

CONCORDIA
THEOLOGICAL
QUARTERLY

CTQ

Volume 51, Number 1

JANUARY 1987

Contemporary Christian Music: An Evaluation.....	Klemet Preus 1
Parables of Atonement and Assurance: Matthew 13:44-46.....	Jeffrey A. Gibbs 19
The Scriptural Principles of Fellowship.....	Timothy D. Knapp 45
Book Reviews.....	53
Indices to Volume 50 (1986)	
Author Index.....	69
Title Index.....	73
Scripture Index.....	75
Subject Index.....	77

Book Reviews

THE LORD'S SUPPER IN THE THEOLOGY OF MARTIN CHEMNITZ. By Bjarne W. Teigen. Brewster, Massachusetts: Trinity Lutheran Press. 1986. 226 pages. Paperback, \$16.95.

Martin Chemnitz (1522-1586) was unquestionably the ablest and most prolific theologian of the Lutheran church in the generation after Luther, although serving, not as a professor of theology, but as a very knowledgeable pastor and supervisor of the Brunswick territorial church. One of his earliest literary productions was a *Gutachten*, or theological opinion, in the Hardenberg case. Chemnitz showed convincingly how Albert Hardenberg of Bremen had deviated from the Augsburg Confession's Tenth Article on the Lord's Supper toward a Reformed view. Eventually Chemnitz expanded this opinion into a book, *De Coena Domini*, now available in English translation as *The Lord's Supper* (translated by J.A.O. Preus, Concordia Publishing House, 1979). Chemnitz's critical evaluation of Trent's teaching and decrees, his monumental *Examination of the Council of Trent* (translated by Fred Kramer, Concordia Publishing House), contains a lengthy section of more than 300 pages in Part II on the Sacrament of the Altar. Chemnitz's *Enchiridion*, translated into English by Luther Poellot (*Ministry, Word, and Sacrament*, Concordia Publishing House, 1981), also includes pertinent material on the Sacrament.

Bjarne Teigen's work is a scholarly attempt at delineating Chemnitz's thought on the Supper chiefly from the above sources, but including also references to the *Formula of Concord*, of which Chemnitz was a primary author, and to his dogmatics, *Loci Theologici*, published after his death. Teigen has due respect for the brilliant apology of the real presence which the "Second Martin" fashioned. In an absolutely invincible manner Chemnitz establishes the truth that in the Supper Christ gives us His true, real, substantial body and blood, in a manner transcending human capacity to explain, Christ's seal of forgiveness, His sacred pledge, His last will and testament which no man can or dare rescind or alter, as little as the will of a testator may be changed willy-nilly by his heirs. Teigen also shows how Chemnitz in Luther-like manner attests the close link that a proper understanding of the personal union of natures in Christ has with the article on the Lord's Supper, a point so indelibly etched by the *Formula of Concord* in Articles VII and VIII. A person's teaching on the Lord's Supper will ultimately be no sounder or truer to Scripture than his teaching on the person of Christ, and vice versa.

In view of Teigen's otherwise conscientious work it is, therefore, somewhat of a puzzle and a disappointment to find him driving one point home again and again with almost insular zeal, namely that "Chemnitz is not afraid to recognize that the consecration effects the Real Presence and that, because of this, a miraculous change has taken place." (p. 53) This intense focus repeats itself as the main theme of Teigen's argument, so much so that it unbalances and makes unreliable what is otherwise a scholarly piece of work. He is intent on proving that Baier-Walther, Schmid, Hoenecke, Pieper, and the seventeenth-century dogmaticians whom they followed,

Hunnius, Quenstedt, Gerhard, Hollaz, etc., were wrong in not saying that, when the minister repeats the *verba*, then the real presence is effected (184). Teigen in essence charges these theologians with deficiency. Yet they all trace the empowering efficacy of the Sacrament to the instituting word of Christ at the first Supper and link together the consecration, distribution, and reception to the God-intended and God-commanded use or action of the Supper, faithful thus to the *Formula of Concord*, which states that “the true and almighty words of Jesus Christ which He spake at the first institution were efficacious not only at the first Supper, but they endure, are valid, operate, and are still efficacious ... by virtue of the first institution” (FC VII: 75). Accordingly, from Luther forward theologians in the Lutheran church have pointed to Christ’s empowering command and promise at the first Supper, emphasizing that everything Christ commanded is to be done when this Sacrament is kept in His memory: reverent repetition of the words of consecration, setting apart the simple bread and wine for this special purpose, and also distribution of the elements for the communicants’ reception. Lutheran theologians have regularly refrained from trying to designate the “moment” of the real presence. They resist tying it merely to the act of the minister who repeats the words of institution, harking back rather to Christ’s own ordaining of this holy Supper. Therefore, not only the repetition of the words is of the essence but also the distribution and reception of the elements are constituting parts of the Savior’s gracious gift (cf. FC VII: 83,84). It is regrettable that Teigen feels called on to ride his hobby-horse on “consecrationism” to the point where he labels those who do not follow his “high” view of the miracle of consecration as Melanctonians, or even worse as holding to Reformed thinking with a “functional doctrine” on the Lord’s Supper (p. 178). One thing leads to the next as Teigen eventually also speaks a word for veneration of the elements that have been consecrated, as also for the need to consume *all* the elements (the *reliquiae*) consecrated at a given service (pp. 120, 139). In so speaking he has distanced himself, however conscientiously he speaks in behalf of a more pious practice in the Lutheran church, from virtually all responsible and loyal teachers from Luther onwards. In fact, what becomes most disturbing is Teigen’s mustering of Luther along with Chemnitz for defense of his reasoning. Having worked with both Martins for some years now, I must say that the conclusions drawn by Teigen do not accurately reflect what Luther and Chemnitz taught concerning the Supper. We can be sure of Christ’s body and blood in the Sacrament because “Christ has established the validity of all these activities upon *His* word,” says Luther, “for Christ nowhere commanded that his body should come into being out of *my* word,” not by mere repetition of the Saviour’s words as in an incantation (*LW* 37, 180-190).

