

CONCORDIA  
THEOLOGICAL  
QUARTERLY

CTQ

Volume 46, Number 4

---

OCTOBER 1982

---

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Announcement .....   | 263 |
| The Theology of the Cross ..... Karl Wengenroth                            | 267 |
| Tongues: An Evaluation from a<br>Scientific Perspective ..... Klemet Preus | 277 |
| Luther and the Confessions ..... Wilbert Rosin                             | 295 |
| Theological Observer .....   | 299 |
| Homiletical Studies .....  | 301 |
| Book Reviews .....   | 339 |
| Books Received .....   | 353 |



## Book Reviews

**ENCYCLOPEDIA OF BIBLE DIFFICULTIES.** By Gleason L. Archer. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Michigan. 1982. Cloth. 476 pages.

Archer needs no introduction in conservative Protestant circles. With baccalaureate degrees in both theology and law and a Harvard doctorate, he has the credentials to tackle a book whose title includes the word "encyclopedia." The Christian cause of conversion is not furthered simply by providing answers to those who attack the veracity of its message; however, since Origen the church has recognized the apologetic task as necessary for preserving the authentic gospel. Many in the Missouri Synod have used Arndt's *Bible Difficulties*. It is not entirely suitable in answering problems which have arisen in the last generation in critical Biblical studies. Archer's *Encyclopedia* is the most useful work to cross this desk in answering the newer problems.

Each book of the Bible receives one chapter in the *Encyclopedia*. Not only are the problems usual for such books handled — for example, the reconciliation of the Matthean and Lucan genealogies — but problems relating to Mosaic authorship, evolution, and women's ordination (in a masterly study) are thoroughly discussed. In the Genesis chapter human sacrifice, evidence of Hittite culture, and immorality are discussed. Several years ago a debate arose on whether or not Matthew had embellished the Palm Sunday account by adding another burro in order to make it appear as if the Zechariah 9:9 prophecy was being more closely fulfilled. Archer's answer is that, while the Zechariah passage does speak of only one animal, Matthew does provide an accurate eyewitness account in reporting that two animals were actually involved. He was not fabricating another animal to fit the Hebrew parallelism of Zechariah. A pastor with inquisitive Bible class and confirmation students will want to have this book at hand to handle those embarrassing questions which pop up out of nowhere and whose solutions seem out of reach. Archer writes with sound scholarship in an always understandable style. References for those desiring to search further are provided. Pastors placing this excellent volume on their own shelves may also want to make another copy available in church libraries. A caveat about the author's millennialism and Zionism must be added. Matthew 24:34 with its promise of Jerusalem's destruction in the near future is understood as a prediction of the survival of the Jewish race as the nation of Israel. A closing article on the 144,000 takes the number as a reference to the Jews who finally believe. Archer has authored a best-seller which will guide pastors and laity through some difficult questions.

David P. Scaer

**JESUS AND THE GOSPEL.** By William R. Farmer. Fortress Press, Philadelphia, 1982. Cloth 300 pages. \$21.95.

William Farmer of the Perkins School of Theology at Southern Methodist University has made a name for himself by taking positions contrary to the accepted dogmas in critical New Testament studies. In his *Last Twelve Verses of Mark* he defended their authenticity as coming from the original author of Mark himself, though they were added at a later date. Dr. Farmer also defends the Griesbach theory of the Matthean priority by placing Luke second and Mark third. Rather than having Matthew and Luke use Mark and "Q" in composing their gospels, Luke definitely uses and then expands on Matthew. The two-source hypothesis is so overly refined as to be meaningless. Mark, written as an introduction to Christianity rather than a complete theology, uses Matthew and

---

Luke at those places where they agree. Less than thirty verses are original to Mark. Farmer treats the apostolic and postapostolic periods as a composite. Instead of isolating data, he marshals the information into an organic story of how the oral teaching of Jesus developed first into the gospels and then finally into a canon with a formalized order in the fourth century. The author uses the same data and methods that the form critics have employed, but he finds them leading to other conclusions. Several years ago I heard F.F. Bruce urge that the periods between Jesus and the writings of the first New Testament documents and between the close of these writings and their being collected be given more attention. Farmer has done this and has provided a great service to both New Testament and ancient church studies. At times the author speculates, as, for example, with respect to the office of the Christian prophet, who allegedly spoke officially and ecstatically for Jesus in the early church. Throughout, however, the author is fascinating, even for those who have grown weary of much of New Testament study as mere and somewhat useless disconnected theories.

