter (not written by Peter, Schlatter thinks). Second is "The Knowledge Possessed by the Early Church" (pp. 361–416), which summarizes the NT's view of God and the mission of the church.

Andreas Köstenberger deserves high praise for the *Sitzfleisch* (perseverance) necessary to complete such a massive translation project. His introductory essay at the beginning (pp. 9–22), matched by an essay "Modern Reception of Schlatter's New Testament Theology" at the end (pp. 417–31), is useful in placing Schlatter's contribution in the larger scheme of things. Robert Morgan of Linacre College, Oxford, has justly praised the quality of Köstenberger's translation. This is a high achievement, given the crabbed and sometimes opaque quality of Schlatter's prose. (Yet improvement is always possible: "defense of evil" [p. 252] should be "warding off of evil" or "defense against evil.")

Likewise, Baker deserves credit for publishing a work of high historical and scholarly importance despite the fact that it is unlikely to be a bestseller. This is an example of a publisher doing the right thing rather than the highly profitable thing, and their willingness is commendable.

Schlatter's NT theology is a goldmine on several counts. First is the fact that history and primary documents furnish the foundation for observation; one may contrast this with the dominant approach to the discipline that strains NT statements through dubious ideological grids (F. C. Baur's Hegelian idealism, R. Bultmann's neo-Kantian existentialism). Schlatter's NT theology smacks of history in ways that Bultmann and the more recent work of, say, Childs or Räisänen does not. Second is the richness of Schlatter's comparative discussion. For example, Paul is treated not only in his own right but also in relation to Peter (pp. 64–65), James (pp. 99–103), John (pp. 178–81), Luke (pp. 333–38), and Hebrews (pp. 348–51). Intercanonical juxtapositions receive careful attention in creative and productive ways. Third is the raw depth and intensity of Schlatter's observations. He sees things that others do not. The difficulty of his prose may lie partially in the depth of insight to which he is trying to give expression. Fourth is the perennial relevance of much of his treatment. It is ironic that "critical" studies of NT theology rapidly become period pieces, while treatments like Schlatter's dubbed as "conservative" exemplify classic Christian exegesis while at the same time speaking tellingly to current "critical" disputes. Are there two means of salvation, one for Jews and one for Gentiles? See p. 300. Was justification just an apologetic side issue for Paul? See pp. 238–39.

New Testament theology in its current state of disarray requires the breakthroughs of new minds and voices, not the repetition of old formulations. Schlatter is a voice from the past, not a guide for the future. But past voices can furnish wisdom that would be foolish to ignore just because it is old. This is especially true when those voices testify to the meaning of God's word, because the force of that word as explained

in an earlier era has potential to revolutionize life and thought in later ones. Since Schlatter excelled at the discipline of seeing both the larger issues (e.g. Christology) and arcane details (e.g. the impetus that the synagogue gave to early Christian belief and practice) that go into a full-fledged NT theology, students of the NT would be well advised to put his volumes on their reading list. Many of us are even finding them valuable, despite their age, for classroom use.

Robert W. Yarbrough
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

A New Vision for Israel. By Scot McKnight. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999, xiv + 250 pp., \$21.00 paper.

“The most important development in recent studies of the historical Jesus has been the recognition that Jesus had a mission to the nation of Israel,” writes Scot McKnight (p. viii). Jesus’ teachings about God, the kingdom of God, and ethics must therefore be viewed within the specific context of his mission to bring national salvation to Israel.

Modern Biblical scholarship has all too often sought to portray Jesus as “a Protestant liberal, a social revolutionary, a religious genius, or a misguided enthusiast” (p. viii). In this way Jesus has been snatched from his Jewish milieu in order to make him a generic human being rather than a Jewish one. McKnight, on the other hand, insists that one must understand Jesus’ teachings “[i]n light of what we know about Jesus through his actions as they relate to Israel” (p. ix).

The ministry of Jesus is therefore best understood as driven by “a political vision” (p. 5) that places God’s call to Israel at the center of Jesus’ message. This means that the God of Jesus is “not some abstract, universal deity,” but the God of Abraham who in Jesus calls Israel to national repentance in order that he might bring about that national restoration which shall be the kingdom of God (p. 69).

At the same time, Jesus proclaimed this coming kingdom as already present in his ministry (chap. 3). In so doing, however, he did not set forth a fully “realized eschatology,” but insisted that the fullness of God’s kingdom rule would be manifested in the future with “God’s judgment on Israel’s sinfulness in the form of the destruction of Jerusalem” (p. 155). Following this judgment, the kingdom of God “would be made up of Israelites who had survived the ordeal and who would become the restored Israel” (p. 155). This impending crisis of future judgment and the coming kingdom in turn provides the only proper context for understanding Jesus’ ethical teachings concerning conversion and the cost of discipleship (chap. 5) and Christian morality (chap. 6). *A New Vision for Israel* provides a reasonably thorough overview of modern scholarship’s recent emphasis on the Jewish matrix of Jesus’ ministry. The reader may find it difficult to discern the intended audience, however. The technical terminology is beyond the reach of most laypersons, and the author’s nuanced historical-critical methodology comes across as an attempt to satisfy both McKnight’s fellow evangelical scholars and more liberal scholars such as Marcus Borg and John Dominic Crossan.

Indeed, it is McKnight’s use of redaction criticism that is most problematic, as he often seeks to go behind the canonical texts and evaluate the genuineness of traditions from hypothetical sources such as Q, M, and L. On the basis of such redaction-critical methodology, McKnight repeatedly questions the authenticity of certain Jesus traditions (as the guild of Biblical scholars would have us do), while at the same time insisting that we can have confidence in the NT witness to Jesus. Another of McKnight’s

contentions that seems to undermine Biblical authority is his argument that Jesus believed his return would occur within one generation (in conjunction with AD 70), yet was not really mistaken. On this point McKnight's exegesis is questionable, and he again appears to want to have it both ways.

Reading through McKnight's redaction-critical analyses, I recalled time and again the words of a former professor who advised me years ago: "The best commentary on the text of the Bible is the text of the Bible."

Ted M. Dorman
Taylor University, Upland, IN

Conversion in the New Testament: Paul and the Twelve. By Richard V. Peace. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999, 397 pp., \$25.00.

The strength of this book is its weakness.

Its strength is that it belongs to the breed of books that attempts to bring several disciplines to bear on some important subject or other. Peace is the Robert Boyd Munger Professor of Evangelism and Spiritual Formation at Fuller Theological Seminary. In large part his book is a NT study by a man with a background in psychology and whose job description is professor of evangelism.

The book is divided into three parts. In the first, Peace studies the conversion of Paul as recorded in Acts. From this he infers three essential characteristics of Christian conversion: insight, turning, and transformation, all succinctly summarized in Acts 26:18. In the second part of the book, Peace turns from the dramatic conversion of Paul to the nurtured conversions of the Twelve, as recorded in Mark's Gospel. They gradually come to understand Jesus in his roles as teacher, prophet, Messiah, Son of Man, Son of David, and Son of God. For Peace, these represent a six-step process of conversion in Mark that becomes the organizing principle of Mark's Gospel. Part III links the first two parts into a synthesis that Peace uses to evaluate various contemporary modes of evangelism, finally preferring what he calls "process evangelism," with its emphasis on spiritual journey, over "encounter evangelism," which underscores sudden conversion.

Here and there this mingling of Biblical and psychological reflection yields interesting and provocative results. But I regret to say that the mingling of disciplines is the weakness of this work as well. The handling of the Biblical material is so spotty, and sometimes so methodologically uncontrolled, that the results are frustrating.

Quite apart from the focus on Paul's conversion in the brief accounts in Acts, without seriously attempting to integrate what Paul himself writes about his conversion and about such matters as the work of the Spirit in conversion, Peace insists that Paul's conversion is paradigmatic for all Christian conversion, without seriously wrestling with unique elements. Moreover, elements of Peace's analysis seem more tied to the demands of the psychological model than to the text, e.g. "*The texts insist that what triggered Paul's turning was the sudden insight into himself which came as a result of his dialogue with Jesus*" (p. 45, emphasis his). Is that really the emphasis of the text? Gal 1:15-16, "was pleased to reveal his son in me" (NIV), is taken to be an assertion of Paul's "inner experience of Jesus" (p. 85). Well, maybe. But Paul uses *en emoi* not uncommonly to mean something like "with respect to me"; see, for instance, the use of exactly the same expression at the end of Galatians 1. Here as elsewhere Peace proceeds by mere assertion, without serious evaluation of the stances he takes. He is so enamored with Krister Stendahl's famous 1963 essay that he plays down the

role of a guilty conscience in conversion (pp. 27–29). He may be right in the case of Paul's conversion. But he seems unaware of the stringent responses to Stendahl, and in any case he does not follow Paul's own theological argument about how we ought to connect guilt and sin to the cross (as in Romans 1–3). From the fact that the verb *šûb* ("turn" or "return") is used more than 1,000 times in the OT—most of these referring to the people of Israel "returning" to their God—Peace infers (with Witherup) that conversion is not a missionary activity of getting converts to a religion. Similarly in the NT, the focus is on discovering who Jesus is, not changing religions (p. 28). At a certain level, this is right. But it is right precisely because those who are called to "turn" or "return" in the OT are already part of the covenant community; those who discover who Jesus is in the NT are either Jews who in consequence read their Bibles rather differently than they had, or pagans who are certainly changing religions (even though changing religions *per se* is not precisely the focus). Nevertheless, the antithesis is too neat, and the put-down of missionaries unconscionable.

The treatment of Mark, I fear, is worse, though it would consume too much space to detail the charge. Peace's analysis of the text is part of one current tendency in Markan studies to analyze this Gospel for patterns of discipleship. Not for a moment am I denying that there are things to be learned about discipleship in Mark. But the purpose of the Gospel of Mark is not to give us a psychological profile of normative conversion or normative discipleship. Rather, it is to tell us things about Jesus and the gospel and the dawning of the kingdom. Moreover, the sad fact is that if you focus endlessly on discipleship, you rarely produce disciples; if you focus on all the texts have to say about Jesus—who he is, what he has done, what he demands—then by God's grace you produce disciples.

The last chapter, too, has insights, but too much of its argumentation proceeds by way of caricaturizing antithesis. In short, what begins as potentially a strong and really useful book turns out to be disappointing and misleading.

D. A. Carson

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

A Primer of Biblical Greek. By N. Clayton Croy. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999, 264 pp., \$18.00.

New textbooks designed to assist Greek teachers in their often thankless but vital task of imparting grammatical knowledge of NT Greek to beginning students continue to be published from time to time. Each seeks a better way. Yet, few have the staying power of Davis, Machen, Robertson, Wenham, and, most recently, Mounce. Croy, Professor of NT at Trinity Lutheran Seminary, believes his effort to be the remedy for other currently available Greek grammars, which are flawed in a variety of ways, in his view, by inadequate explanations, excessive detail, inadequate exercises, unidiomatic exercises, quirks, gimmicks, typographical errors, high prices, and non-inclusive language. One can readily observe his studied efforts to make corrections in just these ways. However, one must ask whether he has in places overcorrected or even introduced his own flaws.

Each of the 31 lessons in this volume begins with 10 to 20 vocabulary words to memorize, followed by grammatical explanations and important paradigms, usually no longer than two or three pages, with four types of translation exercises at the end: composed (about 10), Septuagint (about 10), NT (about 10), and English to Greek (about four). Special vocabulary to aid in translating the LXX and NT sentences (about

20) conclude each chapter. Sections are numbered consecutively through the entire book, totaling 351, for quick reference. Forty pages of paradigms are collected in the back, as well as two dictionaries, one English to Greek, a good idea to help with that section of translation, and Greek to English. Verbs are introduced early, present indicative in chap. 2. Participles are handled in depth, with 20 pages in 3 chapters. Introduction to the Greek accenting system is introduced in chap. 1 and along the way as relevant to nouns and verbs.

The greatest strength of this volume lies in its inclusion of four types of exercises from which the instructor can pick and choose, and especially the inclusion of Septuagint sentences. Another strength is its manageable size.

Weaknesses, however, must also be noted. Croy's overly concise explanations could use more examples, more connection to English. As it is, heavy supplementation by a teacher will be required. Some items Greek teachers have grown accustomed to in grammars are not in Croy: no irregular verb or principal-part chart, no master verb chart on one page (12 pp. in Croy), no review chapters, no boldfacing of key spots in paradigms, and no use count of vocabulary.

Visually, this book, other than the cover, is unappealing, some of which may make the learning task more difficult for students. Line spacing is too close, especially on exercises. Paradigms within chapters do not stand out visually. Students may find picking out special vocabulary on a list cumbersome as opposed to simply placing the English in parentheses within the sentence after the Greek word.

Although some Greek instructors may like his early explanations of accents, I found these comments much more detailed than a beginning student needs. Croy's insensitivity to students also appears in his very first task, on p. 1, helping them learn the sounds of Greek letters. Inexplicably, his only help for *upsilon* is to say that it sounds like the "French u or German u," and for *chi* the "German *ich*," supplying no English help whatsoever.

I have taught NT Greek for 15 years. Just last year I cautiously switched from Wenham to Mounce. What I discovered was that Mounce, which incorporates every Greek learning device and student motivational help known to humanity, has helped make my task as a teacher easier, and the students learned Greek as well or better than previously. Any new beginning Greek grammar today must be compared to the new benchmark set by Mounce. Croy fits in with the older style of grammar. For price and for a short, seminary, course in Greek, it has advantages over Mounce. However, for the undergraduate, which I teach, it is a step back, not a step forward.

William R. Baker
Saint Louis Christian College, Florissant, MO

A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew. By Craig Keener. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999, xxii + 1040 pp., \$60.00.

The author of this book should be well known to *JETS* readers from his previous publications, including a shorter commentary on Matthew in the IVP Commentary Series (InterVarsity, 1997). In the present volume he seeks to illumine the socio-historical context of Matthew, although he acknowledges the value of other studies that stress redaction criticism, structuralism, history of interpretation, and narrative criticism. Keener also stresses Matthew's exhortations to his community with a view to aiding the current reader who wishes to reapply Matthew's exhortations to his or her own audience. This is a thorough study, with 70 pages of introduction to Matthew,

650 pages of commentary, 150 pages of indexes, and a 150-page bibliography, which is strangely omitted from the table of contents.

Not surprisingly, Keener writes from the standpoint of Markan priority. Instead of citing only those “parallels” from second-temple and rabbinic literature that he deems most relevant, he cites numerous sources and encourages his readers to come to their own conclusions on their relevance. He views Matthew’s genre and purpose to be in line with historical, biographical, and catechetical concerns. Thus Matthew may exercise a degree of freedom in the use of his sources, but he does not create pericopes out of whole cloth in order to connect them to proof texts from the Hebrew Bible. To the extent that accuracy was expected of works of this type in Matthew’s day, Matthew incorporates an accurate understanding of the words and deeds of the historical Jesus into his Gospel.

Keener’s brief discussion of the structure of Matthew concludes that the common threefold (based on “from that time Jesus began . . .” in 4:17 and 16:21) and fivefold (based on “when he had finished speaking . . .” at the end of the five major discourses) divisions are not incompatible. Yet he does not explain how one should understand the complementary nature of these structural indicators. This is problematic in that one tends to view Matthew’s literary strategy as chronological and biographical when one adopts the threefold structure, but Matthew’s strategy of topically arranging teaching for the Church is emphasized when one takes the fivefold structure approach. The biographical and ecclesiological aspects of Matthew are complementary, but literary analysis would seem to require one of them to be primary and the other secondary for Matthew’s purpose. Coming to a decision on this matter is also important for construing the application of Matthew, a major concern of Keener. Thus one would have expected him to have come to a more nuanced view of this matter.

Keener is reluctant to come to firm conclusions on the authorship of Matthew, but he does think that the book contains a significant deposit of traditions that came from Matthew the apostle. Antioch in Syria is the most likely place of origin of this Gospel, and its date could be as late as the eighties of the Common Era. Matthew is writing as a Jewish Christian for a largely Jewish Christian community that is in conflict with the emerging proto-rabbinic leadership, centered at Jamnia. Thus Matthew is not anti-Jewish. On the contrary, Matthew’s community is still aligned with Judaism, although it likely includes Gentile converts. Keener’s agreement with the views of Overman and Saldarini, *inter alia*, which are still the minority among Matthean scholars, should be noted. But if this is the case, and I agree with Keener that it is, would it not be better to refer to Matthew and his community as Christian Jews rather than as Jewish Christians? Similarly, it may be anachronistic to speak of the Gentiles in Matthew’s community as converts to Christianity.