One would like to recommend this book to stretch the minds of thoughtful people on the important article of Christ’s Supper. However, it must be stated that it is a slanted stance and a mistaken one; it does the very thing, unfortunately, which the author himself accuses his Lutheran forebears of doing, that is, of fitting “the material under consideration into previously constructed paradigms” (p. 185).

E.F. Klug

FUNDAMENTAL GREEK GRAMMAR. By James W. Voelz. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1986. 330 pages. \$15.95.

This New Testament Greek grammar is a timely publication. The author acknowledges in the preface that many students in our time are acquainted only with English and, in many cases, acquainted with very little English at that. This grammar is written very carefully, taking the student step by step, leaving very little to the imagination. Dr. Voelz is a capable Greek scholar, and he has taught beginning Greek for more than a decade. It is quite apparent from this book that Dr. Voelz has sifted through much material and had done much thinking about the subject matter. There is no unnecessary verbiage.

The word "fundamental" is found in the title of this book. The book is that, but it is more. Not many beginning Greek grammars carry the student far enough into the language so that he can begin reading the classics or the New Testament without the help of an intermediate grammar. But this book has enough detail and explains enough syntax so that the student can begin such work though he will need the help of an intermediate grammar. What interests this reviewer the most is the Greek-to-English exercises found at the end of every lesson, beginning with lesson 4. Very often such exercises are either too difficult or dull. Some grammars take their examples from actual Greek literature. If these examples are not simplified, they are very often too difficult for the beginning student. If the examples are composed by the author to fit precisely the points which he is making, there is the danger that these examples may be insipid. It appears to this reviewer that Dr. Voelz had worked hard and long on these exercises to maintain the interest of the student.

Even the teacher who no longer teaches beginning Greek can profit from this book. New Testament exegetes may not want to admit it but, after teaching no beginning Greek for a decade, many of the details of morphology and syntax become hazy in their minds. Let such a teacher read through this book to sharpen his knowledge and to relive the thrills which he experienced while teaching beginning Greek. For example, on page 18 Dr. Voelz states: "Reflexive activity is most common in verbs concerning personal care and grooming." Rarely are we given this information. On pages 32 and 83 the author distinguishes prepositional phrases which are adjectival and those which are adverbial. Most grammars, not even advanced ones, give us this necessary information. Chapter 32 (pages 211 to 220) is very informative. Not only are we given details concerning the ultima accent of five strong aorist verbs but also such syntactical knowledge as is found at the bottom of page 215 and at the top of page 216. In addition to what most grammars tell us we are told that the present imperative is the abnormal tense; and, that it is used for demands that signal action to commence. Very likely few teachers of Greek know these details.

Here and there there are a few misspellings and a few incorrect Greek accents. But we shall not clutter this review with such matters. By this time Dr. Voelz is surely aware of them. We wish Dr. Voelz had said more about the genitive and

dative cases of page 24. Basically the genitive case shows more than possession. A beginning grammar ought mention immediately that the Greek genitive basically denotes possession or *relationship*. Likewise, perhaps it would be best to say that the dative states to or for whom something is done, thus, immediately introducing the student to the so-called dative of advantage or disadvantage. We admit that uses other than the indirect object are delineated on page 254, but the genitive of relationship is conspicuously absent on page 253. The chapter on conditional sentences (number 39, pages 266 to 271) contains a few bugs. Dr. Voelz writes: "A contrary to fact conditional sentence imagines a *possibility* that is definitely *impossible*." Instead of "possibility" he surely means "situation." On the next page (267) he fails to inform the student that in New Testament Greek the word *an* is sometimes dropped in contrary to fact conditions and that the imperfect and aorist tenses are not so sharply distinguished as in Classical Greek. On page 268 he uses the term "secondary tense" without informing the student as to the meaning of this term. But these criticisms are details which will surely be corrected in subsequent editions of this grammar. We truly recommend this grammar to all teachers of New Testament Greek. The book is well written and interesting. The printing job is very appealing. The price of the book is quite reasonable.

Harold H. Buls

FREEDOM AND OBLIGATION: A STUDY OF THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS. By C.K. Barrett. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1985. 120 pages.