Farmer maintains that for about fifty years after the life of Jesus, the oral sayings of Jesus assumed different forms according to the needs of the different churches in their circumstances. The actual dates for the gospels are up for grabs and not worth debating. These oral sayings were authoritative for church life. Jesus' sayings in Hebrew and Aramaic were translated into Greek with the Jerusalem apostles Peter, John, and James guaranteeing that the original meaning was preserved. James, who came from Jesus' household, knew Jesus' use of language, and Peter, as the premier apostle, was acquainted with the teaching as it was first given. Matthew is responsible for the creation of the gospel genre, modeled after the Greek encomium, a type of eulogy for great men in the Hellenistic world. Matthew does not copy the Greek style slavishly or mechanically. The other three evangelists followed this style. Rather than moving from the simpler Mark to Matthew, Farmer finds it more plausible to move from the more Jewish and Palestinian and complex Matthew to the Roman Mark. It does seem reasonable that the Jewish Matthew is much closer to Jesus than Gentile-oriented Mark. Luke copied and altered Matthew's pattern. His gospel was necessitated by a church which was rapidly becoming Gentile and by a desire to preserve materials omitted by Matthew. Luke with such stories as the Prodigal Son and the Good Samaritan soon replaced Matthew in influence. It is not difficult to disagree with Farmer's contention that Luke's style is more attractive than Matthew's. Take, for example, the birth and resurrection narratives. Mark serves as bridge between Matthew and Luke and unifies them. Petrine influence in Mark's gospel can be detected in the way that this gospel's outline follows Peter's recorded sermons in Acts. Along with these three gospels, other "gospels" circulated in the church. These three and not the others were recognized as authentic because they conformed to the oral teaching of Jesus as given by the apostles and the description of the suffering of Jesus in these three gospels set the standard for their own suffering. If they were martyrs, Jesus was seen as the first and faithful "martyr." The Gnostic gospels stressed the miraculous in the life of Jesus and denied that He had actually suffered. Farmer is also quick to point out that, as the gospels and the writings of Paul were written, they were considered along with the Old Testament as the Christian Scriptures. Farmer takes his canonical discussion right up through Constantine and the fourth century. Until the end of that century no firm order existed and certain books like Hebrews and Revelation were doubted in some parts of the church.

Constantine and his legalization of the Christian religion were responsible for the rigid canon which was never again questioned until Luther and the

Reformation. Farmer posits the view that Constantine determined to follow Alexander's unrealized dream of one god, one empire, one religion and used Christianity with its commitment to martyrdom and to a sacred book to accomplish this purpose. He succeeded. Eusebius, ordered by the emperor, distributed fifty officially certified Bibles to the bishops. The arrangement in Constantine's Bibles soon closed the canonical issue. The reader is easily persuaded by Farmer to question Constantine's conversion and to call it an "inspiration" to bring about an empire unified not only in government but also in religion. The emperor cult failed to bring unity. Constantine took the authority of a bishop and even settled problems outside of his domains. In a footnote Farmer sees the pope as the successor of Constantine. This opens some wide avenues of theological thought.

The reader cannot help but be intellectually stimulated by Farmer's ideas even if he cannot agree with them at every point. Impressive lists comparing Mark's embellishments with Matthew's straight-forward style are more proof for an early Matthew and a late Mark. But in attempting to demonstrate that Mark is late Farmer provides several pages of Marcan mistakes. But is it really wrong to call Herod Antipas a "king" instead of a "tetrarch"? Still Farmer's point is valid that Matthew is more precise than Mark. Farmer has not written a devotional book, but he has made more vivid the early church situation in which the words of Jesus eventually would become the canonical Scriptures. The Spirit active in Jesus and in the preservation of His words was the same Spirit who motivated the martyrs in their death for Jesus. The modern church has something to learn here. Conservative Christians sometimes miss this continuity. The book's last sentence says it best of all: "The faith for which they lived and died was inextricably bound up with their confidence in the divine inspiration of the New Testament Scriptures, which sustained and nourished their faith both in life and in death." Fortress Press is congratulated for making Dr. Farmer's impressive study available. It can be read several times with profit.