The format of the commentary typically entails a brief introduction to each pericope, followed by sections with bold headings that contain text-related comments. The pericope introductions normally cite synoptic parallels, allude to significant literary and historical backgrounds, and summarize the content of the text. The text-related comments frequently take verses out of order because of Keener’s topical and applicational concerns. Thus this is not exactly a running, verse-by-verse commentary. Keener’s concern with application is apparent throughout, with bold paragraph headings written in the present tense that stress the contemporary application of the text. A prime example of this is the commentary on 1:18–25, which lays out five ethical lessons from the exemplary conduct of Joseph and Mary. For the preacher who is undaunted by the bulk of this commentary, sections like this will be very valuable.

Along more technical lines, just over 2,000 footnotes are included. These are very helpful to the scholar, but their enumeration system is a bit confusing. Because there

is no outline of Matthew in this commentary, it is not easy to follow when and why one section of footnotes ends and another begins. The emphasis on socio-historical matters does not entail much reference to Greek grammar and syntax; the relatively few citations of Greek words are put into italics, not Greek script. Incorporated here and there are short excursions on such topics as personal and ancestral merits in Jewish texts, synagogues, demons and exorcism, *porneia* as incest, and Jewish resurrection theology. These summary essays are quite helpful, but since they are not included in the rather minimalistic table of contents, one discovers them only as one reads through the commentary.

This commentary's emphasis on the socio-historical milieu of Matthew should make it quite attractive to scholars. Keener's lists and discussions of plausibly relevant primary texts and historical traditions are very helpful for scholarly research into the first Gospel. There are other evangelical commentaries on Matthew that credibly present this sort of material along with other valuable perspectives on Matthew. But Keener has probably spent more time and space treating socio-historical matters than any other evangelical commentary. However, due to Keener's faithfulness to his limited purpose, readers looking for insights into Matthew's syntax, putative redactional techniques, literary tendencies, and Biblical theology will not find a great deal of help here.

The commentary also deserves a place on the shelf of the pastor due to its emphasis on application. The applicational thoughts are not superficial or haphazard; they address contemporary readers with insights drawn from Keener's exacting study of the original historical situation of this Gospel. This kind of application, if not sensational, is surely most wholesome and beneficial. Pastors who are serious about expounding Matthew should not be put off by the length and price of the book. It will prove to be well worth its price and the time spent in pondering its profound applicational thoughts.

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

Luke's Stories of Jesus: Theological Reading of Gospel Narrative and the Legacy of Hans Frei. By David Lee. JSNTSup 185. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999, 403 pp., \$85.00.

This work, a revision of Lee's 1996 dissertation, represents an original contribution to the area of study that has become known as the "new literary criticism" of the Gospels. Since the appearance of the popular work *Mark as Story* by David Rhoads and Donald Michie (1982), NT scholarly interest has moved away from the historical development of the Gospels (source, form, and redaction criticisms) toward the literary features that mark their final form (plot, character, narrative point of view, etc.). Lee recognizes that the theoretical groundwork for this paradigm shift was laid by Hans Frei's *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative* (1974).

Lee's monograph attempts not only to analyze the approaches of Frei and his successors, but also to correct what he sees as their deficiencies and to forge a revised approach of his own. Lee's focus is therefore more an exploration of narrative-critical method than a study of Luke's Gospel *per se*. One of his more intriguing ideas is that the "first generation" of narrative critics (Rhoads and Michie, C. Talbert, R. A. Culpeper, J. D. Kingsbury) have not been true to Frei's vision (in his later period) for a truly postmodern approach to theological reading. By assuming the narrative unity of the

Gospel text, these critics, according to Lee, failed to offer the reader the opportunity to grapple with disunities uncovered by a close reading of the text, denying the reader a formal role in the construction of the text's meaning. Lee's characterization of the reading process as the reader's dialogue with the *stories* (plural, not singular) in the gospel narrative represents the latest initiative in the scholarly pursuit of a hermeneutic that is both text-centered and postmodern. It will certainly invite discussion among narrative critics for years to come.

Lee's study consists of three parts. In Part 1 ("The Legacy of Hans Frei for New Testament Studies"), Lee does a great service by explicating the thought of Hans Frei (1922–1988), whose writings have been found by many to be dense and lacking in specifics. Particularly illuminating is Lee's demonstration of how Frei's hermeneutic was motivated by his larger theological and Christological concerns. Also helpful is Lee's presentation of the development in Frei's thinking, which he says moved from a "modern" text-centered phase, in which Frei championed the category "realistic narrative," to a "postmodern" reader-centered phase, in which Frei sought the "*sensus literalis*," the use of a text in its reading community. Lee believes the later Frei's abandonment of the primacy of the text was a mistake; it is this disappointment that motivates Lee's choice of Luke for his working material, in order to contrast his approach to that of Frei, who also worked frequently in Luke.

The climax of this section is Lee's own take on Frei's hermeneutical legacy and Lee's resulting criteria for an appropriate literary criticism of the Gospels, which he summarizes in five points (p. 116). Each of these points, I may add, serves to remind us that evangelicals are still grappling uneasily with the impact Frei made on the hermeneutical landscape. Lee's first point, Frei's "respect for the whole of the text in its final form," has been applauded by many evangelicals weary of historical-criticism's relentless dissection of the Gospel text. However, Lee's second point, Frei's bracketing out of historical concerns in favor of his literary-critical reading, has struck many evangelicals negatively as a fictive approach to Biblical narrative (though a few, like John Sailhamer, have been genuinely appreciative of the call to distinguish "text" from "event"). The remaining points assign a formal role in the reading process to the reader's ideological commitment and to his interpretive community, which, while subordinate to the text's literary features, allow the text to generate multiple interpretations. It is this allowance for polyvalence in the name of the reader's "critical freedom" that evangelicals will perhaps find the most objectionable. Those who approach postmodern reading strategies with an open mind, however, will embrace Frei's legacy here and will be curious to see what Lee has to offer.

In Part 2 ("Literary-Critical Options for a Theological Reading"), Lee maps out his reading program. In this section Lee rejects first-generation narrative-critical Gospel studies because of their ideological commitment to the Gospel text's coherence, in effect disallowing the reader the critical freedom to interrogate the text's deconstructive features. In its place, Lee suggests the work of the contemporary Dutch literary theorist Mieke Bal, who forged her methods to produce feminist readings of Biblical texts. Lee reworks Bal's narratology, which sees three communication layers to every narrative text. The lowest layer Lee calls the "chronicle" level, which is comprised of events experienced by characters (formally inaccessible to the reader). The second layer is the "story" level, in which some "focalizer" (usually, but not always, a character) processes the chronicle into a "story-vision," a depiction of the chronicle from a particular point of view. There may be many focalizers and many competing story-visions in the same narrative. The final layer is the "discourse" level, in which the "narrator" processes the many story-visions into a text, narrating in his own distinctive "voice." "Thus the discourse is twice processed, and disentangling these two con-

tributions is one of the keys to reading well. The real reader encounters the discourse text and reconstructs the 'earlier' stages of the production of the narrative" (p. 166). Lee, following Bal, assumes that a narrative text contains a "conversation" between its many narrative subjects, who will sometimes agree and sometimes disagree with one another. The reader then constructs his own concept of the text's meaning by "joining the conversation," so to speak, dialoguing with the text's narrative subjects and coming to his own conclusions.

Bal's three-layered scheme sets the stage for conflicting focalizations of the single "chronicle" within the text and seems, at least at first glance, to serve suitably Lee's quest for a reading program in which text-based narrative possibilities yield an open-ended meaning. However, there is also great irony in that Lee's approach, which supposedly seeks the "final form" of the text, resorts to assigning some aspects of the text to the narrator at one level, other aspects to one focalizer at another level, and still other aspects to other focalizers. The end result is a disentanglement that is strangely reminiscent of the historical-critical approach from which Lee seeks to distance himself.

In Part 3 ("Stories of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke"), we see Lee's method worked out practically. He pursues the same question that interested Frei—"Who is Jesus?"—by separating out within Luke's Gospel the characterizations of Jesus by three narrative agents: the narrator (at the "discourse" layer), Jesus himself, and the demons (the latter two at the "story" layer). Lee assumes that "these stories of Jesus cannot be formally synthesized, but they may be appreciated in their context by the reader and so provide the catalyst for the reader's production of their own story of Jesus" (p. 329). But it is here that Lee's study left me disappointed. Having been set up to expect "dissonance, difference, the absence of stable and objective meaning and the lack of closure" (p. 332), I came away with the sense that the three perspectives of Jesus were quite complementary. For example, according to Lee, the demons stress Jesus' authority over them as Son of God, Jesus presents himself as the fulfillment of Jewish traditions, and the narrator portrays Jesus as a teacher who speaks for God. But surely none of these portraits are incompatible with the others. Other differences Lee sees, such as the "forgiveness of sins" theme (strong in Jesus' self-characterization, weak in the narrator's characterization), are too insignificant to be construed as "deconstructive" features of the text's narrative Christology. While I imagine Lee's reading program would be better illustrated if he were pursuing some Gospel theme with more "dissonant" elements (e.g. the kingdom of God, the relationship between faith and miracles), he has failed to show it is well suited to ferreting out multiple "Christologies" operating within Luke's Gospel.

How one receives Lee's monograph depends, of course, upon one's presuppositions. On the one hand, for those whose interpretive communities are marked by the "hermeneutics of suspicion," it is always a welcome development to allow individual voices from within a Gospel text to speak at variance with the dominant (and possibly oppressive) voice of the narrator. In the spirit of postmodernism, Lee's method frees the reader to abandon harmonization and to align his ideology self-consciously with whatever voice in the text he deems most reliable. On the other hand, for those who find Gospel narrators trustworthy, who embrace the text's unity, who see differing viewpoints as complementary perspectives on multifaceted truth, and who view moments of dissonance as part of the larger harmonious symphony, Lee's work will be little more than a passing curiosity.

Frank Chan
Nyack College, Nyack, NY

Encountering John. By Andreas J. Köstenberger. *Encountering Biblical Studies*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1999, 277 pp., \$26.99.

Generally absent from the college bookstore are textbooks on individual books of the Bible that are useful for instruction at the college level. Because of the wide range of knowledge, ability, and interest among collegians, rarely does a single commentary prove useful. And so, the arrival of the *Encountering* series of texts on the scene is encouraging.

Encountering John is an upper-level college textbook on the Gospel of John, designed to acquaint the student with the contents of the Gospel along with its historical, geographical, and cultural background. Further, it addresses some hermeneutical issues and introduces its readers to the basics of the critical issues they will meet in various commentaries and journals. Recognizing that most Christian colleges include a significant number of non-Christians in their student body, the author also seeks to “substantiate the Christian faith” while not writing an apologetic.

The approach of this work follows the pattern of the earlier *Encountering the Old Testament* and *Encountering the New Testament* survey books, though without a CD. Each chapter begins by identifying its outline of topics and instructional objectives and ends with study questions and key words the students should know. Chapter content is enhanced by a number of illustrations, charts, and tables along with sidebar discussions of theological, exegetical, and ethical issues raised by the Gospel’s message. Finally, ten excursions in the back discuss issues related to the text that need not take up space in the chapters, but deserve discussion.

The majority of the textbook focuses on literary and theological issues related to the text of John in a manner that is readable, reflecting a level appropriate to the average college junior or senior, and thorough without being verbose or delving into needless detail. Yet, it is not so thorough that room is not allowed for the instructor to develop each passage in greater depth. It provides the instructor with a tool that should enable the average student to come to class adequately prepared to participate in discussions of interpretive issues, doctrine, and personal application. Students will not find assigned readings burdensome or boring. Nor will these leave the student knowing so much that the information discussed during the lecture need end up being redundant.

Köstenberger’s high view of Scripture is evident throughout the text. He identifies various critical views and honestly discusses issues facing the church today while promoting a classic evangelical (inerrant) understanding of John’s Gospel. This is said in light of his taking the text-critical approach that favors certain Alexandrian manuscripts to the extent that he drops John 7:53–8:11 from the text with little more than a footnote directing his readers to Metzger’s discussion in a separate text. This is such a significant issue, with most college students being unaware of the textual problem until it is raised in the classroom, that it deserves a fuller discussion in either an appendix or excursus.

This text is a helpful addition to the field of Biblical, especially Johannine, studies at the college level. I have not yet seen anything comparable to it as a teaching tool. But, before using it, the instructor needs to understand that it is written from a thoroughly Reformed perspective. As a result, someone teaching from an Arminian or non-Reformed Baptist perspective will need to develop classnotes that respond to those areas where marked differences in theology and interpretation exist.

Gary W. Derickson
Western Baptist College, Salem, OR

John 1:1 as Prooftext: Trinitarian or Unitarian? By Garrett C. Kenney. Lanham: University Press of America, 1999, xvi + 44 pp., n.p.

There are occasions when polite polemics and exegesis meet. The author confesses a personal involvement in the answer to the title's question. His father was a Roman Catholic and his mother a Christian Scientist, and he himself accepted Christ in a Pentecostal context. As a college teacher of courses in the humanities and religion, he has faced the question in the title for 20 years, and he recognizes that the answer is much broader than the presuppositions behind one verse.

But on its own terms, the study is helpful, methodologically and otherwise. Kenney walks us through nine approaches to the verse: text criticism, lexical, grammatical, and translation criticism, then more summarily, source, form, redaction, rhetorical, and composition criticism. None of these is groundbreaking or applied in a strikingly new way for the readers of this *Journal*, but as he remarks in the preface, Kenney thinks the partners in dialogue (who often are unacquainted with some of these approaches) can use a guide like this.

Perhaps in deference to the Christian Scientists involved, the Scripture quotations come from the King James Version. This is no great issue when only 17 words (difficult to translate in any other way) are involved, but when we want to deal with parallel texts in John and other books, the King James is a poor basis for serious exegesis, and we are glad to begin the study with the Greek text.

Kenney suggests (p. xii) that we read 1:1 in the context of the whole Prologue (1:1–18), or better yet, of the entire first chapter. He is right, of course, but Christian Scientists might seize on the idea that Jesus is “son of Joseph” (1:45). This reminds us that Trinitarian truths cannot be proven by dealing with a small number of texts. Unfortunately, the 64 items recommended in the bibliography are seldom more recent than 1989. Some very outstanding work has been published in the meantime (for example, R. E. Brown's 1997 *Introduction to the New Testament*, pp. 333–39), and some of the older titles are no longer helpful.

Still, this dialogue-oriented booklet will be useful to many who find its methodology or subject matter attractive.

Richard T. Foulkes
Universidad Bíblica Latinoamericana, San José, Costa Rica

A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles. Vol. 2: Introduction and Commentary on Acts XV–XXVIII. By C. K. Barrett. ICC. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1998, cxx + 577 pp. [pp. 695–1271], \$69.95.

Those who are familiar with Barrett's work will not be disappointed by the second volume completing his commentary on Acts. This work represents the pinnacle of Barrett's contribution to Lukan scholarship. Together with the numerous other commentaries he has published, it will prove a valuable resource for years to come.

As promised in the first volume—reviewed in *JETS* 41 (1998) 136–39—the second volume begins with a detailed 100-page introduction. While the preliminary introduction of vol. 1 covers primarily the textual evidence for Acts, in this second volume other traditional introductory questions receive proper treatment. In his discussion of sources, Barrett diverges from the pessimism of Dupont and others, as he provides a sketch of traditions available to the author of Acts. This concern for source-critical issues resurfaces at various points as he comments on individual pericopes. The focus of this discussion lies in the issue of the “we-passages.” Without addressing the

multiple possibilities in detail, Barrett interacts primarily with the work of C. J. Thornton, who defends the traditional hypothesis that the “we-passages” signify eye-witness accounts of Luke, the companion of Paul. In light of the writer’s profound misunderstanding of Pauline thought, Barrett concludes that the relationship between the author of Acts and Paul cannot be established. Therefore, “[t]hat Acts as a whole was written by one of Paul’s immediate circle is very difficult to believe; that the author, whoever he may have been, was able to draw on one or two sources derived from that circle—the We-passages and perhaps some others—is probable” (pp. xxviii–xxix).