"A Christian man is the most free lord of all and subject to none; a Christian man is the most dutiful servant of all and subject to everyone." This statement by Luther in 1520 expresses well the paradoxical nature of freedom and obligation which forms the theme of Galatians and the focus of this examination of that epistle. The author's purpose is to explore the relationship between history, theology, and ethics in Galatians in order that Paul's view of the paradoxical nature of freedom and obligation in Christian life be clearly articulated. C.K. Barrett, a renowned New Testament scholar with numerous major literary contributions made during his tenure at the University of Durham, began this analysis of Galatians in the Sanderson Lectures presented to the United Faculty of Theology in Melbourne, Australia, in 1983. Thus, the format of this book is not that of a verse-by-verse commentary. While this study does follow the natural sequence of Galatians and does involve some detailed exegesis, Barrett gives attention to the broader historical situation and the theological method Paul uses to address it.

Barrett's treatment is carefully organized and unashamedly Christocentric. With an engaging style he brings alive the controversial struggle Paul faced, demonstrating the interpenetration of history and theology by often offering the reader probable arguments of the Judaizers that Paul seeks to refute. Secondly, Barrett expounds Paul's theology of freedom, stating that the law "was added to turn man's revolt against God into specific acts of transgression ... to make sin everywhere observable"

and that righteousness is fundamentally forensic, beginning as "God's gift of a proper relationship with himself" (pp. 33-34; 42). The author centers his discussion of freedom on Paul's passionate obsession with *solus Christus*; everything depends upon God's grace visible in the "placarding" of Christ crucified. Lastly, the ethics of obligation in Galatians are stressed: "Freedom is freedom to die with Christ by faith and is inseparable from the obligation to live the life of love that Christ lives within the believer" (p. 89). In highlighting the egocentricity of the Judaizers, Barrett effectively demonstrates the enduring significance and application of this letter.

As much as Barrett lets Paul speak, he does not "get into his skin" as Luther did. The result is that law and Gospel, as well as justification and sanctification, are at times merged instead of clearly distinguished (e.g., justification is viewed as a "process," p. 65; Christian ethics rests upon "an absolute obligation," p. 71). Other concerns that this study raises center around Barrett's treatment of Luke's method of composition in Acts. In his opinion Luke fails to deal with division in the early church (cf. the epilogue: "Apostles in Council and Conflict"). This is not the type of quick-reference book meant for a homiletical study; it is a penetrating, thought-provoking examination of Galatians as a whole that is designed to stimulate the student who is already versed in its content.

Charles A. Gieschen
Traverse City, Michigan

BIBLICAL EXEGESIS AND CHURCH DOCTRINE. By Raymond E. Brown. Mahway, New Jersey: Paulist Press, 1985. 176 pages. Cloth, \$8.95; paper, \$5.95.

This brief work by a famous Roman Catholic scholar of the New Testament is an important study of a most important topic, even more important for Lutherans than for Roman Catholics, at least in the implications for the two communions. The work is really meant for the family and is at bottom a defense of historical exegesis of the Bible against those Catholics who are, to put it mildly, unhappy with exegetical results. Brown is very honest in his study and conceals nothing of the plain facts. He has a section in which he discusses "Doctrines about which the Scriptures are Virtually Silent" and the doctrines mentioned are the continued virginity of Mary, the immaculate conception, and the assumption. Furthermore, he holds "it would be unwise to interpret the institution of baptism by Christ to mean that in his lifetime Jesus specifically commanded the practice," and he seems to side with those critics who regard the eucharistic directive ("Do this in remembrance of Me!") "as a later liturgical specification similar to the baptismal directive" (pp. 45,46). On the next page he admits that "we have virtually no information in NT times about who this person (i.e., the one who presided at the eucharist) was or how the person was designated to do this."

It is clear, or if not it should be, that these facts cause no real problem for Roman Catholics; "if by logic, or sheer historical reasoning, or traceable eyewitness tradition, the inevitable necessity of many dogmas *cannot* be shown from the NT data, we

we must then recognize that the guarantee about what must be believed and proclaimed rests with the Spirit working in the Church and speaking through its teachers" (pp. 50-51). The situation for Lutherans is far different for we have Holy Writ as our authority and not Holy Church. Thus doubts as to the historicity of Scripture and its truth throughout have immediate and severe repercussions for the doctrine we confess.

One does, however, wonder whether Roman Catholics can really be satisfied with some of the positions taken by Brown. I know that, if I were a Roman Catholic, I should think a person guilty of something like prevarication or sophistry who could argue as follows (p. 48):

... the institution of priesthood by Christ would have to be understood as a complicated historical process that began at the Last Supper ... In my judgment, such a view in no way weakens the validity of the dogma of Trent (DBS 1752) that "Christ" established the apostles as priests with the words "Do this in commemoration of me." It simply demands nuance.

Similarly, in an historically written narrative, can one simply invoke the decision of the Roman Catholic Church "that inspiration cannot be equated with historicity" (p. 36)? What sort of inspiration of historically, conceived texts is it which gives up the historicity of the texts?

I have another criticism. There is no denying that it is a right procedure to seek the historical situation and original meaning of the texts. But I wonder whether Brown is critical enough, not of the texts, but of the method of historical criticism that has become the common thing. I believe that much of the argumentation used to establish big situations in form criticism and redaction criticism, as well as individual judgments concerning this or that text and its provenance and so on, is of such a kind that, if applied to a criminal case, it would simply be thrown out of court as wasting the court's time. I look for more of the attitude of Joseph A. Fitzmyer, to whom this work is dedicated on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday. Fitzmyer is quoted in an essay of Alber C. Outler (appearing in *Jesus and Man's Hope, III*, p. 53) as saying concerning the Synoptic Problem that "the problem is practically insoluble." But Brown is always stimulating and everything he writes deserves attention.