David P. Scaer

**BORN AGAINISM: PERSPECTIVES ON A MOVEMENT.** By Eric W. Gritsch. Fortress Press, Philadelphia, 1982. Paper. 111 pages.

Current Lutheranism, has been touched and perhaps even infected by the born-again movement. Gritsch provides an immediately useful introduction to the problem from what he understands as a Lutheran perspective. The five chapters discuss millennialism, fundamentalism, Biblical authority from the fundamentalist view, the charismatic movement, and the born-again experience, also known as the baptism of the Holy Spirit. As a historian Gritsch is well equipped to trace the movement's origins in the Anglo-American religious movements of the eighteenth century which saw first in Israel and then in the United States a divine purpose in accomplishing the world's redemption. In the third chapter, the one focusing on the question of authority, Gritsch sees Biblical authority as derived from and existing for the sake of the Gospel. The latter claim is true enough, but hardly the former. For Gritsch the Bible's uniqueness rests in being a type of first witness to the Gospel's efficacy. But the suggestion that the doctrines of Biblical inspiration and inerrancy are correlatives with the born-again movement only muddies the water. Gritsch is surely not suggesting that adherence to such doctrines is un-Lutheran and makes one a born-again Christian, or is he? If one can skip the chapter on authority, one can benefit from seeing the contemporary phenomena as the culmination of a two-century process, a process in which Lutherans played a real role and which now, however, presents great dangers to them. *Born Againism* is an informative and

well documented general introduction to the movement. A second edition might include chapters on the political implications of the movement and its utilization of the mass media. Fundamentalists are accused of looking for rational certainty in the doctrine of Biblical inerrancy but at the same time are chastised for an experience-based religion. Is there a contradiction here? The claim that fundamentalism has its origins in the Aristotelianism of Luther's doctrine might be pushing a point too far in order to play one's own saw. It is about time that fundamentalism and the related phenomena be brought up for discussion with our people. For this Gritsch lays the groundwork. If Gritsch's own bias against the traditional view of Biblical authority can be passed over, his assessments are worth reading.

David P. Scaer

**EIN UNERWARTETES PLAEDOYER.** Seit 1977: Addenda ad Formulam Concordiae. By W. M. Oesch. Theologische Hochschule, Oberursel, Germany, 1981. Paper. 96 pages. No price given.

The sainted Dr. W. M. Oesch was an American-born German scholar. At the beginning of World War II he replaced Dr. Martin Naumann in the church at Hamburg. With the founding of the seminary at Oberursel Dr. Oesch became a recognized theologian on the German scene, representing a conservative theology. During the troubled decades of recent Missouri Synod history his voice was often heard on this side of the Atlantic in *Inter Nos* and other epistles. Since the beginning was made of an organization of gnesio-Lutheran seminaries throughout the world, Dr. Oesch took an interest in possible additions to the Lutheran Confessions. The four hundredth anniversary of the Formula of Concord prompted discussion of such addenda. Dr. Oesch cites Dr. Eugene Klug, Dr. Richard Klann, and Dr. Lewis Spitz, Jr., but especially Dr. Neelak Tjernagel, who delivered a "Twentieth Century Tribute to the Formula of Concord" at Mankato. Of his twenty-two closely printed pages, Tjernagel devoted the last five to an appeal for addenda to the Formula of Concord.

It must be granted that the age of confessions has never been closed. The Presbyterian Confession of 1967, the 1973 "Statement of Biblical and Confessional Principles," and "Faithful to Our Calling, Faithful to Our Lord" give ample evidence. Recently the World Council of Churches has also advanced the idea of a new Ecumenical Confession by the year 2000. The reader becomes aware of an on-going theological development. Represented also are the "Arnheim Theses" and the "Leuenberg Concord." Dr. Oesch in this "Unexpected Plea: Addenda ad Formulam Concordiae" provides an extensive review of the theological developments in Europe and America in parallel columns. It is in the style of Kahnis' "Der innere Gang der Lutherischen Kirche," which covers several centuries. Dr. Oesch reveals a comprehensive understanding of the church on both sides of the Atlantic.

In the concluding Part III Dr. Oesch offers various suggestions as to matters which need to be considered in confessional addenda. In an age of gigantic perversions the author urges that in a joint effort scholars on both sides of the Atlantic prepare addenda regarding Holy Scripture. He proposes that authors ranging from Calov to Malentin Ernst Loescher be considered. He suggests that if Dr. Sasse had read the work of Dr. Robert Preus, he might not have been misled by German neology into the opinion that men like John Gerhard had distorted their theology through Aristotelian terms and antique mythology. Dr. Adolf Hoenecke is offered as a commendable guide. In Christ it becomes clear that both Old and New Testaments are a communication of God with man.