In discussing “Acts as a Historical Document,” the conclusion of the previous section reappears. While maintaining that the author writes as a responsible historian, this early Christian document is not exempted from errors and inconsistencies. In his discussion of the Jerusalem council, for example, the historical issues within the text of Acts and difficulties that arise when Luke’s report is compared with the Pauline account are highlighted (pp. xxxvii–xxxix). The absence of close interaction between the author and Paul is assumed. Moreover, in order to explain such “problems,” Barrett refers his readers back to the suggestion of F. C. Baur, with the added qualification that Baur’s reconstruction of division and consensus should be pushed back to the first century. This leads Barrett to a discussion of the purpose of the work. Instead of seeing Acts simply as providing data for the reconstruction of early Christian history, Barrett argues that the author “wished to hold up before his readers a set of Christian ideals which would show them what their own Christian life should be and at the same time supply them with a strong motivation for following the example” (p. ii).

Moving from the question of historicity to the question of “Acts in History,” Barrett provides an account of the history of the reception of Acts. Its lack of authority among the first few generations after its composition may be explained by the fact that Acts is “neither a gospel, stamped with the authority of the Lord himself, nor an epistle bearing an apostolic signature” (p. lxx). In a survey of the “modern” interpretation of Acts, Barrett provides a brief discussion of critical methodologies utilized in the analysis of the Lukan writings. Barrett concludes the introduction with a discussion of the theology of Acts, which he organizes according to the traditional categories: Eschatology, Holy Spirit, Christology, the Church, apostles and ministers, baptism and the Christian meal, *Frühkatholizismus*, the Jews, the Law, Gentiles and the Gentile mission, and ethics.

In the body of the commentary, each section begins with a bibliography and a brief introduction that highlights various historical, literary, source-critical, and theological issues. The verse-by-verse commentary leaves no stone unturned. Citation of ancient sources and interaction with modern sources are included in the main text of the commentary.

No brief review will do justice to this massive and detailed commentary. The painstaking analysis of the text is evident, and the textual and grammatical observations are especially helpful. Theological observations find firm grounding in the minute details of the text. The articulation of conclusions reached in most cases reflects the mind of a careful and mature scholar who is more concerned with wrestling with the text than with the novelty of his own interpretation. Consequently, one will find an admission of ignorance whenever a firm conclusion cannot be drawn based upon the information provided by the text.

In his interaction with modern scholarship, Barrett displays a broad knowledge of the history of Lukan scholarship. At times, one may find Barrett controlled by questions arising out of the agenda established by scholars such as Conzelmann and Haenchen. Nevertheless, he has also provided fresh perspectives and questions for the next generation of Lukan scholars.

Moving beyond these general observations, several specific areas of concern should be noted. First of all, in his focus on source-critical issues, one may wonder how such a diachronic exercise should affect one's understanding of the Lukan task. The relevance of these issues directly reflects the confidence one can place on attempts to go behind the text in the search for the elusive historical core. While one cannot fault Barrett for lengthy discussion when the understanding of a text is at stake (e.g. the "we-passages"), at times he seems to imply that the Lukan program is significantly scarred by the limited sources available to the author (p. ci). Furthermore, beyond the historical traditions and the creative mind of the author, greater emphasis should fall upon the significance of the OT as yet another pole on which the Lukan program is constructed.

Barrett's portrayal of Luke as a historian also demands further discussion. Barrett has provided us with a commentary that reflects the current tendency to move away from the extreme skeptical position of critical commentaries of the last generation. The generally positive tone of the work is reflected in Barrett's statement that "There are many features of Acts that must win a favourable verdict on the author as a historian" (p. cxiv). This general statement is echoed by the refrain found throughout the commentary, "The story is not all fiction" (p. 960). This does not mean, however, that one can trust Acts at face value. For Barrett, Acts as an historical source "attains its full value only when used with the strictest—historical and theological—criticism" (p. cxviii). Furthermore, Barrett believes that historical problems in Acts may be traced to two larger issues. First, the writer's apparent lack of personal knowledge of Paul creates problems that cannot be solved through attempts at harmonization. In discussing the "we-passages," this issue becomes most significant for Barrett: "In the end however we have to balance against each other a factual problem (the misrepresentation of Paul's thought and action) and a verbal problem (the retention of 'We' passages in the midst of 'He/they' passages); and it seems reasonable to give the factual problem priority" (p. xxiv). Similarly, in dealing with the Jerusalem council, Barrett laments that Paul has lost his integrity at the hands of Luke when Paul's theology of grace cannot be harmonized with the apostolic degree of Acts 15 (p. cxvi). In both instances, the basis of Barrett's conclusion may be questioned.

The second cause of Luke's "failure" to provide an accurate historical report may be traced to historical distance. According to Barrett, the author is writing "in an atmosphere different from that of the period that he describes" (p. xli), and therefore his account is "distorted by the refracting medium of continuing church life through which he views the past" (p. liii). In his discussion of the historical problem of Acts, it is not so much the details of the account but the writer's misunderstanding of both Paul and the early Church that disturbs Barrett. Such misunderstanding is assumed and its credibility is in turn enhanced by its supposed explanatory power in the process of exegeting the various episodes. However, C. Hemer (*The Book of Acts in the Setting of Hellenistic History*), C. J. Thornton (*Der Zeuge des Zeugen, Lukas als Historiker der Paulusreisen*), and, most recently, S. Porter (*The Paul of Acts: Essays in Literary Criticism, Rhetoric, and Theology*) all have demonstrated that the text of Acts is quite intelligible without making such assumptions.

A more fundamental matter concerns both Barrett's method and his understanding of the author as a theologian. Barrett adopts the traditional historical-critical method and is able to produce a fresh and insightful work. While his cautious comments regarding other methodologies should not be ignored, one wonders if this historical approach is alone sufficient for uncovering the power of the narrative of Acts. His argument that literary criticism finds "more scope in other parts of the NT than in a matter-of-fact work such as Acts" (p. lxxviii) is debatable, as does his suggestion

that “the thought of Acts lies on the surface and does not require elaborate hermeneutical arts to draw it out” (p. lxxviii). While not entirely incorrect, viewing Acts merely as a “matter-of-fact” work can prevent one from recognizing the theological current behind the account of historical events. This may explain why Barrett can say that “there is in Acts no profound Christological thought” (p. lxxxvii), and that the author “has no theological doctrines that he wishes to commend beyond basic Christian conviction” (p. cxii). Moreover, the connections between various episodes frequently lose their significance when Acts is understood merely as a collection of traditional stories. Thus, Barrett concludes that the author’s “strength as a writer lies in the presentation of a single event, not in the logical linking of a sequence of events” (p. 1071). Finally, while his statement that the “lessons Luke presses upon his readers are not speculative but practical” (p. liii) may be true, it sets up a false dichotomy between theological truths and practical admonition, both of which we should expect from the narrative of Acts.

In this commentary, one will value the theological insights built on close textual analysis of individual episodes. However, one would hope to find a deeper appreciation of Luke as a theologian who composes a unified theological work. For what Barrett has given us, we should be profoundly grateful. His knowledge of the text and the world from which it emerges provides us with a solid foundation upon which further studies can be built.

David W. Pao
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

The Apostle of God: Paul and the Promise of Abraham. By John L. White. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999, xxxv + 277 pp., n.p.

In 1981 Seyoon Kim published *The Origin of Paul’s Gospel*, suggesting that Paul’s Damascus Road vision was responsible for his radical alteration in his view of Jesus and thus the basis of his Christology. Without reference to Kim, John L. White has made a similar proposal, but this time it is not Christology that is the issue, but rather Paul’s view of God. White argues that as a result of his visionary experiences Paul altered his view of God from that of lawgiver and judge to that of creator of spiritual offspring. This primacy of God as creator is what enabled him to view God as extending his grace to non-Jews and creating out of them and Jews a new people.

White develops this view in three sections of the book. The first looks at metaphors for God and sees creative ones as primary. It ends with a reflection on the Pauline rhetoric, especially that of the opening and closing of his letters. The second examines Greco-Roman influences on Paul’s concept of God, and especially the emperor cult. A final and longest section examines the theology (“God our Father”), Christology (“Christ the Lord”), and ecclesiology (“household of faith,” “Abraham’s offspring”) developed by Paul.

In the first part, White argues that Paul’s writing was more determined by his own agenda and particularly by his view of God than by the situational issues found in the churches to which he wrote. Thus the metaphors and analogies for God remain relatively constant, and the rhetoric is viewed as more epideictic than forensic or deliberative.

In the second part, a long description of Augustus’s conservative reform in Rome introduces the idea that Paul’s view of Christ was modeled on Augustus and the kingdom of God was modeled on the Roman empire.

In the third part of the book, White examines Paul's picture of God as the universal creator and thus as father, using the results of his study of Pauline images for God in the first part. However, rather than attribute both creator/father and ruler roles to God, Paul divides these and attributes rule to Jesus. Here White takes issue with James Scott's study of "sonship" vocabulary, agreeing that it indicates adoption, but disagreeing in that he feels that Scott's own data points to Greco-Roman models, specifically those found in Augustus (who was both ruler and priest) rather than Davidic messiahship as the basic influence on Paul's language. As a result of these influences and his Jewish background, Paul looks on the Church as an extended family or ethnic group (children of Abraham). While political images do appear, his own class status and his focus on God's ability to create life out of sterility led him to focus on the more organic metaphors. An epilogue in which some modern literary parallels to Paul are cited closes the book.

This work is certainly a significant one. First, every chapter makes for interesting reading, even though there are chapters that are not well integrated, specifically the one on Paul's rhetoric, and ways in which one might rearrange some topics. This work would be worth reading simply for the Greco-Roman background it provides for the Pauline letters. Second, the focus on Paul's conversion as the defining moment in his life is also helpful. Often this event has not been taken seriously enough in Pauline studies. Third, in pointing out the metaphors for God as creator and father, the one who will eventually recreate all of humanity into his new empire, White has made a significant contribution. A further contribution is in his insight that rule tends to be split off from God and, along with priesthood, attributed to Christ. This, along with the demonstration of how this would make sense in imperial Rome, is certainly most valuable.

But has White demonstrated his case that justification by faith as traditionally understood is not central to Paul, for his image of God is not that of judge but of creator? Here I want to be more cautious. He does show that the preponderance of images favors God as creator, but I am not convinced that he has eliminated the image of God as judge. It is not what he discusses that raises questions, but what he fails to discuss, i.e. all those uses of judging language. I missed in this book a detailed discussion of those texts. Thus, while offering fascinating insight into Paul and pointing us again to the origins of Paul's thought, he has at best succeeded in showing that the image of God as judge is not totally central for Paul, not that the image was eliminated.

Peter H. Davids
Innsbruck, Austria

"Christ in You": A Study in Paul's Theology and Ethics. By William B. Barclay. Lanham: University Press of America, 1999, 170 pp., \$42.50.

William B. Barclay's monograph *"Christ in You"* is a published 1997 Ph.D. dissertation written under the tutelage of J. Paul Sampley at Boston University. The study compares the expressions "in Christ" and "Christ in you" within the epistles of Paul.

The first chapter argues persuasively that scholarship has yet to define conclusively either expression or explain their relationship adequately within Pauline theology. Chapters 2–4 examine the "Christ in you" expression within the epistolary, theological, soteriological, and pneumatological contexts of Galatians, Romans, 2 Corinthians, and Colossians. Though the phrase occurs only five times in the entire Pauline canon (Gal 2:20; 4:19; Rom 8:10; 2 Cor 13:5; Col 1:17), Barclay appraises it as "a well-established

formula within Paul's thought" and "a central concept in Pauline teaching" (p. 50). He explains the infrequency of the phrase as possibly related to its traditional origin, which was "so bedrock that it did not bear frequent mention" (p. 122).

Barclay asserts throughout that there is a slight variation in meaning between "in Christ" and "Christ in you." Paul uses "in Christ" primarily as a *corporate* expression in comparison to the more *personal* phrase "Christ in you," which recalls a believer's baptism and dynamically recounts a believer's entrance into the Christian faith. "Christ in you" therefore is a theologically loaded phrase. Leading readers "back to the fundamentals of the faith" (p. 138), "Christ in you" encompasses the entire recreation process whereby believers become conformed to the image of Christ. This process begins at baptism, continues throughout the believer's life, eschatologically looks forward to the end times, and anticipates the believer's final transformation "from glory to glory" (p. 138). As the study progresses, parallels emerge between "Christ in you" and "Spirit in you." Both are shown to depict the indwelling power of God that regenerates and recreates believers into the image of Christ. But whereas "Spirit in you" focuses primarily on the process, "Christ in you" focuses primarily on Jesus as both the first cause of Christian transformation and as the final goal of the transformation process, since conformity to Christ is the process's ultimate objective. By establishing "Christ as exemplar for the life of faith," "Christ in you" promotes Christ-likeness as the standard for Christian ethics (p. 138).

In sum, then, "Christ in you" is a dynamic phrase that broadly describes God's salvation of human beings through the work of Christ in believers. In Pauline terms, this means "'Christ in you' makes possible new life 'in Christ' and forms the basis by which the benefits of Christ's death and resurrection accrue to believers (including justification, reconciliation, sanctification and redemption)" (p. 140).

Authors of published dissertations are always to be congratulated and Barclay is no exception. He is to be commended for bringing to our attention an important theological expression that has not received adequate attention. He supports his clearly written text with meaty endnotes that successfully engage in appropriate scholarly debate without confusing the internal objectives of the thesis proper. And, unlike what we find in many dissertations, he manages to relate a narrowly defined topic to the broader emphases of Biblical theology.

This study could be upgraded on several fronts, however. First, the phrase "that Christ may dwell in your hearts through faith" (Eph 3:17), which Barclay dismisses as "slightly different" from "Christ in you" (p. 22), should be incorporated into this study. By not doing so, Barclay preempts the possibility that Ephesians might contribute an added dimension to our understanding of this Pauline concept. Equally unfortunate is this work's omission of an exploration of the OT concepts of "new creation" and "new covenant," which Barclay portrays as being fulfilled by the presence of Christ in believers. A brief development of Paul's interpretation of Jeremiah 31 and Ezekiel 36 would further support the importance of transformation soteriology in Paul's thought (e.g. 2 Cor 3). Third, on the level of scholarly discussion, it is surprising that Barclay does not evaluate the ongoing debate regarding the exact meaning of justification within Pauline theology. It appears that he presupposes a transformational concept, which is legitimate, but he never explains why, and never appraises the forensic perspective. And finally, while "in Christ" is corporate in meaning, it also has important personal implications for the individual Christian. These issues aside, this monograph is a valuable contribution of significant merit.

Edward P. Meadors
Taylor University, Upland, IN

Commentarie de l'Épître aux Romains suivi de Lettre à Bernard Ayglier, abbé du Mont-Cassin. By Thomas d'Aquin. Translated by J.-É. Stroobant de Saint-Éloy. Paris: Cerf, 1999, 651 pp., 390 francs.

This commentary on Romans by Thomas Aquinas has until recently been available only in Latin. An older French translation from the 19th century was done but is long out of print. This new French translation provides a readable commentary manifesting the intellectual and theological strengths and precision of its author. The style well illustrates the medieval exegetical method where intricate rational connections were intertwined throughout, and the existing hermeneutic permitted several possible interpretations for the same passage.

While Aristotelian methodology is evident in the analytical process, one finds according to the calculations of the translator only 24 total references to Aristotle. He states, however, that there are 2,862 Biblical citations among which half belong to the OT. The second most-cited reference is that of the *Gloss*. After the *Gloss*, Augustine is the next most cited author, all helping us to see from where Thomas derived his authority for interpretation.

The text is accompanied by profuse annotations, provided by the translator Jean-Éric Stroobant and his associate Jean Borella. They are given to aid the modern reader unfamiliar with the unidentified Biblical, patristic, philosophical, and theological references found in Thomas's original writing. The notes serve to identify all of these references as well as to provide textual notes, cross references to other writings of Thomas, and elucidations of a historical, theological, or cultural nature. There is a 21-page bibliography, replete with European works pertinent to the study of this commentary.

After the greeting and introduction in 1:1–16, Thomas sees the letter to the Romans unfolding in two main sections: in 1:16b to the end of chap. 11, there is a display of the power of evangelical grace; in 12:1 to the end of the letter, instruction is given on the use of grace. A more detailed outline reveals the necessity of grace for the nations in 1:18–32. Grace is shown again for the Jews in chaps. 2 through 4. The efficacy of this grace is displayed in chaps. 5 through 8. The origin of grace is discussed in chaps. 9 and 10 through the election of Israel and then the nations, followed by the fall of Israel. Chapters 12 through 15:13 discuss moral doctrine. Final warnings begin in 15:14, and the book concludes with recommendations, salutations, and thanksgivings.