Henry P. Hamann

JESUS, SON OF MAN: A Fresh Examination of the Son of Man Sayings in the Gospels. By Barnabas Lindars. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1983. 244 pages.

This book claims to be "an attempt to break the deadlock in the debate concerning the Son of Man in the New Testament" (p. vii). The point of contention is the titular versus non-titular use of the "Son of Man" expression in the gospels. This

debate was especially fueled in 1965 by Geza Vermes who asserted that the Aramaic *barnash* or *bar nasha* was not a title in Judaism, nor was it used as such by Jesus; rather, it was used as a non-messianic human self-designation to express his identification with the sons of men (i.e., first-person circumlocution in place of "I" or an idiom meaning "a man"). Furthermore, any titular "Son of Man" usage in the gospels was identified as a post-Easter creation. Such a position has been supported more recently by M. Casey in his *Son of Man: The Interpretation and Influence of Daniel 7* (London, 1979). *Jesus, Son of Man* follows in the track of Vermes and Casey by expanding their research into a detailed study of the sayings traditions in the gospels.

Barnabas Lindars is an internationally respected author and the Rylands Professor of Biblical Criticism and Exegesis at Manchester University. His purpose in this examination is threefold. His primary goal is to demonstrate that the "Son of Man" expression is not a title in "authentic" Jesus sayings. Secondly, Lindars seeks to use this findings regarding "authentic" Jesus sayings to give the reader a sketch of the understanding Jesus had of His own mission. Thirdly, the author also seeks to use his findings to better articulate the special Christological understandings that each evangelist "collected or edited" into his gospel.

Two major problems are present in this study. The first involves the pre-suppositions upon which Lindars builds: that the Aramaic *barnash* or *bar nasha* cannot be a title and that "Son of Man" was not a title in Judaism at the time of Jesus. While the basic linguistic meaning of *bar nasha* is clearly "man" or "human being," we must not conclude that "man" is all it can mean. How a phrase functions in a particular context affects what it means. It is evident from the usage of Daniel 7 in 1 Enoch 37-71 that such a linguistic form served an "identity" function for an individual eschatological figure. This necessitates that we maintain the possibility that, in certain contexts, the Aramaic construct could carry these loaded Danielic and Enochic associations and therefore have a titular "identity" function. It appears that the Septuagint form of Daniel 7:13 has validity as a rendering with this force. Furthermore, since the 1977-78 SNTS Pseudepigrapha Seminars on the Books of Enoch a scholarly consensus has been reached that I Enoch 37-71, with its numerous "Son of Man" references, is certainly Jewish and pre-A.D. 70. Thus, Lindars' main pre-suppositions can be considered inaccurate.

The second major problem with this study is the critical methodology Lindars employs in his examination of the gospels. He subjectively concludes that all other "Son of Man" sayings apart from the nine in which he is able to detect the underlying *bar nasha* idiom ("a man" instead of "Son of Man") must "be regarded as inauthentic" (p. 85). He posits the rest to the creative minds of the evangelists and Q. Lindars is another scholar who separates the Jesus of history from the Christ of faith and then attempts to document the transition. This book is a detailed technical presentation written for specialists in Jesus or gospel research. Outside of perusal by such specialists, this study, in the opinion of this reviewer is not worth much attention.

Charles A. Gieschen
Traverse City, Michigan

THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH. By Everett F. Harrison. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1985. 251 pages.

While some biblical scholars hesitate to label little, if any, of the New Testament record as "history," Everett Harrison is comfortable grouping all of the New Testament writings into two general divisions: "Gospel History" and "Apostolic History." This work attempts to be a comprehensive survey of the latter; it overviews the life and work of the early Christian church as depicted in Acts and the Epistles. Everett F. Harrison is Emeritus Professor of New Testament at Fuller Theological Seminary and author of *Introduction to the New Testament*. Rather than follow a typical chronological sequence in this study, Harrison structures his examination topically. His primary topical focus is the "external history" and "internal development" of the apostolic church, but also included are chapters on the background of the apostolic age, the historical value of Acts, and a concluding chapter which reviews what is known about the individual churches mentioned in the New Testament. The analysis is intended for the student, yet its content is readily accessible to the interested layperson.