Dr. Oesch also calls for addenda on the doctrine of the two kingdoms, the formal and material principles of theology, the *tertius usus legis*, and apologetic matters. The historico-critical method, already two hundred years old, must be treated. Ernst Troeltsch and George Ebeling are mentioned as modern advocates of it. This is an ambitious program and apropos to our times. It reflects the conservative character of the independent Lutheran churches of Germany, France and Belgium, and Sweden.

Otto Stahlke

**HOLINESS AND THE WILL OF GOD: PERSPECTIVES ON THE THEOLOGY OF TERTULLIAN.** By Gerald Lewis Bray. New Foundations Theological Library. John Knox Press, Atlanta, 1979. 179 + xii pages.

Perhaps of all the Church Fathers Tertullian is the one who most has the capacity to exasperate and to please. In his intellectual and moral energy he must have been an imposing figure; at least that is the way he appears in his writings. All of his writings, even those of rather arcane interest (i.e., "On the Veiling of the Virgins"), evince an active mind and a burning soul, both amply served by devastating wit and polemical prowess. This along with Tertullian's obvious importance for the development of western Christianity has made him an object of recurring scholarly interest.

But like other objects of study, Tertullian must be interpreted; and he is not easy to interpret. The disparate character of Tertullian's writings (Bray divides them according to content into five categories, pp.3-6) makes difficult the question of the center and structuring principle of Tertullian's thinking, or whether there even is one. How is Tertullian to be interpreted? In a most illuminating chapter Bray traces the fate of Tertullian in the hands of his interpreters (pp. 8-31). As in the interpretation of the Bible itself, the image of Tertullian often has been created after the image of his interpreters. Generally neglected during the Middle Ages due to his supposed Montanism and the general legacy of Augustine, Tertullian was again appreciated in the late Middle Ages by those who represented the anti-clerical, anti-Roman ferment of that time.

Modern study of Tertullian, however, began with the pupil of Schleiermacher, August Neander (early nineteenth century). Starting here, Bray very nicely summarizes the various cultural and intellectual fashions which have governed the scholarly view of Tertullian—personality as the key to understanding a person's thought (Neander, von Harnack), developmental school (Ernst Noeldechen), sociological school (Paul Monceaux, W.H.C. Frend), *Sondersprache* school (Christine Mohrmann), emphasis on lexical study (Rene Braun), historical and cultural context as interpretive key (T.D. Barnes)—and Bray rejects each, although not without appreciation, as insufficient to understand Tertullian.

Instead of these approaches to Tertullian, Bray offers his own key to the interpretation of Tertullian: "The student who would understand Tertullian must understand above all that his life was the pursuit of holiness in the presence of the living God" (p. 31). It is the great merit of Bray's book that it presents Tertullian as a *Christian* thinker who is working out the practical implications of that which is specifically Christian rather than as a typically ancient Latin thinker who makes certain Christian adjustments in his thought. The result is a well-written, well-argued book which, while iconoclastically rejecting many operative assumptions of modern scholarship (Bray denies that Tertullian was

ever a Montanist, pp. 55-62), presents a cohesive picture of a theologian actively engaged with his contemporaries but basing himself on the firm authority of Christian revelation.

"It was Tertullian's concern for sanctification which determined his approach to theology and which formed the main theme of his writings" (p. 66). In the chapter, "The Man and His Times" (pp. 32-65), Bray establishes this concern as central to Tertullian by examining his attitude toward paganism, the early church's experience of martyrdom, the development of church dogma, and Montanism. Then in successive chapters Bray analyzes the nature of holiness in the writings of Tertullian (pp. 66-94), the authoritative bases Tertullian uses to elucidate his concept of holiness (pp. 95-123), and the character of the holy life according to Tertullian (pp. 124-152).