For Thomas, the origin of grace is God's love (1:7), which is provoked not by the good of the creature, since it is God himself who causes the creature's goodness. God's love is that which wills the good of the one loved. Saving faith in 1:17 depends on both the understanding and the will of the believer. The will moves the understanding to accept, but saving faith must also be that which is perfected by charity resulting in a formed faith. When "the just live by faith," their faith is to be understood as more than mere mental assent. At the same time, faith and love are not to be confused. Faith is an acceptance of eternal truths, while the virtue of charity renders the faith both active and alive.

In 1:18, there is a threefold breakdown in the following manner: God's invisible perfections can be known by the way of negation, his eternal power by the way of casuality, and his divinity by the way of excellence. The nations know this by God's works in the same way that one knows an artist by means of his works. Nonetheless, the nations cannot know the essence of God, since by the analogy of nature there is nothing in nature to represent the divine essence. This is why Paul appealed to the "unknown God" in Acts 17:23.

Thomas then cites the *Gloss* to give us another way of understanding 1:18. The invisible perfections represent God the Father according to 1 Tim 6:16, the eternal power

is Christ who is the power of God in 1 Cor 1:24, and divinity represents the person of the Holy Spirit to whom is attributed goodness. A similar trinitarian approach is used in the explanation of 11:36. There one finds three different prepositions relative to God the creator and sustainer of life. The preposition “from” relates God to the first power who operates, the second “by” relates him to wisdom, and the third “in” relates him to goodness that preserves. Power, wisdom and goodness are three attributes shared among the divine Persons. Consequently, “from him,” “by him,” and “in him” can also be attributed respectively to the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

In 3:4, God is true while every human is a liar. Thomas explains among other ways that we are liars according to our intelligence, unless, of course, we participate in God’s knowledge of eternal truth. This is why the psalmist says in Ps 42:3, “Send your light and your truth.” Since divine knowledge is the cause and measure of things, everything is true as it conforms to itself. But we do not have the truth as to the thing itself, only a mental abstraction of the thing. In addition, we are mutable and tend toward nothingness apart from God. Since God does not come from nothingness and does not change, he alone possesses the truth of all things.

Faith does not merit us justification according to 3:22, since faith does not, as in the Pelagian sense, come from us. Rather, faith is the first movement of the soul towards God, and the faith that justifies comes from God. The law of faith in 3:27 is the law written on the heart, which directs both exterior and interior works. We glory in the law of faith because it causes us to “believe from the heart for righteousness” (10:10). This is the same law in 8:2 that is the law of the spirit of life, liberating us from the law of sin and death.

God is God both of the Jews and the Gentiles in 3:29. Thomas argues that sinners all possess an insufficient material cause in order to save themselves. The section of 3:27–31 emphasizes that it is God who justifies both Jew and Gentile. Here, the annotators help us to understand that justification informs the sinful soul in such a way that it establishes a new state of justification penetrating to the interior being. They claim that Luther’s notion of justification was only of an exterior nature. Thomas defines for us his meaning of “impute” in the section on 4:3–5. Imputed righteousness is a gracious act where the totality of righteousness is imputed to one who has only accomplished partial justice. The annotators inform us that for Thomas imputation was not only juridical but also real. Thomas made the distinction between human acts of righteousness in the sense of a virtue and God’s righteousness, which alone can justify us in order to accomplish works fit for God’s glory. For sure, its origin comes from outside of us. Nonetheless, it penetrates our being and changes it so that both faith and love are present in the heart, the latter perfecting and confirming faith as salvific.

In 4:25, Thomas ties together the notion of Christ’s death for the destruction of sins and his resurrection as the ultimate cause of justification. He sees our justification as a renewal of justice. Our salvation is accomplished by the merit of Christ’s death and by the efficiency of his resurrection. Christ accomplished his atoning work as earthly pilgrim (*viator*), while his resurrection was accomplished in the beatific state (*comprehensor*).

Sin is transmitted by human generation in 5:12 as a deficiency coming from the sin of our first human father. This deficiency is a privation of original righteousness. Adam is said to be the origin of this deficiency as to its seminal cause and its corporal substance. This was not so for Christ, whose seminal cause was the Holy Spirit and whose corporal substance came from the Virgin Mary. We, however, have received sin and our human nature from Adam. This is why new life must come from Christ, while the old life is from Adam.

The Christian is no longer under the law in 6:14 in two ways. First, he is no longer subject to its ceremonial precepts. Second, he does not observe the moral law out of

fear but observes it willingly through love. This demonstrates the work of grace. One who does not observe the law willingly still has sin as his ruler. Grace, however, liberates us from sin's dominion. "The wages of sin is death" (6:23). Our works do not deserve merit, says Thomas, but they do if they proceed by the grace of the Holy Spirit. Here the annotators point us to the *Summa Theologicae* 1a-2æ, Q. 114, a. 1 and a. 3, where Thomas explains that there can be no human merit before God, unless one wishes to deal with the relation of human liberty and divine ordination. Nonetheless, the "value of the merit will be esteemed according to the power of the Holy Spirit who moves us toward eternal life" (p. 261, n. 7; translation mine).

In discussing the vivification of our mortal bodies at the day of resurrection (8:11), Thomas contrasts this with the judgment that the unsaved will receive. They will be judged because they are not members of the temple of the Holy Spirit. Nevertheless, their bodies will be raised incorruptible. The annotators here refer us in a note to the *Summa Theologicae*, suppl. Q. 86, a. 3, where Thomas explains that the fire of hell is eternal and will not consume the bodies of the unsaved. Nonetheless, their bodies will be passible, and so they will experience suffering.

All creation waits for the revelation of the children of God (8:19). Those who are already justified are only formed in part by grace. When we compare the present form with the form we will receive in glory, it is like matter that awaits its form, or like colors that desire to complete an image. Our end will exceed our natural form, the human body being clothed gloriously and supernaturally.

Romans 9:3 speaks of God's love for Jacob and his hatred for Esau. God's love pertains to divine eternal predestination in the same way that hatred speaks of reprobation. Reprobation is eternal, since nothing in the divine will is temporal. Predestination is the preparation for glory, while reprobation is preparation for punishment. Foreknowledge of our merits cannot be a motif for predestination, since such sins come from the sinner himself and not from God. The just will be rewarded for merits that do not come from themselves.

Speaking of human liberty in 9:15, one is given a power or motor to deliberate. This comes ultimately from outside the person and belongs to God, who shows mercy and pity to whom he wills. Thus, both the usage and the habit of grace come from God. Wisdom 8:1 tells us that God "disposes all things with sweetness." From this, Thomas reasons that all natural forms are disposed or inclined within themselves to the ends that God has ordained. In such a way, one can balance the value of human merit with divine grace. Nonetheless, Thomas emphasizes that God, the motor of our wills, is the one who ultimately wills. So, in 9:16, the action is attributed to the principal agent, that is God, but this does not deny human liberty, which is a function of the means by which God's will is accomplished.

In 9:17-18, the Scripture states that it is God who raised up Pharaoh. God raises up some for good, others for evil. He inclines some for good directly and by himself, but inclines others for evil only in an occasional way. God is the provider of good things, while evil humans use the good in a perverse way to do evil. In raising up Pharaoh, God ordained the evil but did not cause it. In addition, God does not directly harden men, but instead permits it and indirectly causes it by not granting his grace. At this point, the annotators point out that in Thomistic thinking, God does not will evil, since this would be a negation of the good that comes and is from God himself. Thus, God permits sin only with regards to human liberty. As to why God raises up some for good and others for evil, we are left in ignorance before the inscrutable will of God.

Thomas sees the Jews as a race included within God's electing grace. For him, 11:14 indicates that the fall of the Jews is repairable. The proof of this is the zeal of the apostle Paul demonstrated by his desire for the conversion of his own race.

"Every authority comes from God" (13:1). This includes even those who do not recognize God nor submit to his law or will. This further raises the question as to whether

the power of sin also comes from God. Thomas answers in the affirmative, claiming that the power to do evil and the power to do justice are the same. Yet, when the power is ordered to good, it comes from God. When the power is ordered to evil, it comes from the imperfection of the creature.

Matters of conscience are dealt within 14:14–16. Thomas is aware that there exists an “erroneous conscience.” It is evident from the annotators’ long footnote here that Thomas touched on the subject of both *synderesis* and the conscience in many of his writings. It played an important role in his understanding of how the law was applied. Whether the conscience was correct or not, it always was compelling for behavior. For Thomas, *synderesis* was the natural understanding of first principles and thus was infallible. Error came from the wrong application of those principles, and the application was what he referred to as “conscience.” So an erroneous conscience is mistaken discernment and from this, the will proceeds to perform evil. Speaking on 14:14, he says: “L’obligation de la conscience, même erronée, est celle de la loi divine, sont la même obligation . . . Car la loi n’est appliquée à nos actes que par l’intermédiaire de notre conscience.”

The book closes with a letter to Bernard Ayglier, abbey of Mont-Cassin, situated near the city of Aquino, birthplace of St. Thomas. This is followed by several tables or lists: first for Scriptural references; second, for significant words used in the commentary that are defined and identified as to their location in the text; third, a listing of all parallel passages with the rest of the works of Thomas; and last, a list of all authors and works cited. I found this a valuable read not only as an illustration of the medieval hermeneutic but also as a demonstration of Thomas’s appreciation for Scripture as he understood it and the place he put it within his own understanding of God’s ways.

Fred Karlson
Bibles International, Grand Rapids, MI

2 Corinthians. By Jerry W. McCant. *Readings: A New Biblical Commentary*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999, 196 pp., \$23.75 paper; *2 Corinthians*. By William R. Baker. *The College Press NIV Commentary*. Joplin: College Press, 1999, 470 pp., \$29.99; *2 Corinthians*. By David E. Garland. *NAC 29*. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1999, 587 pp., \$29.99.

Twenty years ago *2 Corinthians* was one of the more neglected Pauline epistles. Unlike *1 Corinthians*, with its highly contemporary discussion of tongues, prophecy, spiritual gifts, lawsuits, and more, this homely younger sister received little attention from the popular and scholarly worlds. This situation has been remedied in recent years, and there now exists a host of commentaries on *2 Corinthians*, ranging from full-scale technical studies (Thrall, Furnish, Martin), to those aimed at the layperson and Bible-study leader (Kruse, Belleville, Hafemann). The commentaries under review here would fall somewhere between these, being written primarily for the pastor (Garland, Baker) or serious student (McCant, Garland). All three defend the unity of *2 Corinthians*, and explain the letter’s changes in tone and subject matter in terms of the complexity of the situation Paul is addressing in Corinth.

Jerry McCant’s deceptively slender volume is part of a new series of commentaries from Sheffield that intentionally focuses on the literary dimensions of the text. The commentary proceeds paragraph by paragraph, rather than verse by verse, which allows McCant to concentrate on the structure and development of each section, as opposed to atomistic analysis of the components. The rhetorical/stylistic features of the text are explored with deft acumen, and the reader gains the impression that the

author has lived a long time with the argument, language, and phraseology of 2 Corinthians. Those unschooled in the vocabulary of rhetorical criticism will probably find some of McCant's analysis tough sledding. Latin phrases, frequently untranslated, are sprinkled generously throughout the book, as are other technical literary-critical terms. The author interacts with a limited selection of important modern authors, reflecting the constraints of the series, but is generous in his reference to ancient writers—certainly a prudent exchange.

McCant advances two provocative theses regarding 2 Corinthians, rendering his contribution more substantive than might first appear by its mere 196 pages. McCant's first bold proposal is that all of 2 Corinthians, not just the final three chapters, should be read as a parodic defense in which "irony and parody are frolicking on every page" (p. 13). It is widely acknowledged that 2 Corinthians 10–13 is rife with parody and sarcasm, though McCant contends that this is characteristic of the earlier chapters as well. His section titles are indicative: "A Parodic Defense of Behavior" (chaps. 1–7); "A Parody of Benefaction" (chaps. 8–9); "A Parodic Defense of Authority" (chaps. 10–13). In his introductory comments McCant offers some broad definitional boundaries for *parody* that highlight its function to ridicule, caricature, and malign through imitation. He comes closest to a definition on p. 14: "parody imitates serious writing . . . but with slight changes makes the serious appear ridiculous." In his attempt to read chaps. 1–9 as parody, McCant uncovers numerous tongue-in-cheek expressions, and other sardonic elements that might otherwise go unnoticed. This is all genuinely helpful, yet it remains doubtful whether the argument as a whole should be understood as an extended theological lampoon. McCant frequently invokes the term *parody* or *parodic* to describe passages or features of the text that do not fit any conventional definition of parody. Can we seriously read the appeal of chaps. 8 and 9 for the Corinthians to recommit themselves to the collection as a parody of benefaction? In what sense is 8:16–24 a parody of a letter of recommendation? Where are the elements of imitation, ridicule, and sarcasm? It seems that McCant must stretch the definition of *parody* beyond any recognizable form in order for his creative analysis to work. While appreciative of his many insights, I remain unconvinced.

The second daring thesis McCant advances is that, contrary to the unanimous voice of scholarship on 2 Corinthians, there were no intruders from outside causing problems for Paul in Corinth. He writes, "There is no evidence that Paul considers that he has any 'opponents' in Corinth. They are a troublesome lot, even a 'thorn in his flesh' (12.7), but Paul's pastoral heart does not permit thinking of the congregation as 'opponents'. Perhaps it is time to close the door on discussions about opponents in Corinth" (p. 18). The identity of Paul's opponents in Corinth is certainly vexing, and has led to numerous imaginative profiles (Schmithals, Georgi, Güttgemanns, Rissi), and also to confessions of agnosticism (Stockhausen, Bieringer). But can we dispense with the notion altogether? When Paul decries any who would preach "a different Jesus" (11:4), and calls those feigning apostolic status before the Corinthians "false apostles and workers of evil" (11:12–13), who are trying to deceive the Corinthians as Satan did Eve (11:3, 14–15), it is difficult not to conclude that there were in fact opponents in Corinth. Paul's rhetorical questions, "Are they Hebrews? Are they Israelites? Are they the seed of Abraham? Are they ministers of Christ?" (11:22), along with his designation of this group as false *apostles*, virtually demands that we are dealing with Jewish-Christian missionaries representing (most likely) the Jewish wing of the Palestinian church. While there is no evidence that they were advocating the Mosaic law—and Paul's own attack focuses on their demeanor, not their doctrine—it seems impossible to deny their existence. Indeed, it remains unclear to me how McCant can argue that there were a minority of wealthy Corinthians who did not support Paul against the offender of 2:6—whom McCant calls "slanderers" (p. 105) and "troublemakers" (p. 119), and whom Paul perceived to be "satanic" (p. 127)—and at the same

time claim that Paul had no opponents in Corinth. By the definition of most, these would qualify as opponents. Unfortunately, McCant never offers any systematic defense of his proposal (which would probably require a monograph-length treatment), but contents himself with passing comments as he works through the text.

These criticisms are not intended as a devaluation of the work as a whole. Almost every page of McCant's work contains insightful comments, and it is a rare treat to find a commentary written in such exquisite prose. Both students and scholars will benefit from a careful read of this volume.

Unlike McCant's more technical exploration of 2 Corinthians, William Baker's commentary addresses the practical concerns of the pastor and layperson. The College Press series is based on the NIV and is intended to be useful "whether you are preparing a Bible School lesson, a sermon, a college course, or your own personal devotions" (from the dust jacket). Greek words are transliterated, and the footnotes are succinct and confined to noting recent scholarly contributions. While the editor's estimation of scope of appeal of this commentary might be a bit optimistic (a college course would be better served by a more advanced treatment), Baker's commentary is packed with solid exegesis and illuminating discussions of problematic texts (e.g. Moses' veil in 3:12–18, the alleged intermediate state of 5:1–10). The layperson reading this volume devotionally will find food for both heart and mind.

There is room for improvement, however. The social context of Roman Corinth is largely ignored, and this context sheds valuable light on the argument of 2 Corinthians and its practical application. Paul's emphasis on strength in weakness (2 Corinthians 11–13), for example, is considerably illuminated by understanding Corinth's status as the sponsor of the biennial Isthmian games. As the proud host of this pan-Hellenic athletic competition, the victorious athlete stood at the center of Corinth's civic pride. Corinth's city center was adorned with exquisite statues of wrestlers, sprinters, victor's plaques, a temple dedicated to Hercules, and a colossal sculpture of the goddess herself, Nike/Victoria, with triumphant wings outstretched. In a city whose heritage, culture, and world view were shaped by the triumph of strength over weakness, the final chapters of 2 Corinthians would have been heard as a provocative challenge to adopt a truly counter-cultural perspective. The relevance of this to the modern setting is straightforward.