This book can best be described as an average conservative treatment of a very broad subject. Harrison touches on so much that very few aspects of his presentation are deep. For example, his introduction on political, cultural, and religious background is informative, but it lacks detail and further documentation is not available in the endnotes (i.e., the source of population estimates and information on major personages or cults). Harrison's Reformed theology influences his interpretation in some important areas of doctrine and practice: receiving "Christ into one's heart" leads to creedal confession (p. 118); baptism is a "rite by which those who have put their faith in Christ are inducted into the church" (p. 122); baptism is a symbol (p. 130); "water baptism" is separate from "spirit baptism" (pp. 44, 126-127); early Christian worship had vitality since "formalism had not yet laid its restraining, deadening hand upon the service" (p. 135); the Lord's Supper was a memorial of Christ (p. 140); the early Christian's daily activities were "lifted to a higher plane because they lived 'wholly in the Lord'" (p. 149). Several positive aspects of Harrison's work should not be ignored. He presents a survey of criticism on Acts and positions himself against scholars like F.C. Baur, Martin Dibelius, Hans Conzelmann, and others by upholding the historical value of Acts. He insightfully supports his position with material from Greek historiography (Thucydides), as well as arguing from the strong influence which Hebrew historiography had on Luke and the close correspondence between the speeches of Acts and the content of apostolic letters (i.e., Peter's speeches and his letters). His explanations of the Jewish background of Pentecost and Judaism's influence on Christian worship show interpretative skill. While this book is basically sound, it lacks the quality that calls for endorsement.

Charles A. Gieschen
Traverse City, Michigan

ISAIAH 1-33. Word Bible Commentary, Volume 24. By John D.W. Watts. Waco, Texas: Word, 1985. Ivii and 449 pages. Cloth, \$24.95.

The book of Isaiah as "dramatic vision" is the reading proposed by John D.W. Watts in this latest addition to the Word Bible Commentary series. Specifically, Watts would have us see the book as a whole, the product of editors working in Judah around 435 B.C. with materials which had been assembled over the centuries, beginning with the historical, eight-century Isaiah himself. Watts contends that these fifth-century editors organized their work in a series of ten "acts," plus an introduction and epilogue, with one act per generation from Isaiah's time to their own. The purpose of their labor (and of the finished book) was to convince their contemporaries that, beginning in the eighth century, God had been instituting a new role for His chosen people: no longer were they to dream of king and empire; they were still to be His mission to the nations (as they had been since Abraham), but without high political status or even independence.

Watts, who serves both as professor of Old Testament Interpretation at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville and as editor for the Old Testament volumes in the Word series, has organized his discussion of each pericope much in the style of the *Biblischer Kommentar: Altes Testament* series (and, indeed, he acknowledges a heavy debt to Hans Wildberger's *BKAT* entry on Isaiah). Each section begins with bibliography, followed by a fresh translation of the text (in the manner of the *Anchor Bible* series), notes on text critical matters, comments on the "Form/Structure/ Setting" of the passage as a whole, comment on individual words and phrases, and an explanation setting the given passage in the overall context (as Watts sees it) of the book. (Thus, in contrast to the *BKAT* "Ziel" section, there is no attempt as such at modern application, except in some excurses on the history of interpretation.)

Such a thoroughgoing rereading of Isaiah deserves a more serious response than is possible in a brief review. Nevertheless, some observations are possible. The Word series seeks to be of use to a wide range of "consumers": "the fledgling student, the working minister as well as to colleagues in the guild of professional scholars and teachers" (Editorial Preface). However, much as is the case with Dahood's *Anchor Bible* commentaries on the Psalms, the reading of the book proposed in this commentary hangs so heavily on a new understanding of a multitude of technical details that it is hard to see how many outside of the "guild" will be able to benefit greatly.

As to the merits of the argument itself, Watts' effort to give pre-eminence to the final form of the text is certainly worthy of note, however much it may derive from the "new literary criticism" of the Bible, rather than more traditional concerns of theology. Nevertheless, although he prescinds from discussion of earlier layers or editions of the text, one cannot avoid the impression that he has not entirely avoided the risks of hypothetical, historical reconstruction. His dating of the finished book of Isaiah places it in the midst of a period of Judah's history of which all must admit we know precious little. His speculations regarding the parties and perspectives competing in this period might be considered on their own merits, were

this a work on postexilic history, but to build on them an interpretation of a work which makes no explicit claims to be from that time is a precarious exercise, indeed. He himself admits somewhat the subjectivity of his reading of the text, as he conceded that the assignment of speaking parts in the ostensible "dramatic vision" is arguable and that, in fact, we lack concrete evidence of dramatic tradition in Israel (thanks, he claims, to the "rigid imposition of puritanlike restrictions" by Ezra [p. xxiv]).

Other concerns with the work include its inclination to tendentious reinterpretations of Israelite history, such as the suggestion that Isaiah's Ahaz was not a panicked monarch who called in the monster from the east to relieve the Syro-Ephraimite pressure, only to see the monster fairly swallow him as well (p. 93). Most serious of all, however, is the suspicion that Watts has been caught "between two stools" of a historical and a literary reading. By reading the text wholistically, yet giving such short shrift to its canonical setting at the time of the prophet Isaiah, Watts runs a great risk of a heavily idiosyncratic reading which will say little to those who cannot accept his theory. Such extraordinary exertions of energy and scholarship as are here in evidence are certainly not for naught, but their value will all too often have to be mined.

George C. Heider
Seward, Nebraska

RESPONSIBLE FAITH: CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY IN THE LIGHT OF TWENTIETH CENTURY QUESTIONS. By Hans Schwarz. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1986. 448 pages.