The pith of the book lies in these last three chapters, and they are informative, thought-provoking chapters indeed. The central importance Bray attributes to the doctrine of the soul for Tertullian's anthropology and therefore for his notion of sanctification (pp. 73-83) is undoubtedly correct. Similarly, his discussion of the relation between soul and flesh in Tertullian (pp. 83-94) is beneficial. Highly problematic, however, is Bray's comparison between Tertullian and Irenaeus concerning the source and cause of sin and evil. Certainly, as Bray contends, for Tertullian sin arose entirely through the disobedience of man's free will. However, to assert that "Irenaeus thought that ultimately human sin was due to finitude" (p. 89) is mistaken. For Irenaeus to have asserted man's finitude as the root source of evil and that man "as a creature was virtually bound to sin from the start" (p. 88) would have played into the hands of his gnostic opponents. Bray fails to appreciate the recapitulatory thrust of Jesus' temptations and of the cross as perfect obedience in Irenaeus' thought.

Bray's discussion of the *regula fidei* in Tertullian's writings and of its relation to Scripture is good. The use of a *regula*, a normative proposition which guided the interpretation of a particular statute that was unclear or open to various understandings, was common in Roman jurisprudence, and Tertullian adopted this usage, presenting summary statements of the faith (*regulae*) to aid in the interpretation of the Bible (pp. 97-104).

"Tertullian saw the unfolding of salvation as a historical process in three distinct phases, which correspond to the Old Testament, the Incarnation of Christ and the Pentecostal reign of the Holy Spirit" (p. 104). It was this triadic dispensational view which provided Tertullian a theological basis for his understanding of the work of the Paraclete and therefore of the character and content of Christian discipline and asceticism. Bray nicely summarizes this feature, but he ought have devoted more space to this central idea in Tertullian's thought.

For Tertullian, the holy life was essentially a life of chastity. While chastity obviously has reference to the sexual behavior of the Christian, "chastity" has much broader application and can be generally defined as "reasoned restraint, governed by a will fortified with the indwelling presence of the Paraclete" (pp. 130-131). Bray demonstrates the Latin origin of the close link Tertullian draws between holiness and chastity and concludes: "Tertullian regarded Christian moral teaching as the natural fulfilment of pagan Roman beliefs, as well as of the Old Testament law" (p. 139).

This book is a welcome addition to the study of Tertullian and a healthy corrective to much recent scholarship on him.

William C. Weinrich

---

HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN ETHICS. VOLUME I: FROM THE NEW TESTAMENT TO AUGUSTINE. By George Wolfgang Forell. Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis, 1979. 247 pages. \$12.50.

George Forell, professor of religion at the University of Iowa, is well-known as a Christian ethicist of distinction. His book, *Faith Active in Love*, is still profitable reading. That a thinker of his obvious competence should tackle the monumental task of writing a history of Christian ethics is welcome indeed. As the cover notes, it has been over fifty years since a general history of Christian ethics has been presented in English. This book is the first of three volumes and covers the first five centuries of Christian ethical thought. Professor Forell clearly attempts to meet a need.

However, if one expected a comprehensive, coherent history of Christian ethical thought, the book will disappoint. First of all, the scope of the book (some 170 pages of text) is too short to accommodate the material requisite for an adequate survey. Secondly, although an effort is made to place the ethical teaching of major early Christian thinkers in their historical and theological contexts, the result nevertheless remains on a rather superficial descriptive level and does not explain why Christian ethics took the form they did. In other words, there is little, if any, serious attempt to correlate developing Christian doctrinal thought with developing Christian ethical thought. Two examples of this lack may suffice to demonstrate the point. The full ethical implications of the early church's confrontation with Gnosticism is not appreciated (this in spite of the discussion on pages 70-72). The church's insistence on God as Creator, on the incarnation, and on the resurrection of the flesh as the goal of God's salvific working had immense importance for the church's understanding of its ethical life and obligations. In this regard there is a good statement in Ignatius of Antioch. Concerning the docetists, who deny the reality of Christ's flesh, Ignatius writes: "They have no care for love, nor for the widow, the orphan, the oppressed, the imprisoned or the released, the hungry or the thirsty" (Sm. 6:2). More attention to Irenaeus in this regard would have been helpful as well. Secondly, the correlation between the doctrine of the church (ecclesiology) and Christian ethics is virtually ignored. An understanding of the church as a community of holy people has clear ethical foundation and orientation. Just such a problematic was behind the favor Tertullian showed toward Montanism, the schism of Hippolytus, the schism of Novatian, and the schism of Donatism — and this problematic remains today in holiness groups and certain sectarian Baptists.