Of the works considered here, the commentary with the broadest appeal will certainly be David Garland's exposition of 2 Corinthians in *The New American Commentary* series. The NAC series is evangelical in orientation, utilizes the NIV, and is aimed at the minister or student looking for a rigorous examination of the text, yet one that is not devoid of theological reflection. Garland succeeds on both counts. His exegetical work is careful, and he interacts with a wide range of contemporary scholarship. While perhaps not as detailed in primary-source research as, for example, Furnish's commentary on 2 Corinthians, Garland helpfully elucidates Paul's argument through a generous (though not overpowering) use of Jewish and Greco-Roman authors. Garland does not merely note extra-Biblical texts with verbal parallels, but he also cites genuinely illuminating background material (e.g. his discussion of the triumphal imagery in 2:14–17).

Readers looking for the application of contemporary social-scientific approaches will be disappointed in Garland's commentary. The emphasis of the NAC series, however, is on "theological exegesis" and "practical, applicable exposition" (from the Editor's Preface), and this restricted focus allows Garland space for pastoral reflection on Paul's letter. Mindful of the spiritual dimension of 2 Corinthians and the practical concerns of the preacher, Garland frequently offers applicational summaries that synthesize and enumerate the key points of a passage (e.g. on 2:1–5; on 7:8–10; 8:1–10; 9:1–8; on 12:1–5). The result is a scholarly, readable, and spiritually challenging exposition of 2 Corinthians. This text would be ideal for any pastor's shelf, and should

be added to that small handful of commentaries suitable as a required text for a college- or seminary-level course on 2 Corinthians.

Moyer Hubbard
Talbot School of Theology, La Mirada, CA

Galatians. By L. Ann Jervis. New International Biblical Commentary. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999, 192 pp., \$11.95 paper.

According to its editor, W. Ward Gasque, the purpose of the New International Biblical Commentary Series is "to provide for the benefit of every Bible reader reliable guides to the books of the Bible—representing the best of contemporary scholarship presented in a form that does not require formal theological education to understand" (p. ix). Jervis's volume fits this goal well as an introductory commentary to Galatians.

Her work is a good resource for a lay teacher for many reasons. It is a short volume, and thus it is not intimidating. The introductory essay presenting the dating of the epistle, the situation in Galatia, Paul's Galatian opponents, and information about the apostle Paul is brief (30 pages). As a result, a lay reader can access this important information without being overwhelmed with the greater argument surrounding each of these issues.

When one proceeds to the verse-by-verse commentary, this information is also clearly presented for the lay teacher. Comments on each individual verse are regularly tied to the exact wording of the NIV, thus making it easy to follow the presentation. A section at the end of each paragraph division provides further information.

Some readers of this commentary may be frustrated with the lack of development of two important topics for the study of Galatians. The work does not develop Paul's Jewish orientation following his apostolic calling. In other words, it does not develop whether Paul is writing from the thought world of a messianic Jew or as one separated from Judaism. The commentary also does not develop the Judaism that he opposed. Is Paul confronting works of righteousness or Jewish boundary restrictions (i.e. covenantal nomism) in the Galatian community? Jervis is clearly aware of the controversy surrounding both of these issues but does not develop one side or the other in her commentary. Her approach steers a middle road through both of these issues. While this approach is sufficient for an introductory commentary, it may frustrate some who want to see a commentary take a particular side in the exposition of Galatians.

All in all, this is a good introductory commentary to Galatians. It would be a good resource for a Sunday School teacher working through a verse-by-verse study of this epistle.

H. Drake Williams, III
North Wales, PA

The First and Second Letters to Timothy. Eerdmans Critical Commentary. By Jerome D. Quinn and William C. Wacker. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000, lxxvii + 918 pp., \$65.00.

This voluminous work—almost 1,000 pages on 1 Timothy and 2 Timothy!—represents the inaugural contribution to the Eerdmans Critical Commentary. It is the sequel to Quinn's Anchor Bible commentary on Titus, published posthumously (and with much additional labor) by Quinn's student William Wacker. While only published in 2000, the present study is current until 1988—a 12-year hiatus. The volume also

includes a reprint of the "Introduction to the Pastoral Epistles" and the "New Translation of 1 and 2 Timothy" from the Titus commentary.

The book constitutes an important reference for the linguistic background of Paul's letters to Timothy. The primary audience of the work, however, will be scholars, owing to the rather technical form of presentation of the material. The material is divided into "Notes," which consist of parallel linguistic usage, and "Comment" sections, which deal with exegetical and theological observations. In his introduction, Quinn contends that the Pastorals were written, not by Paul, but in the post-Pauline period (AD 70–100) in order to counter the tendency of disparaging the apostle owing to his shameful end as a purported criminal (p. 20). As to the "recipients," Quinn conjectures that "not only Titus and Timothy but also the places to which the letters are addressed may have a typical or representative function" (p. 22). Quinn presupposes that Titus was written first and that 1 and 2 Timothy are to be understood as parts 2 and 3 in the "Pastoral epistle" corpus.

As far as the "Notes" are concerned, while their documentation of word usage in a variety of writings is helpful as a general reference, the practice of undifferentiated juxtaposition of parallel references has a similar effect as the Amplified Bible and may give the wrong impression that every adduced parallel is of equal value for the interpretation of the use of a given word in a specific passage in the Pastorals (see e.g. the comments on *oikonomia* on p. 63, where other NT references, instances in Ignatius, and the LXX are listed in that order and without further comment or distinction). Often the comments on a given word resemble a digest of diachronic usage (though not necessarily in chronological order, which can make things even more confusing) not unlike Kittel's *TDNT*, which renders this work open to similar criticisms as those leveled by James Barr against Kittel (see e.g. the treatment of *agapē* on p. 65). Another difficulty is the degree of overlap between "Notes" and "Comment" sections (note the duplication of much of the *oikonomia* material from p. 63 on pp. 74–78).

Quinn's translation, while doubtless original, tends toward the idiosyncratic. Thus "promote controversies" (NIV) in 1:4 is rendered as "proffer lucubrations"; "rebels" in 1:9 are "refractory persons"; "violent man" in 1:13 is rendered as "insanely arrogant." In 2:2, prayers are urged for kings and all "in high station" (NIV: "those in authority"); women are to "make themselves attractive in a becoming costume" (2:9). In 2:12, "a wife" is not to teach in public worship or "to boss her husband." The examples could continue. Sometimes it is hard to know whether these are serious attempts at translation or exercises in stylistic subtlety and linguistic elegance.

Overall, then, I would recommend using Quinn-Wacker as a supplemental reference work on terminology in the Pastorals. The present work does not, however, replace conventional commentaries in that it rarely renders theological judgments (or even seriously discusses matters of theological import). Moreover, as mentioned above, the authors' failure to adequately screen possible parallels in order to adjudicate their actual relevance leaves this work to the user of this tome, which makes the material assembled rather unwieldy and difficult to digest. Having said this, there is doubtless much valuable information contained in this massive volume that, if sifted properly, has the potential of making a valuable contribution to the study of the Pastoral epistles.

Andreas J. Köstenberger
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Wake Forest, NC

The Pastoral Epistles. ICC. By I. Howard Marshall. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1999, xlii + 869 pp., \$69.95.

After several years of relative drought (the last major commentary on the Pastorals by George Knight in the NIGTC series appeared in 1992), the 1999–2000 academic

year has seen a veritable flood of major publications on the Pastoral epistles pour from the presses. Apart from the present work and the inaugural volume of the Eerdmans Critical Commentary (reviewed separately above), significant new releases also include William Mounce's substantive contribution to the Word Biblical Commentary series and Peter Gorday's Ancient Christian Commentary on the Pastorals, not to mention the more practical works by Walter Liefeld (NIV Application Commentary) and Kent Hughes and Bryan Chapell (Preaching the Word). Clearly, it will take some time before the net gain for the study of the Pastoral epistles can be fully gauged, though the cumulative contribution of the above-mentioned volumes will certainly be judged to be significant. Perhaps to complete this deluge of new material on the Pastorals for the near future, Stephen Baugh has contributed the commentary on the Pastorals for the Zondervan Illustrated Bible Backgrounds Commentary (forthcoming), and I have completed work on a commentary on this corpus myself (for the new Expositor's Bible Commentary).

Marshall's ICC entry, written in collaboration with Philip Towner, culminates the author's long-standing study of the Pastoral epistles and provides a worthy addition to the series. Marshall, Professor of New Testament Exegesis at the University of Aberdeen, has long been one of the leading British evangelical NT scholars, and the present work adds to his reputation. It is not possible within the confines of this review to interact in detail with Marshall's various exegetical judgments. It must suffice to position Marshall's commentary in relation to other comparable works and to select and briefly critique a few salient examples of positions taken by him in the present volume.

Marshall takes up the three Pastoral epistles in the order Titus–1 Timothy–2 Timothy, because Titus addresses a less-developed and complex ecclesiastical situation and therefore may have been written before 1 and 2 Timothy. However, this difference may simply be due to the less-developed situation *in Crete* over against *Ephesus* rather than indicate which epistle was written first. After taking up introductory issues such as canonicity, text, and genre, Marshall devotes a full 22 pages to the structure of each of the three letters (pp. 18–40). Timothy's opponents are identified, not as gnostics, but as "a group of Jewish Christians, perhaps travelling teachers with an ascetic streak, who were active within the Pauline mission area" (p. 51).

In his very full treatment of authorship (pp. 57–92), Marshall concludes, disappointingly, that "the way in which the thought [in the Pastorals] is expressed, both linguistically and theologically, poses great problems . . . which seems to make it unlikely that he [Paul] himself wrote in these terms to trusted colleagues" (p. 79). This does not mean that Marshall opts for pseudonymity, which, he acknowledges, involves deceptive intent (pp. 80–83). Rather, he postulates a scenario in which "somebody close to a dead person continued to write as (they thought that) he would have done" (p. 84), a view Marshall labels "allonymity" or "allepigraphy" (*ibid.*). The intended audience of the letters were, according to Marshall, leaders of congregations in Crete and Ephesus/Asia Minor (p. 85). Thus, in his reading, Titus and Timothy turn out to be only the purported, but not the real, recipients of these epistles. Marshall is, however, rather fond of the idea that 2 Timothy may be substantially the work of Paul and that it formed the basis for the "allonymous" writing of 1 Timothy and Titus (p. 86). If so, of course, this would mean that 2 Timothy, not Titus (see above), was essentially written first.

To apply Marshall's line of reasoning to his own commentary (which was by his own acknowledgment written "in collaboration with" Philip Towner), perhaps several hundred years from now some might claim that the commentary was actually not written by Marshall himself but compiled subsequent to his death by Towner based on Marshall's notes and perhaps also on some of his previous publications. With the passage of time, doubtless a plausible case could be construed along those lines. The only problem would be that, while plausible, such a theory would not square with the facts,

for Marshall did in fact publish the commentary during his lifetime and as the person responsible for his work (the degree of collaboration by Towner is another matter). But if Marshall would protest attributing his own work to a posthumous student collaborator, might not Paul likewise be given short shrift by Marshall's theory of an "anonymous" authorship of the Pastorals?

The remainder of this review will take up several matters arising from Marshall's remarks on 1 Tim 2:9–15 and comment on a few other important interpretive judgments. First, Marshall claims that the injunction, "Let a woman learn," in v. 11 pertains to any learner, including "presumably men who were not teaching" as well (pp. 452–54). However, this is irrelevant here, because the command is addressed specifically, and generically, to *women*. Second, Marshall's argument that elsewhere women are encouraged to teach *women* and *children*, so that the prohibition of women teachers in v. 12 is not absolute (p. 441), does not alter the fact that in the present passage women are told not to teach (or have authority over) *men*.

Third, after calling my syntactical study of v. 12 "convincing" (p. 458), Marshall nonetheless finds a way to sidestep this study's implications for the present passage, concluding that the phrase means "to teach in an overbearing manner" (pp. 458–60). However, Marshall furnishes no proof that the Greek conjunction *oude* can function in the way he suggests (i.e. link a term adverbially to another by way of *hendiadys*). The stubborn fact remains that *oude* is a coordinating, not a subordinating, conjunction. Fourth, Marshall's contention that the present prohibition is merely part of Paul's general silencing of false teachers in the Pastorals—and thus "not absolute or for all time"—also misses the mark, because the norm invoked by Paul in v. 13 is creation order, not merely local circumstances. In each case, Marshall diverts attention from the explicit (and usually quite plain) wording of the text by introducing alleged local circumstances that are then taken to relativize or otherwise set aside the overt, express message of the passage. This strategy unnecessarily complicates and obfuscates matters but must be resisted as an attempt to erode a more natural reading of the text that appears to be unpalatable for Marshall on ideological grounds.

In his interpretation of 1 Tim 3:1 ("If anyone aspires to the office of overseer, he desires a noble task"), Marshall contends that "[t]he statement must surely imply that some people thought it undesirable" (p. 475). Apart from the fact that this argument is rather novel, it is also doubtful and an instance of the dubious "mirror-reading hermeneutic" *à la* Fee that looks for local circumstances behind every single phrase in the Pastorals. In his treatment of deacons in 1 Tim 3:8–12, Marshall claims that the requirement in v. 9 that deacons "must keep hold of the deep truths of the faith with a clear conscience" implies "that the deacons also had some share in teaching and instruction of the congregation" (p. 485). However, this fails to take adequate account of the absence of terms related to teaching or ruling (most notably "able to teach," v. 2; see also v. 5b) in the case of deacons as well as to give full weight to the designation "deacon" (from the Greek *diakonos*, "servant") as over against "overseer." Marshall's suggestion that deacons served "perhaps as leaders of house churches" (p. 495) is likewise pure conjecture.

Another interpretive judgment pertains to 1 Tim 5:17 (translated by the NIV as "The elders who direct the affairs of the church well are worthy of double honor, especially [Gk *malista*] those whose work is preaching and teaching"; the NASB rendering is similar). Understood thus, this passage seems to imply that there are some elders who direct the affairs of the church but who do not also labor hard at preaching and teaching. Similarly to Mounce in his recent WBC contribution, Marshall contends that *malista* here means "namely," in which case the distinction between teaching and nonteaching elders would disappear (p. 612). However, the NT pattern of usage speaks

decisively in favor of the meaning “especially” here and elsewhere in the Pastorals (cf. 4:10; 5:8; 2 Tim 4:13; Titus 1:10) in the sense that a larger group is first named from which subsequently a subsegment is separated out and brought into focus (cf. especially Acts 25:26: all of you, especially king Agrippa; Gal 6:10: all people, especially believers; Phil 4:22: all believers, especially those of Caesar’s household; Titus 1:10: many rebellious people, especially those of circumcision group; 2 Pet 2:10: the unrighteous, especially the immoral and those who despise authority).

On the positive side, Marshall rightly renders *rhiza* in 1 Tim 6:10 as “the” rather than “a” root of all evil (contra Mounce and the majority of interpreters). He appropriately points out that the absence of an article before “root” does not necessarily mean that the term is indefinite. Moreover, Marshall is correct in contending that calling the love of money “the root of all evil” is probably hyperbolic and need not be taken to mean that money literally is the sole root cause of evil. This is further suggested by similar sayings in Greek literature that are likewise worded in absolute terms (e.g. “Money is *the* mother-city of all evil”).

Not infrequently Marshall’s commentary displays original thought, such as when he suggests that 2 Tim 3:7 may refer to “people receiving an endless series of lessons, perhaps for a fee?” (p. 777) or when he conjectures that Demas may have left Paul because “he balked at martyrdom” (citing Pol. 9:2) but that he may have “continued actively as Christian, even as a missionary,” in Thessalonica (pp. 815–16; cf. 2 Tim 4:10). This quality is comparatively rare in a day when much material is merely recycled or repackaged. Another valuable feature of this commentary is the presence of eleven thorough excursuses on major themes in the Pastorals, such as εὐσέβεια and συνείδησις, the σὸφρων and πίστις word groups, the trustworthy sayings, and other topics.