Hans Schwarz offers this work as an exercise in "theological reflections." As such he warns the reader not to expect a comprehensive dogmatics textbook. And, indeed, the reader will undoubtedly be disappointed if this warning is not heeded. Rather, one is encouraged to expect thoughtful reflection on assertions and challenges, both historical and contemporary, which arise as one encounters the principal dogmatic loci of the Christian faith. Schwarz seeks to present the Christian faith in an apologetic mode. Yet this book decidedly is not an "apologetics" in either the historical or "contemporary-evangelical" sense. In fact, the author exhibits a misinformed understanding of early church apologetics when he suggests that such theological writings arose because "Christians felt a need to inform the authorities, above all, the emperor, that their new faith contained nothing detrimental to the state, to clear thought, or to desirable morals" (p. 19). Rather, Schwarz' work stands as a contemporary reflection of the apologetic approach of Schleiermacher. For the author, the "cultured despisers" to which he appeals are those imbued with the scientific and philosophical perspectives of the late twentieth century, and it is evident that he wishes to convince such readers that in his theological reflection there is nothing detrimental to the state, to clear thought, or to desirable morals. Schwarz also intends this work to be a contribution toward a greater degree of ecumenism between Roman, Lutheran, and Reformed faiths. Thus, traditionally knotty issues

in Christology, soteriology, ecclesiology, the means of grace, and eschatology are consistently addressed with generous praise for those who seek to reframe confessional positions so as to include previously rejected antithetical positions. Yet, the author does not set forth his own contribution to the ecumenical movement with the typical methodology of minimalism, in which these are proposed (a) with terminological vagueness and (b) without corresponding antitheses. Rather, he consistently employs a *via negativa* methodology.

To employ assertion by negation or antitheses without corresponding theses is not new. Schwarz's methodology has a noble pedigree, including Plato, Plotinus, Maimonides, Spinoza, Kant, Whitehead and Tillich, not to mention the entire history of "Eastern" thought. Yet Schwarz's method does not exhibit a Tillichian philosophical preoccupation. Instead, assuming that each article of Christian faith is bigger than language is capable of handling, his approach is to negate the various linguistic formulations which history has given to the article of faith under discussion. While this methodology proves frustrating to those (this reviewer included) who would be interested in knowing, for example, what Schwarz actually does believe about sin, or God's wrath, or the real presence, or eternal damnation, nevertheless Schwarz's challenges to commonly accepted formulations of doctrine force the reader to engage in a reassessment of his own convictions.

For the confessional Lutheran, Schwarz's wholesale acceptance of the assured results of higher criticism will be disturbing, as will his willingness to concede to the bifurcation between the historical Jesus and the Christ of Christian proclamation, though he asserts that by "Christian conviction" both "form a unity of person" (p. 207). Moreover, Schwarz assumes that "theology is the explicit attempt to raise into consciousness what we are doing" (p. 38), over against a confessional Lutheran view that theology is the explicit attempt to raise into consciousness who we are in Christ. Nevertheless, once its limitations were recognized, this reviewer found the book to be an enriching encounter with some fresh exegetical insights and some provocative dogmatic challenges. Seen in this light, *Responsible Faith: Christian Theology in the Light of Twentieth-Century Questions* is a catalyst for one's own theological reflections, and thus to those whose desire is for such theological stimulation the purchase of this book is recommended.

Robert W. Schaibley
Fort Wayne, Indiana

ABORTION: POLITICS, MORALITY, AND THE CONSTITUTION. By Stephan M. Krason. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, 1984. 707 pages. Paper, \$29.00.

The current legal status of abortion in the United States creates many problems for the Lutheran parish pastor. Not the least of these is the challenge of confronting the political implications of an admittedly moral issue. Trained to be sensitive

to the distortions of both message and ministry which are inherent in the "Social Gospel," the pastor finds himself in danger of being impaled on his own bayonet should he venture to adopt a prophetic stance over against the legalized immorality of abortion-on-demand. The relationship of the Word of God to the political institution is at stake here. What is the church's role in addressing perceived moral issues within the political arena? What moral and theological distinctions exist, if any, between the United Methodist Church's endorsement of a U.S. Presidential candidate in 1964 and the Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod's endorsement of a "pro-life" stance now? In discerning the proper role of the church in social-moral issues the confessional Lutheran church stands alone. Both the Roman Church, on the one hand, and the Protestant churches, on the other, see as the goal of the church's ministry the changing of human behavior. Lutheranism does not share with these other communions a self-concept of the church as the "moral conscience of the nation." Rather, the confessional Lutheran church approaches social morality from the perspective of Luther's "Two Kingdoms," according to which we understand that God rules in the social order (the kingdom of the left hand) through natural law.

It is precisely at this point that Krason offers to the confessionally-mined pastor a valuable resource. Krason, who is both a political scientist and a lawyer, delivers an insightful critique of the two landmark Supreme Court decisions which revolutionized the social standing of abortion, *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton*. The reader is guided through the history leading up to these decisions (chapter 1), the legal logic employed in the written opinions (chapter 2), a penetrating analysis of the court's line of argumentation, especially with reference to the moral principles announced by the court (chapters 4 and 6), and the implications of the concept of "unenumerated rights" in constitutional law (chapter 5). Throughout these chapters Krason demonstrates that the crucial issues which the court raises are moral in nature. Thus, he confirms the reality of the moral challenge which the pastor faces. In chapters 7-9 the author evaluates these moral issues from the framework of what he calls the "Artistotelian-Stoic framework." This point of departure is taken because "each philosophy stresses the importance of political prudence and neither is founded on religious doctrine, ... [thus providing] the basis for a politically realistic resolution of the question in our religiously pluralistic political society" (pp. 438-439). What is particularly helpful about Krason's approach is that it suggests a way to deal with the social-moral crisis of abortion with terms appropriate to the "kingdom of the left hand."