There are other shortcomings. The chapter on Tertullian (pp. 44-60) is strangely unbalanced. While Forell correctly identifies the centrality of the concept "idolatry" for Tertullian and the centrality of creation in his work against Marcion, inexplicably no mention is made of the foundational importance of the Paraclete for Tertullian's understanding of the Christian life. This frankly is a huge oversight. One misses as well a good discussion on asceticism and virginity as ethical ideals (here greater attention could have been given to Jerome and Gregory of Nyssa) and also a good discussion on the problem of church and state (Ambrose—although this problem is broached in the chapter on Augustine). Finally, the very subject selection is disappointing. Given the scope of the book, Clement of Alexandria and Origen do not require individual chapters. They share a common outlook. I do wonder why Irenaeus and Ambrose are not featured more prominently, and also a later Alexandrian like Athanasius.

Of course, we do not wish to expect more from a book than it was intended to offer. And if Professor Forell has his university students or the general lay public



in mind as his audience, then this book is a reasonable introduction to certain early Christian ethical thinkers and is worthy of a reading. The chapters on Origen (pp. 75-92), John Chrysostom (pp. 129-53), and Augustine (pp. 154-80) are especially good. And Forell offers ample quotations from the Fathers, enabling them to speak for themselves. Indeed, the quotation selection is excellent. Attractive as well is the easy style of Forell and his ability to put a point clearly. A helpful bibliography and indices conclude the book.

William C. Weinrich

**LAYMAN'S BIBLE BOOK COMMENTARY. VOLUME 13: HOSEA, JOEL, AMOS, OBADIAH, JONAH.** By Billy K. Smith. Broadman Press, Nashville, Tennessee, 1982. 153 pages.

The *Layman's Bible Commentary*, planned to appear in 24 volumes, appears to be Broadman's counterpart to the 25-volume *Layman's Bible Commentary* published some years ago by John Knox Press. The Broadman commentary series was also designed for laymen who might find *The Broadman Bible Commentary* written for pastors and scholars too difficult. Two volumes of the Southern Baptist *Layman's Bible Commentary* deal with the twelve minor prophets. The author of the volume on the first five minor prophets is Billy K. Smith, Associate Professor of Old Testament and Hebrew, New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary. The author has attempted to show what the message of each book meant for the times in which the prophets lived and then to indicate what these books have to say to twentieth-century men and women.

Professor Smith appears to espouse the interpretation of those scholars who use the historical-critical method. Passages in Hosea, Joel, Amos, Micah, and Jonah which the New Testament understood as being prophetic of the Messianic age are not accepted as such. For Smith, Joel and Obadiah are not the earliest prophetic writings: Joel is assigned to a time around 400 B.C., and Obadiah was composed after the fall of Jerusalem (587 B.C.). Jonah was written in the fifth century to counteract the narrowminded stance taken by Nehemiah and Ezra against mixed marriages. The Book of Jonah is not an historical account, says Smith: "He [i.e., the author] used the historical, nationalistic Jonah to represent the narrowness, intolerance, and exclusiveness of the returned exiles" (p. 138). The author claims that the smallest book in the Old Testament, Obadiah, has interpretative problems way out of proportion to its size. This commentary gives more evidence for the permeation of the historical-critical method into the seminaries of the Southern Baptist Convention.

Raymond F. Surburg

**DECIDE FOR YOURSELF. HOW HISTORY VIEWS THE BIBLE.** By Norman L. Geisler. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, 1982. 115 pages.

Dr. Geisler, Professor of Systematic Theology at Dallas Theological Seminary, deals with an important theological issue, which has divided the Protestant world for quite some time. What is the origin of the Bible? To what extent is it inspired? Does inspiration preclude the possibility of error? Since the publication of the two books by Lindsell in 1976 and 1979, the question of the nature of the Bible has spawned numerous volumes representing diametrically opposed positions. In this ten-chapter book the author has presented by means of quotations the views of the early fathers, the medieval fathers, the

Reformers, the fundamentalists, neo-orthodoxy, the liberals, the evangelicals, and the neo-evangelicals. The opening chapter gives the key Bible verses that are crucial for the establishment of the Bible's own teachings about itself.