Apart from the above-mentioned differences on the interpretation of 1 Tim 2:9–15 and other passages, I found myself frequently (sometimes to my surprise) in agreement with Marshall’s exegesis (especially on Titus). When compared with Mounce’s recent WBC commentary, Marshall clearly emerges as the more seasoned interpreter whose judgments are generally judicious and well-informed. While in overall flavor more critical than its North-American counterpart—especially in its rejection of Pauline authorship—and problematic in its culturally conditioned reading of passages such as 1 Tim 2:9–15 owing to Marshall’s egalitarian commitment, the present work constitutes a valuable contribution to scholarship on the Pastorals and a worthy addition to the ICC series.

Andreas J. Köstenberger
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Wake Forest, NC

1–2 Peter, Jude. By Erland Waltner and J. Daryl Charles. Believers Church Bible Commentary. Scottdale: Herald, 1999, 352 pp., \$19.99.

In the “believers-church” tradition (Anabaptism and its descendants), Erland Waltner (1 Peter) and J. Daryl Charles (2 Peter, Jude) have co-authored a commentary on books that feature concerns of that tradition: peacemaking and discipleship. Their work is a unique blend of exegesis with a history of the interpretation of specific Biblical documents within a particular confessional heritage.

Discussion of the Biblical text includes explanatory comments and a consideration of “the text in the life of the church.” The reader will find the outlines and bibliographies helpful. Greek words are transliterated, and discussion of textual and lexical problems is kept at a minimum. The audience is the serious lay Bible-study group.

Both authors argue for the authenticity and integrity of the letters. The dates for the epistles are early (1 Peter: ca. 62–64; 2 Peter: before the apostle's death; Jude: 60s or 70s). Peter wrote both letters from Rome to churches that suffered slander or other opposition for their faith. The recipients are "aliens and strangers" in an exclusively metaphorical sense (pp. 20, 84; vs. Elliott, *A Home for the Homeless*). Quite possibly, 2 Peter and Jude draw from a third document.

Valuable contributions to the study of 1–2 Peter and Jude are numerous. Waltner stresses the suffering-vindication pattern of Christ's experience as paradigmatic for the audience of 1 Peter: "even as the suffering Jesus was vindicated, so the suffering believers will be vindicated. . . . Such an understanding of Jesus' vindication gives profound meaning to the experiences of suffering believers as followers of Jesus Christ" (p. 128, on 3:18–22; cf. Sharon Clark Pearson, *The Christological and Rhetorical Properties of 1 Peter*). The need for the sufferers' hope in future vindication determines one's interpretation of Peter's cryptic reference (3:19) to the dominical proclamation to the imprisoned spirits. Christ announces his triumph, not an offer of salvation. The essay "A Theology of Suffering" may be the best part of the entire book; it is an excellent study of the central concern of 1 Peter, and of the nonretaliatory way of the cross as a measure of discipleship.

Charles bemoans the lack of attention given to 2 Peter and Jude. They are the "Rodney Dangerfield" of the NT (pp. 204–5) because they receive so little respect! They deserve recognition, however, as important statements on Christian ethics. 2 Peter is "less a tract to affirm doctrinal orthodoxy than a passionate exhortation toward virtuous living" (p. 208; Jude also, p. 274). Christian discipleship, Charles affirms, exhibits a proper stance toward authority and a "bridled sexuality" (p. 230).

Some weaknesses appear, however. Poor binding on my copy and lack of Scriptural text in the commentary made the volume unhandy. "The text in the life of the church" is uneven in quality. Sometimes Anabaptist perspectives are featured, sometimes omitted, or (if included), seem only indirectly related to the exegesis. The question of cultural relativity in regard to 1 Pet 3:1–6 remains unanswered for me. How does a wife's submission look now? Attention to issues of honor and shame in Mediterranean culture would inform the discussion on this point. Charles eschews any mention of the problematic phrase in Jude 7: "and went after strange flesh" (NAS). In a discussion so devoted to ethics in Jude, his omission is puzzling.

Still, Waltner and Charles have admirably furnished a commentary that should prove useful to any Christian who wants to learn about Christian discipleship and peacemaking.

Barth L. Campbell
Simpson College, Redding, CA

Why Study Theology? By Donald G. Luck. St. Louis: Chalice, 1999, 147 pages, \$14.99 paper.

Donald Luck writes conversationally, yet learnedly, especially for those who as university students or members of mainline denominational churches are new to, or hesitant concerning, Christian theology as an area of study. His first three chapters identify and respond to various objections to formal theology that he has encountered, objections such as "God calls for faith, not doubt" and "theology is too abstract." Luck then delineates the importance of theology to the believer and the community, the goals of theology, and the constructive work of theology as accomplished through careful thinking that examines ideas and constructs theories.

Standing in the tradition of neo-orthodox presuppositions and method (while granting the value of natural theology), Luck defines theology as “the scholarly discipline by which the church attempts to understand its own faith,” particularly “how the primitive Christian community viewed Jesus and what that should mean in the present contexts of culture and history” (p. 50). The Bible “remains a central resource for the Christian community, and it has a fundamental authority” (p. 7), yet “the term *Word of God* refers primarily to an *event*. The Word is not fundamentally the Bible. Rather, it is God’s self-communication that happens when human words become vehicles for God’s outreach into the world” (p. 60).

An interesting epistemological tension runs through the text. Luck affirms the objectivity of “the truth that in the final analysis is grounded in God alone” (p. 24), yet he emphasizes the fluidity and tentativeness of all our theological conclusions (pp. 36–37, 44, 138) and posits that no human being “can ever say that she or he possesses the truth” (p. 23) and that “Christian theology cannot even dream of creating a comprehensive system” of understanding (p. 83). He correctly notes that better theology “demonstrates awareness of its operating presuppositions and presents arguments for them” and that we “do not have to settle for endless numbers of subjective opinions that coexist alongside of each other with no basis for conversation, mutual criticism, or cross-fertilization” (p. 136). He concludes, however, that “some theological affirmations are better than others, but they are only *relatively* better, not absolutely so” (p. 137; italics his).

One asks, if these affirmations are *only* relatively better, how does one know they are even relatively better? It is true that absolutely, comprehensive knowledge of all truth (omniscience) belongs to God alone, yet we humans possess as an aspect of his image the capacities for limited yet objective knowledge and for abstract reasoning, by which we are able to know truth and to formulate worldviews that are comprehensive in scope. This tension is one aspect of the dilemma that is created in the neo-orthodox attempt to maintain the content of a Biblical worldview on the philosophical basis of an inferior alternative. As Jack Cottrell has observed, a truly Biblical theology is Biblical in its presuppositions and method as well as in its content.

Why Study Theology? is most likely to be useful as a resource to *JETS* readers who are seeking to lead a non-conservative church toward a greater confidence in the value of careful theological reflection and toward a fuller integration of Biblical faith and contemporary life.

Kelvin Jones
Kentucky Christian College, Grayson, KY

Evangelical Truth. By John R. Stott. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1999, 131 pp., \$9.99 paper.

John R. Stott is one of the renowned statesmen in the global evangelical community who in more recent days has caused a stir with his agnostic approach toward eternal punishment. In *Evangelical Truth*, he gives his definition for the term “evangelical” in a beleaguered attempt to settle the issue once and for all. He gives two goals for his work. First, he desires evangelicals to stop fragmenting over minor issues. These include baptism, the Lord’s Supper, church government, worship, *charismata*, women in ministry, ecumenism, OT prophecy, sanctification, church and state, missions versus evangelism, and eschatology. He desires Christians to emphasize their similarities and not their differences. Second, he desires to leave a spiritual legacy for

his concept of evangelicalism. From my perspective, I believe Stott accomplishes this second goal but misses on the first.

Stott defines evangelicalism by the criteria of the Trinity: (1) the revealing initiative of God the Father; (2) the redeeming work of God the Son; and (3) the transforming ministry of God the Holy Spirit. The difficulty of arriving at the precise meaning of "evangelical" arises when he expounds each of the three criteria just mentioned. In regard to the first criterion, Stott maintains that an evangelical must hold to the revelation of God's Word. While that is commendable, he still leaves a great deal of ground open for discussion. He leaves the exact definition of concepts such as inerrancy, sufficiency, and authority open to an individual's actions as opposed to his or her understanding. For example, a person could define inerrancy from a neo-orthodox perspective or a strict verbal plenary approach and still be considered evangelical. Stott states, "The hallmark of authentic evangelicalism is not subscription but submission. That is, it is not whether we subscribe to an impeccable formula about the Bible but whether we live in practical submission to what the Bible teaches, including an advanced resolve to submit to whatever it may later be shown to teach" (p. 61). Thus, according to Stott an evangelical would include anyone who holds any of a broad range of views on inerrancy, sufficiency, and so forth as long as the person has a humble attitude toward the Word. Thus, Stott tends to leave definitions broad and open as opposed to concise and specific.

This is also seen in regard to his third criterion—the transforming ministry of God the Holy Spirit. He writes, "I believe all evangelical Christians agree and affirm that the indwelling presence of the Holy Spirit is the chief distinguishing mark of the people of God today . . ." (p. 93). He then pleads for charismatics and non-charismatics to agree that (1) all Christians have the Spirit; (2) the Spirit is received at salvation; (3) sanctification is a process; and (4) during sanctification many richer, deeper, and fuller experiences may be granted. Thus, as long as a person agrees that the Holy Spirit is part of the Trinity and actively enters into a believer's life, that person would fit Stott's definition of an evangelical.

Interestingly, while being very general in regard to the Word of God and the Spirit of God, Stott makes precise and explicit statements concerning sin and justification while discussing his second criterion—the redeeming work of the Son of God. He firmly attests that sin is the curse of all mankind and that justification is totally and completely apart from works. This seems to be his only unbendable concept when defining evangelicalism.

With that in mind, it appears that Stott would say an evangelical is a person who holds to (1) the revelation of God's Word (however that is understood and applied); (2) salvation as entirely a work of God for man; and (3) the indwelling of the Spirit in the believer (with whatever nuances that may entail for the individual). Throughout the work, Stott pleads for unity and seeking common ground while urging all to avoid extremes. While unity is a current catchword in evangelical circles, I do not believe that it will happen unless there is a commitment to a core element of truth. This book is designed to give what Stott believes is that core. However, unity will not be reached apart from a broad-reaching individual and corporate commitment to that core. I am not convinced that Stott's core is one that most people would be willing to endorse as the definitive absolute of evangelicalism. Some very pertinent and pragmatic issues would be left hanging as secondary or, in Stott's words, "matters indifferent." In my view, many of these issues do make significant theological differences.

I recommend the book for personal reading. The ideas of love, acceptance of others in the faith, and a need for unity are Biblical and as such commendable. Stott does cause one to think through some issues in relation to their importance and priority.

However, I believe that it only settles what John Stott sees as important in an evangelical. The book fails, because the necessity to define an evangelical forces one to be precise, while a need to include the broadest number possible forces a person to be general. The balance is difficult if not impossible to maintain.

Ronald L. Rushing
Grace University, Omaha, NE

Invitation to the Classics. Edited by Louise Cowan and Os Guinness. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998, 384 pp., \$34.99.

For many, the word “classic” serves as a warning, like the poison label plastered on a bottle. In our time, readers generally flee from the classics, being reminded only that they serve, or did in pre-postmodern days, as texts for education, dreary reading, and examinations. Indeed, if not construed as lethal, then the classics have come to be viewed as medicine that, while good for one, is distasteful or disappointing. The present age appears to have forgotten that the classics are, as the rubric implies, benchmarks of illustrious and lasting literature, enduring in the power of imagination, interest, and instruction. To remedy this situation of neglect and scorn comes the engrossing *Invitation to the Classics*, subtitled, perhaps ironically, “A Guide to Books You’ve Always Wanted to Read.”

While this work is ostensibly about classic works in Western literature, including fiction, philosophy, and politics, it actually breaks into two parts. Prior to the main body—the essays on various classic texts—three introductory pieces commence the volume. These extended essays are sapient in their pithy explanation of which elements determine the designation of “classic,” concentrating on the custodial nature of protecting the classics and their worth. Editor Cowan lists a “constant set of [seven] characteristics” that magnifies what a classic is. Then, Roger Lundin reminds us that while the classics are important to our civilization, they are not the canon, the revealed Word of the Lord.

But the mass and delight of *Invitation to the Classics* are the essays on particular writers and their works. From Homer and comments on *The Iliad* and *The Odyssey* to Solzhenitsyn and *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich*, readers are ushered, in fleeting but tantalizing glimpses only, into the classics. The formula is straightforward and repeated: (1) scant background; (2) a projection of a work’s—or author’s—seminal concept and thesis, including how the masterpiece relates to and reflects upon standard, hallmark concerns such as love, honor, conflict, and depravity of man, etc.; and (3) sets of deliberate questions—captioned “Issues to Explore”—that are designed not as mere queries but counsels. All facets of this method are steeped in Christian thought and worldview. Photographs and highlighted quotations grace each entry, and a box titled “For Further Study,” containing bibliographic information and recommendations, concludes the article.

Overall, *Invitation to the Classics* is a commendable effort. The writing is enthusiastic and accessible, avoiding the fussiness and deliberate erudition of similar reference materials. For evangelicals, the inclusion of Christian concerns and comments is welcome and refreshing, given the manner in which “dead, white Europeans” are disdained today, and the corpus of Western literature is almost as suspect as the canon of Scripture. Here, the spirited defense surges that the foundational writings of civilization speak for themselves, voicing the verities, endurance, conflicts, and quests of the West. Strength emanates from the source, not from critics, even benign ones.

As in any work, several flaws persist. Some of the “cluster” chapters (e.g. “Roman and Italian Classics”) appear obtrusive. Between Virgil and early Christian writers comes an extended essay that, rightly, considers Livy, Tacitus, and Cicero succinctly, but then glides to Boccaccio in the Middle Ages and to Pirandello and Calvino in modern times. Some of the “For Further Study” bibliographies omit key works. For example, why are Troyat’s monumental biography on Tolstoy and Jill Baumgaertner’s trenchant commentary, *Flannery O’Connor: A Proper Scaring*, absent? Who, or what, is disregarded proves downright glaring, if not simply problematic. Why is there no mention of Tolkien, Waugh, Trollope, Dreiser, Snow, Calhoun, Spenser, Burns, Scott, the Brontës, Tennessee Williams, Arthur Miller, Fitzgerald, Greene, Buck, Carroll, and R. L. Stevenson? Does Ruby Turpin actually merit mention at the expense of, say, Mrs. Proudie, Jay Gatsby, Blanche DuBois, Father Brown, Willy Loman, or Bilbo Baggins? Why is there not at least a cluster chapter on children’s literature? And why is there nothing on four acknowledged giants: Kipling, Orwell, Whitman, and Hardy?

Still, one comes away enticed, interested, and caught in the web of great writing on grand themes—the solid and steadfast, not chimerical. Perhaps the subtitle should read “A Guide to Books You’ve Always Wanted to Read or Re-read,” for *Invitation to the Classics* does inspire a reader to encounter, or become reacquainted with, the great books and understand what constitutes exceptional writing. For a beginner—and a beginning effort—*Invitation to the Classics* serves well as a summons and partial reward.

Terrence Neal Brown
Mid-America Baptist Theological Seminary
Germantown, TN

God: Who He Is, What He Does, How To Know Him Better. By J. Carl Laney. Nashville: Word, 1999, 300 pp., \$19.95.

A truism in theology is that one’s doctrine of God directs the rest of one’s theology. Although J. Carl Laney never states this explicitly, I suspect he agrees and would add that we each need to develop a personal, intimate relationship with the one true God of the Scriptures. It is to these ends that he wrote this work.

The prose style that Laney uses is pious and didactic. It has a quality that suggests you are listening to a well-thought-through sermon. His illustrations are often personal and his use of them prompts one to desire true intimacy with our great and good (the terms he uses to distinguish God’s attributes) God.

There are a number of real strengths in this work. First, there is a real devotional quality to this book. The reading of it prompts one to knowledge and love of God. Second, the chapters are generally short but rich with information and generally cover the key elements of the issue being discussed (he is not exhaustive in his discussion of the issues but does refer one to other works that address the issues more completely). The third, and I think Laney’s greatest strength, is in his use of the original languages of Scripture. He shows the richness of the language but writes in a way that is accessible to a layperson. Laney is not overly technical and does not dedicate extensive time to the original languages. Still, he uses the word studies effectively and shows how the reader can apply them to daily life (his references are often very insightful). This, I believe, is a good model for pastoral use of language in the pulpit.