The author concludes his work with two appendices which outline a strategy by which to effect the proscription of abortion in the nation. There are three basic options by which the current moral status of abortion might be changed: federal legislation, a constitutional amendment, or a reversal of opinion by the Supreme Court, presumably through the process of filling future vacancies in the court. While Senator John P. East, in his forward to this book, suggests the last option as the most hopeful one, Krason offers the first option as his recommended strategy. Regardless of the approach which one may advocate, the groundwork laid by this extensive work will prove most valuable.

Abortion: Politics, Morality, and the Constitution offers confessional Lutherans an avenue for an effective and theologically justifiable exercise of their responsibilities as citizens who, by personal Christian convictions, are concerned about the current legal status of abortion. The book is well-written (especially for a work which began as a Ph.D. dissertation) and thorough. One will appreciate the extensive index and the helpful format of indexed end-notes, although the lack of a bibliography is lamentable for a work of this scope. This book is worth the price of twenty-nine dollars to those who desire to make a case for ending what Christian conscience compels us to regard as immoral and to make that case in the context of the "Kingdom of the left hand."

Robert W. Schaibley
Fort Wayne, Indiana

THE BATTLE FOR THE TRINITY. By Donald G. Bloesch. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Servant Publications, 1985. \$10.95.

The current debate over the ordination of women, inclusive language to denote the Trinity, and the reconstruction of the symbols of Christian faith form the substance and thrust of this excellent book. The author (a professor of theology at the University of Dubuque) is an evangelical Reformed theologian well grounded in his subject material. He is biblically opposed to any change in the language and imagery of Scripture. He proposes that the rise of feminine theology can lead the church in one of two directions or even both—Baalism and Gnosticism. He makes a solid case for his contention. In a striking chapter entitled "Parallels with German Christians," he compares the rise of feminist theology with the rise of a "German Church" under Nazism. The similarities are startling, to say the least. The appeal to the American cultural experience, with its emphasis on freedom, autonomy, and change, parallels the Nazi-controlled philosophy and theology of the German church in the thirties. The book is accurately entitled "The Battle for the Trinity." It is necessary reading for parish pastors and professors alike.

George Kraus

DIE APOKALYPSE IN ANGERS. EIN MEISTERWERK MITTELALTERLICHER TEPPICHWERKE. By Pierre-Marie Auzas, Catherine de Maupes, Christian de Merindol, Francis Muel, Antojne de Ruais. Translated by Roswitia Beyer. Munich: Hirmer Verlag, 1985. 195 pages.

This beautiful publication presents the late medieval tapestries depicting the Apocalypse of John which are displayed at Angers in France, where they attract some two hundred thousand tourists annually. The several authors present the history

of the Apocalypse in art, the history of the Angers tapestries, the coats of arms, the preservation of the tapestries, and the individual scenes. The Angers tapestries are considered the first and the greatest depicting this subject. They are based on illustrations similar to medieval illuminations. These were of small size, credited to Jean de Bondol and Jean de Bruges. The enlarger is unknown but may be Robert Poisson, the weaver. Nicolas Bataille was the producer, providing the means. The tapestries are of heroic proportions. The total length of six long pieces is 130 meters, the height 4.5 meters. While these pieces are amazingly well preserved and restored after six hundred years, some scenes are missing, and the original length was 130 meters, the height 5.5 meters. The woven subscriptions have been lost.

Duke Louis I of Anjou commissioned these works in 1375 "to bolster his prestige." He was a great collector, credited with owning 3602 artistic items. Little distinction between sacred and secular was made in the early renaissance. In 1377 a payment of one thousand francs by Louis I is recorded. Three more long wall hangings were delivered in 1379, each purchased at the same rate. Other tapestries were made at about the same time, based on the Apocalypse. Robert Poisson is known to have made some for the Duke of Burgundy. Others were in the possession of the Duke of Berry, a brother of Anjou.

The artistic interpretation of the scenes of the Apocalypse is quite realistic and literal, following the book chapter by chapter. This is true of earlier illuminations, such as the Cloisters Apocalypse in New York. It was Duerer who about 1490, a century later, introduced dramatic dynamism. The authors give a detailed history of the handling and restoration of the Angers tapestries, but they do not enter into a discussion of the significance of the Apocalypse in the early renaissance. That age produced Petrarch, Dante, Wyclif, and Huss, all of whom declared the Pope of Rome to be the antichrist. According to Hoe von Hoeneegg, in his *Commentarium in Apocalypsin*, many manuscripts were destroyed by the Reform councils before the Reformation. There was a rising storm against Rome, a great resistance when priestly celibacy was being enforced in France and other lands. It seems desirable, therefore, that a much more thorough study of the popularity of the Apocalypse of John before the Reformation should be made. The sober understanding of this matter in the Middle Ages is refreshing and heartening.

Otto F. Stahlke

BEYOND FUNDAMENTALISM. By James Barr. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1984. x and 180 pages with a further 15 pages devoted to notes, indices, and hints for further reading. Paper, \$9.95.

This further book by James Barr on Fundamentalism presupposes that the reader knows what fundamentalism is. However, some sort of accurate description would have been desirable, since the term is one that is variously used. Very generally, it can be said that for Barr fundamentalism is synonymous with inerrancy and "the idea that scripture and one's views about scripture form in themselves the absolute

touchstone of everything to be said and done in Christianity" (p. 3). The book is meant for fundamentalists, especially for those who have become disillusioned concerning it and dissatisfied with its intellectual status (p. vii). Barr has also evangelicals in mind, whose fundamentalistic leanings in great part Barr rejects (p. 179). Barr's basic position is clearly set forth in a number of passages, of which the following may serve as an example (p. 174):

If we are right in starting from scripture and taking it as authoritative, then the fundamentalist use and understanding of it often contradicts scripture itself. If scripture, so understood, contradicts our ideas of biblical authority then our ideas of biblical authority have to be adjusted to meet that fact. This is the centre of our argument.

Various aspects of the Bible, treated in different chapters, are examined and shown to demolish the fundamentalist position. The matters treated are quite central, as the following selection of chapter headings will indicate: "The Religious Core I: Justification by Faith," "The Religious Core II: What was Jesus Like?," "Law and Morality, Experience and Nature," "Variation and Perfection in the Divine." One chapter (13) puts various alternatives to the fundamentalist understanding of inspiration. However, Barr does not argue for any particular view of biblical authority that could take the place of fundamentalism. He says explicitly: "I do not wish to suggest that there is any one particular view of biblical authority that necessarily follows from my arguments" (p. 178).

One cannot simply dismiss all of Barr's arguments out of hand, and a serious student of the Bible has to give close attention to much of what he has written here. However, some statements and arguments leave one in a state of some perplexity. Barr declares quite categorically that it is "quite absurd" for anyone to suppose that Jesus, who made such free use of "fictions as one of his main forms of teaching," should insist on the historical accuracy of his citations from the Old Testament (p. 11). Where is the absurdity? Are not both things possible? Again, Barr finds a contradiction between Matthew 5:17-18 and the new meaning given to the law by Jesus in His repeated "but I say unto you" in the same chapter. "He is not simply explaining the law, he is not setting himself under the law as a mere exegete, he is saying something that he considers to be new, to go beyond what the law itself had to say" (p. 9). I do not think fundamentalists would deny that Jesus as God's Son could in expounding the law make clear how the law properly understood goes beyond popular interpretations of it. And yet again Barr argues: "it is clear that mere submission to pre-existing scripture was not at all a tenet of Jesus' own vision, whether for himself or for the community to be created through his work" (p. 12). This assertion seems to be contradicted by a great number of sayings ascribed to Jesus in the various gospels, not least by the one to which Barr himself refers, John 5:39. Barr quite misses the real thrust of this text, that the Jews should believe on Jesus for eternal life just because the scriptures testify of him.

Against one audacious assertion of the author I shall not argue, but merely oppose to it two statements completely contrary to Barr's own opinion. Barr says,

“The frightening picture of the critical scholar, tearing the Bible to shreds and scattering the fragments to the winds is largely a figment of the ignorant imagination.” (p. 129). I cite the “ignorant imagination” of C.S. Lewis (*Miracles*):

When you turn from the New Testament to modern scholars, remember that you go among them as a sheep among wolves ... In using the books of such people you must therefore be continually on guard. You must develop a nose like a bloodhound for those steps in the argument which depend not on historical and linguistic knowledge but on the concealed assumption that miracles are impossible, improbable, or improper. And this means that you must really re-educate yourself; must work hard and consistently to eradicate from your mind the whole type of thought (i.e., Naturalism) in which we all have been brought up.

And I cite the “ignorant imagination” of R.P.C. Hanson in the introduction to the third volume of *The Pelican Guide to Modern Theology*:

But in spite of shocked churchmen ... the revolution moved inexorably on. It consisted in the simple but far-reaching discovery that the documents of the Bible were entirely conditioned by the circumstances of the period in which they were produced.

If this is not a “frightening picture of the critical scholar,” as he presents us with a Bible completely human and of this world, to be treated precisely like all other ancient documents of the ancient world, I should like to know what is.

A final criticum—the book of James Barr is entitled *Beyond Fundamentalism*. What is the alternative to which he points, the “Beyond”? There is none really. The argument is: fundamentalism is no good, give it away, a proper study of the Bible will lead you to a better position. But that better position is not given, although, as stated above, some alternatives to fundamentalism are mentioned in chapter 13. Barr himself points to this aspect of the book: “It may be argued that I have not sought in this book to outline any adequate view of biblical authority” (p. 178). He goes on to say that he has written amply on the subject of biblical authority in other books of his. But is that good enough, good enough just for the people for whom he wrote this book? They are hardly likely to have read his other works and might find it a bit inconsiderate to be asked to buy another book to find the answer for the problem which led them to buy this book in the first place. I think the title has promised more than the book supplies.

Henry P. Hamann