Fourth, Laney does not enter into polemical battles but stands with the Calvinistic and premillennial thinker when the issues arise. These debates are not the agenda, and he does not dwell on them but offers a strong foundation and case for why he main-

tains these positions and supplies good reasons for why he thinks they are Biblical. Still, he is able to avoid falling into debate for the sole purpose of argument as this is not the intention of the book.

A fifth strength of the book is that it covers more than just the classic theological categories of God's names and attributes, decrees, nature, and responses to problems (i.e. evil). He adds sections on friendship with God, loving God, knowing God's will for one's life, and communication with God. Again, Laney's focus is not merely to show the reader who God is but also how to have a relationship with him. These untypical chapters help to accomplish this goal.

Despite its many strengths, there are some weaknesses in the book. The subject of God necessitates a familiarity with philosophical discussions of the concept of God, and although he addresses the necessary issues, Laney is clearly not comfortable in this area. At times he fails to draw connections that are important (e.g. the relationship between pantheism and process theology is neglected), and he tends to oversimplify some philosophical schools (e.g. his claim in the section on polytheism that all gods are a part of Brahman, and the statement in the pantheism section that the world changes so God must change, are examples of somewhat oversimplified representations of these positions). Still, his discussion of philosophical issues is almost adequate.

Laney, in an attempt to avoid being weighed down in theological complexity, occasionally fails to be as thorough as the issue demands. An example of this is his discussion of the trinity of God (the term he prefers). In this chapter he needs to develop a concept of essence or being. This would have helped him further develop his case for the relationship between the members of the Godhead.

Despite these criticisms, the book more than accomplishes the task that the title and series state, which is to offer a readable theology that challenges one to a deeper relationship with our Lord. I think it would be most effective when used as a lay study guide or as an upper level college text or perhaps as a fine example of theological teaching for a homiletics class in a seminary. One recommendation I would suggest for future editions is the addition of questions for discussion at the end of each chapter. The chapters tend to promote further thought, and challenging questions would help a study group focus on what is important.

Thom A. Schultz
St. Petersburg Theological Seminary, St. Petersburg, FL

Good News and Good Works: A Theology for the Whole Gospel. By Ronald J. Sider. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1993, 253 pp., \$12.99 paper.

Most evangelism books published today deal exclusively with methodology, all but ignoring Biblical or theological matters. Such books sell well in the consumer-driven church in America, but hardly satisfy the deep needs facing evangelicals at the beginning of the third millennium. Ron Sider's *Good News and Good Works* is an exception in this case. Known for his passionate plea for evangelicals to give attention to temporal needs of people along with the eternal message of the gospel, Sider seeks to distance himself from the errors of Rauschenbusch and the social gospel movement. Nevertheless, he seeks to find the proper relationship of social ministry and spiritual ministry. He aims to provide "a full blown biblical theology that affirms both personal and social sin, both personal conversion and structural change, both evangelism and social action, both personal and social salvation, both Jesus as moral example and Jesus as vicarious substitute, both orthodox theology and ethical obedience" (p. 10).

After critiquing four paradigms he calls the individualistic evangelical, radical Anabaptist, dominant ecumenical, and secular Christian, Sider offers a fifth approach to understanding evangelism and social action: incarnational kingdom Christianity. Sider proffers a legitimate indictment among many evangelicals who are content to live in suburbia with no concern for the inner city, or with no concern for the deeper needs of people: "Jesus' kingdom is clearly wholistic. Thank God that it *does* bring forgiveness with God and personal, inner sanctification in the power of the Spirit. It also challenges and changes the social order" (p. 75). He rightly notes that an over-emphasis on the forensic nature of justification can cause an apathetic attitude toward the daily life of the Christian.

This book is a theology of evangelism and social action. Sider offers his understanding of the relationship between evangelism and social action: "The proper way to distinguish evangelism and social action is in terms of intention. Evangelism is that set of activities whose primary intention is inviting non-Christians to embrace the gospel of the kingdom, to believe in Jesus Christ as personal Savior and Lord, and join His new redeemed community. Social action is that set of activities whose primary goal is improving the physical, socioeconomic, and political well-being of people through relief, development, and structural change" (p. 163). Sider wisely calls the church to look back towards those in the past who did combine evangelism and social action. For example, Charles Finney not only preached the gospel, but he insisted that the converts to Christianity forsake the sin of slavery. Sider argues that the combination of evangelism and social action would move from typical evangelism city-wide crusades to what he calls shalom revivals. He notes rightly that if the Christian movement were to emphasize justice and social change along with evangelism, it would buttress an apologetic for those who have been intellectually and otherwise turned off by the hypocrisy seen in the church in America.

I resound greatly with Sider's plea that we come back to the wholistic community that not only talks about personal individual salvation but also affects the whole life of the individual, the life of the church, and therefore the life of society. The one nagging question that Sider fails to deal with is that, historically, movements and traditions always seem to abandon evangelism for social ministry. From the World Council of Churches to the Salvation Army and the YMCA, including multitudes of individual churches and ministries, those movements focused on social change as well as evangelism always tend to move away from evangelism. This provides the continual and nagging problem for evangelicals. How do we raise the bar for social justice without losing a passion for the gospel? Despite the failure to answer this question, Sider's work stands as a powerful and helpful call to social action from the perspective of an evangelical committed to the Word of God.

Alvin Reid
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Wake Forest, NC

The Spirit Helps Us Pray. By Robert L. Brandt and Zenas J. Bicket. Springfield: Gospel Publishing House, 1993, 459 pp., \$26.99.

Subtitled "A Biblical Theology of Prayer," this volume is a significant addition to the substantial number of books available on the subject of Christian prayer. Robert Brandt, long-time district superintendent and executive presbyter of the Assemblies of God, and Zenas Bicket, long-time Assemblies of God educator and writer, are authentic spokesmen of mainstream Pentecostal teaching. The worth of this book lies principally in its overt Pentecostal perspective, disclosing to the reader the values that Pentecostal understanding and experience bring to the topic of prayer. For example, in the

chapter on the history of revival movements, the conclusion focuses attention on the events surrounding the outbreak of the modern Pentecostal revival at the beginning of the twentieth century. Although non-Pentecostals may disagree with some of the insights in the book, the book offers a fair representation of beliefs cherished by Pentecostals and its tone is certainly non-polemical.

The Pentecostal practice of "praying in the Spirit" is described in the practical application section of the book. Brandt and Bicket make a persuasive case for this Biblical expression being identified with praying in tongues (*glossolalia*) reported by Paul in such passages as 1 Cor 14:14–15.

The commentary on the teaching of the apostle James on prayer includes reflections on prayer for the sick (James 5). It is clear that the authors write from a traditional Pentecostal perspective in the detailed explanation of James's recommended procedure for ministering to the sick person from the local body of believers. Important to note is that the authors cautiously address the topic of prayer for the sick. No attempt is made to claim that everyone for whom prayer is made will necessarily be healed. This section emphasizes that the instruments God may use are, after all, mere human beings. Thus any blessings that God provides through the earnest prayers of ordinary people point solely to his great grace.

Pentecostal teaching on baptism in the Holy Spirit, understood to be an experience subsequent to the new birth and routinely accompanied by speaking in other tongues, is a favorite theme among Pentecostals. It is surprising that so little attention is given to this topic in the entire book. As one would expect, the commentary on prayer in the Jerusalem church supplies the Pentecostal understanding of the Pentecost event (Acts 2).

Apart from a few conspicuous passages that disclose the authors' Pentecostal point of view, the rest of the book lines up squarely with mainstream evangelical, orthodox teaching. This becomes apparent, for example, in the treatment accorded the role of angels in the ministry of prayer. Great care is evident in ensuring that no more is made of angelic visitations than can be supported by Biblical examples. The role of God's ministering spirits is couched within the framework of standard evangelical theology. Cautions are provided to make clear that believers are not to seek angelic appearances and to know that authentic angelic manifestations are rare. Although a Biblical case from both the OT and the NT is readily made for a genuine ministry of angels, it is to the credit of the authors that a degree of reserve is evident in treating such topics.

The non-Pentecostal reader will likely be impressed with the balance the authors exhibit in addressing a whole range of controversial topics. After all, the entire field of Christian prayer is laden with sensitive issues, since prayer by its nature is experiential and deeply personal. Both Brandt and Bicket have lived out lives and ministries that authentically reflect the maturity of judgment that the book transparently reflects.

Several features of the book, apart from its Pentecostal orientation, are worthy of special note. The structure of the book is surprisingly comprehensive. The detailed outline given to the reader makes it easy to follow the flow of thought. Six chapters in part one—prayer in the OT—offer reflections on the significant junctures describing prayer in the lives of the patriarchs, the prophets, and other key persons of the OT. Part two—prayer in the NT—dedicates seven chapters to such topics as prayer in the life and teaching of Jesus, prayer in the apostolic church, and key concepts taught on prayer in the various NT writings.

The third part of the book, containing four chapters, moves from Biblical commentary to observations about prayer in the life of the Church. This section is an attempt to make practical applications for the benefit of the contemporary reader. One chapter in this section is devoted to the subject of angels. As noted above, the authors display a degree of caution, clearly to avoid the danger of encouraging the sensational.

A chapter is devoted to the topic of revival. The study sketches revival episodes in the OT and NT as well as some of the obvious revival episodes, especially giving focus to revivals in the Western church. The chapter on the disciplines of prayer is a valuable gathering of principles for the successful management of private prayer, family prayer, and the prayer life of the Church.

Chapter 17 stands by itself, being written not by the authors themselves but by Dr. Stanley Horton, professor emeritus of the Assemblies of God Theological Seminary, Springfield, Missouri. Titled "Problems Considered," Horton treats briefly such topics as the problem of sin, the problem of human reasoning, the problem of God's character, and the problem of the laws of nature. Employing copious Scriptural references, Horton makes a persuasive case for the propriety of prayer as the instrument a sovereign God has chosen to effect changes in a universe marred by sin.

The reader is served well by a subject index, a Scripture reference index, a substantial bibliography, and four appendices. These appendices offer the reader testimonies and reports of remarkable answers to prayer, experiences with demonic exorcism, and angelic appearances. Each chapter concludes with a list of study questions. This feature lends the book to classroom use at the Bible college level. This, of course, is to be expected, since it is in the Logion series of GPH publications, which are intended to be textbook materials.

Brandt and Bicket have provided a useful service for pastors, serious lay readers, and earnest students. Although the book is crisply written and is packed with information, it has a winsome devotional tone. And, although it reflects a Pentecostal disposition, there is surprisingly little in the book with which non-Pentecostal evangelicals would likely disagree.

William W. Menzies

Asia Pacific Theological Seminary, Baguio City, Philippines

Baptism. By David P. Scaer. Confessional Lutheran Dogmatics 11. Edited by John R. Stephenson. St. Louis: The Luther Academy, 1999, xiii + 222 pp., n.p.

Based on the Lutheran confessions, David P. Scaer's theological work on baptism is volume 11 of a new series in confessional Lutheran dogmatics. A work conceived as one that will fill the need for a contemporary Lutheran theology, this series was not intended to supplant Francis Pieper's *Christian Dogmatics* but instead to supplement it. Professor Scaer himself has been a noted scholar in Lutheran circles for three decades; having written his dissertation on the subject of baptism, it was fitting that he was chosen for this particular title.

The editor notes that the authors of the volumes bind themselves to the *Book of Concord*, and Scaer does not disappoint the reader. Insisting on the ontological ground of baptism, the author affirms its divine objectivity. Scaer writes, ". . . Baptism and not faith provided the certainty of salvation" (p. 2), and also that should a church "[give] the impression that Baptism is an act of the congregation and not solely of Christ, [it] destroys the concept that the church is a heavenly reality and that Baptism bestows the heavenly blessing" (p. 66). Moreover, his stress on the trinitarian formula leads him to write that rebaptism ". . . can only be considered blasphemy, because it shows contempt for the divine name of the three persons of the Trinity and their works in the world through Baptism" (p. 83).

Another surprise for those of a "memorial-only" viewpoint is a chapter on "Biblical Support for Infant Baptism" in which the author states that ". . . the Baptist position on faith as moral decision is nothing less than Pelagian, and excusing children from divine judgment is modified universalism!" (p. 137). His point that infant faith is not

a divergence from Scripture but a norm for adult faith may give all Christians, however, pause for thought (p. 154).

Scaer also discusses the efficacy of baptism. Those symbolists who hold to the subjective and existentialist pole of a baptismal theology will surely disagree, but still will find the ontological and objective sacramentalist view well presented here. Linking baptism with regeneration rather than with a profession of faith, the author confesses the Lutheran belief that neither faith nor cognition is the essence of baptism. The rite is seen as Christological, and the non-Lutheran reader may be surprised that Scaer has designated the sacrament as *epiklesis*. Inevitably, perhaps, he offers the interpretation of John 3:5 and Titus 3:5 as related to baptism, though he has concluded this after an exegesis of the texts rather than through a deductive intentionality toward the baptism phenomenon. Obviously, many a symbolist may interpret these verses differently.

As a Missouri Synod Lutheran, I thought that the work proclaimed the confessional Lutheran view very well, although some may be disappointed that the seventeenth-century Lutheran orthodox theologians (e.g. Calov, Gerhard) are scarcely represented. Scaer, however, has done a commendable job updating the work of the confessions by engaging in dialogue with the theology of Karl Barth. Also, his excursus on ministry treats the contemporary question of the ordination of women and whether baptism is a Scriptural foundation for their ministry. Additionally, many may wish to see the old Lutheran-Reformed or Lutheran-Roman Catholic debates on the sacrament relegated to the backwater of past Christian dialogue. Still, Scaer notes throughout that these churches are important theological factors in the Christian world, particularly in North America, and cannot be ignored.

Some minor criticism is necessary, however. Professor Scaer employs Pieper's argument concerning the baptism of tables (couches?) as that which discredits the Baptist lexical understanding of *baptizō* as always signifying "immersion." Regarding Mark 7:3–4, Pieper had commented that the Jewish people surely did not carry tables or couches to pools for immersion! But the *Mishnah Miqvaot* 7:7 states exactly this: the couch (מטה) was clean if when dipped in the water its legs (רגליה) sank in the mud. One may grant that the *Mishnah* is late, but there is also the problem that the inclusion of the Greek term itself (κλίβη) is somewhat questionable; both the UBS and Majority Text editions have set the terms in brackets. Further, the author questions the availability of enough water in Jerusalem whereby several thousand people could be immersed (Acts 2:41). But certainly the discovery of forty-eight first-century *miqvaot* surrounding the Temple site—constructed for those making religious pilgrimage to Jerusalem—puts baptism-by-immersion squarely within the realm of possibility (*Biblical Archaeology Review* 13 1 [1987] 52–59).

Nevertheless, these comments should not detract from what is an excellent up-to-date exposition of baptism from the Lutheran confessional perspective. With an ample bibliography (that features modern works) and four indices (Sacred Scripture, Lutheran Confessions, Name, and Subject), this edition should be a gem within the finished series.

Daniel R. Chadwick
Scottsville, NY

Our Destiny: Biblical Teachings on the Last Things. By Stanley M. Horton. Springfield: Logion, 1996, 304 pp., \$19.95.

The recent "re-discovery" of eschatology has brought with it a number of books exploring various approaches to the discipline. Stanley Horton, Emeritus Professor

of Bible and Theology at Assemblies of God College, adds his latest contribution to the growing literature on the subject. Horton's book seeks a Biblical approach to topics like death and the intermediate state, resurrection and rapture, and matters relating to final judgment.

Horton's approach is dispensationalist, arguing for a futurist view of the book of Revelation along with a pretribulation rapture of the Church. On page 113, he writes, "During the Church Age the Holy Spirit is working through believers. . . . Thus, there is no reason why . . . John 16:7 could not refer to the true believers who will be taken out of the way, caught up in the Rapture."

In some ways, Horton's approach is predictable, if one is familiar with dispensationalist eschatology. At times, Horton cuts short other (opposing) arguments as he puts forth his own view, often by using words like "clearly" and "surely" instead of exploring opposing arguments to their fullest. For example, in the first section of his book ("Death and the Intermediate State") he cites Acts 7:56, 59 (the martyrdom of Stephen). Horton writes that when Stephen prayed, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit," "[c]learly, Stephen expected that upon his death his spirit would be immediately in heaven with Jesus" (p. 53). This passage becomes a key text for Horton in his argument that at death the spirit goes to be with the Lord and awaits the resurrection in a conscious state. While Horton gives attention and analysis to other views like soul sleep, he fails to adequately address them because of the "clear" expectation of Stephen in Acts 7. This short-circuiting of opposing arguments happens occasionally throughout the book.

Horton makes a distinction between wrath and tribulation in regard to the rapture of the Church. Like some dispensationalists of a more speculative nature, Horton suggests that entities like the European Common Market and the European Community "may bring temporary or apparent unity that could possibly prepare for the Antichrist" (p. 94). He adds, however, that the Antichrist's rule will be temporary. His dispensationalist approach is revealed in other ways. For example, in his discussion of the "Time of the Rapture" (chap. 4), Horton states that J. N. Darby's pretribulation approach was not a totally new concept, "but rather a return to the imminence that was taught in the Early Church and to a literal interpretation of Biblical prophecy" (p. 122).

Throughout his discussions on key tribulation issues, his work is more like an apologetic treatise than a survey of the doctrinal issues. One again becomes especially aware of his uses of words like "recognize" (e.g. "Pretribulationists *recognize* that the apostle Paul still had the Rapture in mind when he said, 'God did not appoint us to suffer wrath but to receive salvation through our Lord Jesus Christ,'" p. 128) and "clearly" (see above example regarding Stephen) in his sometimes heavy-handed apologetic for his view. This approach at times does disservice to the extensive bibliography of his book by not always presenting some important areas of disagreement from opponents of his view.

In every section, Horton cites relevant Biblical data as well as opposing theological perspectives. However, he is a bit too quick to solve the issue for the reader in favor of his (Horton's) own position on the matter being discussed.

Horton posits several judgments in his view of the millennium and beyond. The two that take center stage are those of the judgment seat of Christ and the Great White Throne judgment, which he separates.

Horton's book concludes with detailed accounts of the final destinies of the wicked (chap. 8) and the righteous (chap. 9). Horton surveys important Scriptural passages regarding hell, along with competing views regarding the destiny of the unrighteous, from universalism to annihilationism, giving a brief treatment of each. He concludes

hell to be a place of eternal, conscious punishment. In regard to heaven, Horton argues for a new or replacement earth, since the existing earth will be destroyed. Interestingly, he takes the dimensions of the New Jerusalem spelled out in Rev 21:16 literally: 1,380 miles to each side. He does note that the cubic shape described in Revelation 21 compares in symbolism to the Most Holy Place of the inner sanctuary of the Temple, an observation many scholars of various eschatological views would acknowledge. Eternity, for Horton, will not be a timeless one, but rather an "unending, infinite time" (p. 256). Heaven, then, will be a place of joy and delight in the presence and service of God.

If one is looking for an introduction to and apologetic for a classical dispensationalist approach to eschatology that is not as speculative as the popular dispensationalist approaches currently on the shelves, one could do worse than Stanley Horton. While this book does not always thoroughly survey the well-rounded bibliography that is cited, a beginning student would benefit from the books and articles recommended and cited by Horton in this work. Finally, Horton includes an excellent glossary of terms in the back of his book that would be well worth the time of interested students and pastors.

Charles W. Christian
Canby Chapel Church of the Nazarene, Canby, OR

Remembered Voices. Reclaiming the Legacy of "Neo-Orthodoxy." By Douglas John Hall. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1998, x + 166 pp., \$19.95 paper.

According to Douglas Hall, the greatest theologians of the twentieth century are the representatives of "neo-orthodoxy." Even though the term itself needs explanation, it cannot be ignored as a movement that was on the cutting edge of Christian theology in the first half of our century. Why then should we be reminded of it now? Hall claims that Karl Barth, Paul Tillich, Reinhold Niebuhr, Dietrich Bonhoeffer, Emil Brunner, H. Richard Niebuhr and Suzanne de Dietrich represent a movement that is "one of the richest most encyclopedic outpourings of Christian theological work in the entire history of this faith" (p. 5). Hall's goal is to remember their voices by choosing one major point of concentration from each theologian in order to help us understand their emphases that need to be heard in our present world.

To attempt to summarize seven theologians in one book seems to be an impossible task. Hall succeeds, however, in giving us his opinion on the main idea from each representative of neo-orthodoxy. His choices are colored by what he considers to be the most important ideas for our theological orientation, which he explains in seven chapters.

Karl Barth: Christian theology after Christendom. Barth still speaks to our post-Christendom situation because he sees the disappearance of Christian domination. Yet he does not lose hope in the Biblical, transcultural foundations of the Christian faith. His challenge to us is to disengage ourselves from our host society in order to impact it in the future.

Paul Tillich: Systematic theology—faith's quest for wholeness. Tillich challenges us to continue in the theological pursuit of the unity of truth. Theology must be orderly and reasonable, but it must not become oppressive by being imposed on believers by ecclesiastical forces. Three correctives—historical-contextual, existential, and spiritual—should be employed in systematization. Only then can we hope for holistic, integrated, and systematic thinking.

Reinhold Niebuhr: An American theology of the tragic—and beyond. Niebuhr ponders the falseness of the “success story” of the American culture, but he also points to faith in God that keeps from embracing pure tragedy by moving beyond it. There is hope in tragedy.

Dietrich Bonhoeffer: Discipleship as world commitment. Bonhoeffer has a keen insight into the relationship of theology to ethics. Theology that does not express itself in practice is not theology in the Biblical sense. Conversely, ethics that is not well established in theology will not be distinguishable from the society that it needs to impact. Our behavior must be guided by the reality of God as he reveals himself in Jesus Christ.

Emil Brunner: Truth as meeting. Brunner accentuates the relational character of Christian thought and life. He would ask us to form and articulate all doctrine under the rubric of the Emmanuel principle, which is the reality of meeting God and discovering truth. This is the only way in which to avoid the double danger of objectivism and subjectivization of religious belief.

H. Richard Niebuhr: Christ and (post-Christian) culture. Niebuhr describes the relation of our faith to our cultural contexts. This is helpful especially in the post-Christian culture in which we live. He affirms the five virtues of Christ—love, hope, obedience, faith, and humility. Any one-sided concentration on any of these virtues will result in merely a partial understanding of the nature and identity of the Son of God.

Suzanne de Dietrich: The Word of God for the people of God. Suzanne de Dietrich’s accomplishment seems to be in recovering the *sola scriptura* principle of the Reformation. For her, “the Bible is the church’s foundational charter and guide . . . that is intended for the people, the whole *laos*, not only for scholars and professionals” (p. 109). I question the choice Hall made by including de Dietrich among the major theologians of neo-orthodoxy. Did he feel compelled to do so because of the feminist movement, or did he want to include de Dietrich because of his own admiration for her? He even admitted that her voice is remembered by few North Americans. I would add that this is true about Europeans as well.

Similar subjectivism can be felt throughout the book. Hall’s interests and convictions determined the areas where he repeatedly criticized fundamentalists and liberals, as if neo-orthodoxy produced the ideal theology. Should Hall look for other points of interest to benefit his readers in North America, where world wars, communism, and skepticism did not change history as it did in Europe? In fact, Hall recognizes that neo-orthodoxy failed in North America. I agree with Hall that we can learn from neo-orthodox theologians, especially through their struggles with secularism. Historical developments do not stand still. We might do well to understand those who were keenly aware of the secular culture and who proposed Biblical ways to counter it. For that reason, *Remembered Voices* can be a useful tool for exploring theological issues that we are facing.

Josef Solc

Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Wake Forest, NC

Pilgrim Pathways: Essays in Baptist History in Honour of B. R. White. Edited by William H. Brackney and Paul S. Fiddes with John H. Y. Briggs. Macon: Mercer, 1999, xii + 328 pp., \$45.00 cloth.

This engaging and diversified *Festschrift* commemorates the distinguished career of B. R. White, an English Baptist historian and churchman who served for many

years at Regent's Park College in Oxford, England. There in his successive roles as tutor, principal, and senior research fellow, White exercised significant influence on both ministerial students at Regent's and graduate students at the university. As a scholar, his explorations of non-conformist and Baptist history earned him a reputation for careful research and insightful writing. Indeed, White was elected a Fellow of the Royal Historical Society in 1973 and later served for twelve years as president of the Baptist Historical Society.

The editors of this collection have appropriately organized its major divisions around White's scholarly concerns. The first section investigates "Issues of Baptist Identity," beginning with A. P. F. Sell's chapter on Baptist views of polity, doctrine, and liberty. Sell, a non-Baptist contributor, effectively sets forth the theological diversity of English Baptists and the integral connection between doctrine and polity. At the same time, however, Sell attempts to cover too much ground, and his essay lacks overall coherence. In contrast, P. S. Fiddes completes this part of the book with a well-focused treatment of the role of covenant theology in Baptist life. The current principal at Regent's Park is at his best in explaining the varied nuances of the term "covenant" as used by Baptists throughout their history; unfortunately, his prescriptions for the role of covenants in contemporary Baptist life appear to minimize the importance of confessional integrity.

The volume's second division contains four essays that center primarily on Baptist ecclesiology. W. M. S. West launches this discussion with an intriguing account of the English Baptist struggle to articulate a theology of children, including the evolving concepts of infant dedication in their churches. Then, in one of the book's better pieces, S. Brachlow exposes the tension between social solidarity and factional strife that so frequently characterized the ecclesiastical life of the Baptists' English Separatist forebears. K. R. Manley follows with a delightful analysis of the profound impact that J. Rippon (1751–1836) had on Baptist hymnody both in England and America. Finally, K. Smith probes the interplay between personal devotion and covenant community in her study of eighteenth-century Calvinistic Baptists in Hampshire and Wiltshire, England.

The subjects of the third section, "History as Biography," may strike some readers as fairly obscure. G. F. Nuttall, one of White's tutors, offers a brief historical note on J. Norcott, a seventeenth-century English Baptist who wrote a defense of believers' baptism and may have been the same person ejected from an Anglican pulpit in 1662. In a more substantive chapter, R. Hayden examines the influences of evangelical Calvinist B. Foskett (1685–1758) on Baptist theology and education in western England and Wales. M. Reeves provides a useful supplement to Smith's earlier chapter with an introduction to and excerpts from the diaries of J. Attwater (1753–1843), a Baptist woman from Bodenham, England (near Hampshire). The biographical essays close with J. H. Y. Briggs's chronicle of F. Cox, a nineteenth-century English Baptist preacher, educator, and activist who played a key role in the founding of London University. Overall, these case studies present some interesting vignettes of English Baptist life and thought.

Whereas most of the contributors to the first three parts are British, the writers for the last section, "Crossing Boundaries," are all North Americans. Two seasoned Southern Baptist historians, W. M. Patterson and W. R. Estep, address respectively the relationship of Baptists to the English evangelical awakening of the eighteenth century and the valiant efforts of Baptists to champion the cause of religious liberty in both England and America. While neither of these essays represents groundbreaking scholarship, they nonetheless stand as helpful surveys. W. H. Brackney shifts the scene entirely to North America, as he highlights the unmistakable links between

Baptists in New England and Nova Scotia during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. A more transatlantic theme is sounded in the last chapter, as S. M. Gibson demonstrates how the common interests of America A. J. Gordon and Britisher H. G. Guinness in missions, education, and premillennial eschatology brought them into some cooperative ventures in the late nineteenth century. The volume ends with a bibliography of White's published works compiled by S. Copson.

Overall, this collection is a fitting tribute to one of the most prominent English Baptist historians of this era. As in any publication with multiple authors, the quality varies from essay to essay. The efforts of Fiddes West, Brachlow, Manley, and Brackney merit special commendation. Sadly, the editing in this book is consistently poor. In addition to numerous typographical errors, there are several misprinted dates (e.g. pp. 5, 270, and 276), a glaring run-on sentence (p. 23), and a very confusing statement about the relationship of the American Baptist Missionary Union and the Livingstone Inland Mission (p. 308). An expensive volume honoring a scholar of this caliber deserves far better editorial care.

James A. Patterson
Union University, Jackson, TN

A Reformation Reader. Edited by Denis R. Janz. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999, 386 pp., \$29.00 paper.

Appropriately continuing the *ad fontes* legacy of the sixteenth-century humanists and reformers, Denis Janz, a notable church historian, scholar, and professor at Loyola University, takes the reader to the sources of the sixteenth-century Reformation (English translation only) in this timely volume.

The book is divided into six lengthy chapters, covering the late Medieval background, Martin Luther, Ulrich Zwingli and the Radical Reformation, John Calvin, the Reformation in England, and the Counter/Catholic Reformation, respectively. Each chapter begins with a concise and insightful overview of the chapter topic. Similarly, every primary document selection throughout the book is briefly but helpfully introduced.

The readings begin over two centuries before Luther's break from Rome, continue through the turmoil of the early decades of the 1500s and finish with some insightful documents from the Council of Trent. Although primarily theological in nature, they include a wide swath of writings that adequately capture the diverse sentiments of this period.

Although it would be superfluous to list each of the ninety-seven primary documents included, an abbreviated list is warranted in order to get a sense of the topics covered. Readings (sometimes condensed) include Thomas a Kempis's *The Imitation of Christ*; Boniface VII's *Unam Sanctam*; Erasmus's *In Praise of Folly*; Luther's preface to the *Complete Edition of Luther's Latin Writings*, selections from *Table Talk*, the *Ninety-Five Theses*, and *The Freedom of a Christian*; the *Augsburg Confession*; Zwingli's *Sixty-Seven Theses* and *On True and False Religion*; *Reminiscences* of George Blaurock; the *Schleitheim Confession*; *The Trial and Martyrdom* of Michael Sattler; Menno Simons's *Meditation on the Twenty-Fifth Psalm*; Calvin's *Geneva Ordinances*, some documents concerning the Michael Servetus affair, and lengthy selections from the *Institutes*; *The Act of Supremacy* (by both Henry VIII and Elizabeth I); Thomas Cranmer's *Preface to the Great Bible*; *The Thirty-Nine Articles*; some important bulls issued by Leo X; various canons from the Council of Trent; several documents con-

cerning Ignatius Loyola and the Jesuits; and a very gripping *A Short Account of the Destruction of the Indies*.

One of the obvious strengths of this work is the wide variety of documents Janz has selected. He has included the majority of the most significant documents (such as the *Ninety-Five Theses*) and has also included some unexpected pieces that fittingly contribute to the overall picture (e.g. some private correspondence of Calvin).

Another strong point in Janz's collection is his deliberate inclusion of Anabaptist writings. Without necessarily making the distinctions common after George H. Williams's monumental work in the 1960s, Janz nonetheless includes some key documents from this diverse group. Although not the case in the past, inclusion of the Anabaptists is now standard for any serious study of the Reformation, and Janz appropriately complies.

While a compilation of primary documents from such a variegated time period is bound to be limited merely by space, it is disappointing to note some of Janz's omissions. Documentation from the Diet of Worms is absent; therefore, Martin Luther's oft-quoted statement of unbending commitment to the Word is lacking as well. Readings from the *Book of Common Prayer*, perhaps one of the more important contributions of the English Reformation, are omitted. Nothing from John Knox or the Reformation in Scotland is included. One would at least expect a selection from the *Scottish Confession* or the *First Book of Discipline*. Similarly, the single selected reading from Menno Simons's numerous works is disappointing, for certainly the leader who gave credence and solidarity to the Anabaptist movement deserves something more along the lines of his *Foundation of Christian Doctrine* at the very least. Additionally, little is mentioned of the women of the Reformation (with the obvious exception of Elizabeth I). Obscure as they may be, writings from the relatively prolific Marguerite de Navarre or the brave Lady Jane Grey would have made a fascinating and worthwhile contribution.

These omissions notwithstanding, this volume fills a significant void in Reformation studies. The only other introductory-level primary reader with such inclusiveness is Clyde Manschreck's out-of-print *A History of Christianity* (volume two in an excellent two-volume series). While following Manschreck's basic approach, Janz has succeeded in providing a wider sweep of documents focusing particularly upon the Reformation era.

In sum, *A Reformation Reader* conveniently places the majority of the key documents of the Reformation under one cover. It is an engaging resource that will adequately introduce any reader to the theology and chronology of the Reformation. Although the readings are (arguably appropriately) weighted toward Luther and Calvin, the readings are diverse and arranged in a fashion sure to be accessible to students from Protestant and Catholic backgrounds in universities and seminaries alike. This book is an invaluable resource and should find its way onto the bookshelves of church history scholars and students alike.

Linford D. Fisher
Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, South Hamilton, MA