Geisler sets forth the views of the different schools of thought with a minimum amount of editorial comment, encouraging the reader to decide for himself. The position that the author would advocate is the one given in chapter 7, which affirms that the Bible was verbally inspired by God even to the point of modern precision. This would be in agreement with the stance of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod as stated in its *publica doctrina*. Those who have been impressed by C.S. Lewis and consider him a sound Biblical theologian should read chapter 9 (pp. 91ff.), where Geisler has shown from the writings of Lewis that the British apologist cannot be classified as having held a view of the Bible that was faithful to its claims. This book should be useful in pointing up the theological differences which characterize the present theological scene.

Raymond F. Surburg

**A READER'S HEBREW-ENGLISH LEXICON OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. VOLUME 2: JOSHUA - 2 KINGS.** By Terry A. Armstrong, Douglas I. Busby, and Cyril F. Carr. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, 1982. 102 pages.

This book is volume 2 of what is planned to be a four-volume set, designed to help students of the Old Testament to translate rapidly. The authors hope that it will give Hebrew students the same kind of help as Kubo's *Reader's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* gives New Testament students. *The Reader's Lexicon* saves the reader time in supplying him the lexical information needed for accurate translation. Words that occur fifty times or less in the Old Testament are listed verse by verse in the order of their occurrence. Those vocables that occur more than fifty times are given in an appendix. The definition of the words are derived from Brown, Driver, and Briggs (*Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*), but the publisher informs us that they have also been checked for meaning in context. The number at the end of the entry gives the page number in BDB where the definitions may be found. *The Reader's Lexicon*, besides listing the meaning of given words, also gives the respective frequencies both in a given book and in the whole of the Old Testament. Gerhard Lisowsky's *Konkordanz zum Hebraischen Alten Testament* has been utilized for the verb, noun, and adjective frequencies. For words in other categories the authors depended upon Solomon Mandelkern's *Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae Hebraicae*.

The authors believe that *A Reader's Lexicon* as an exegetical tool will permit its users (1) to estimate accurately the work involved in any given word study they might wish to pursue, (2) to find easily the correct page of the standard Hebrew lexicon of the Old Testament for further investigation. The three authors, all graduates of Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, are providing a valuable tool for Hebrew language study.

Raymond F. Surburg

**CHI RHO COMMENTARY SERIES. PSALMS.** By J.T.E. Renner. Lutheran Publishing House, Adelaide, Australia, 1980. 191 pages.

The Chi Rho Commentary series has been initiated by lecturers at Luther Seminary, North Adelaide, Australia, and sponsored by the Lutheran Church of Australia. H.P. Hamann, V.C. Pfitzer, and J.T.E. Renner are the editorial committee chosen to supervise this project. It is planned to publish two

commentaries a year. Thus far the following commentaries have appeared: Galatians by Hamann, Hosea by Renner, Hebrews by Pfitzer, James-Jude by Hamann.

The Chi Rho Psalms Commentary does not contain a discussion of all the 150 psalms, but a selection of fifty of them. The text used in this commentary is the Revised Standard Version. Each psalm is dealt with according to the following pattern: text, form, time of writing, exposition according to paragraph units, and theological thrust. Renner often reflects the theological position of German higher-critical scholarship, having earned his doctorate at Heidelberg.

The psalm superscriptions are said to be later additions, although it should be noted that the present Massoretic text treats them as an integral part of the psalm. The identification of the author does contribute to the correct interpretation of a psalm. In following Hermann Gunkel, C. Westermann, H.J. Kraus, Renner has incorporated interpretations which contradict the New Testament. The Psalms, according to these German scholars, do not contain Messianic predictive passages; the Messianic psalms are simply considered to be royal psalms. Renner does refer to the fact that the New Testament writers quoted from various psalms and saw Christ in them, but that, according to Renner, was not the intent of the original writer. Thus, the New Testament authors reinterpreted these psalms and found in them what they wished. Here is a different kind of hermeneutics than that followed by Luther, Reu, Lenski, Maier, Kretzmann, Stoeckhardt, and many other Lutheran exegetes, who rejected the historical-critical method as it existed when they lived and wrote.

Everard Leske, in the preface, states that the writers chosen to write the Chi Rho commentaries accept "without reservation the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, as a whole and in all their parts, as the divinely inspired, written, and inerrant Word of God, and as the only infallible source and norm for all matters of faith, doctrine, and life" (Constitution of the Lutheran Church of Australia) and stand under a personal commitment to the Lutheran Confessions. This confessional commitment supposedly enables the authors to use the best of the modern biblical scholarship, but also frees them from the errors and excesses of biblical criticism which are abroad today even in popular commentaries. How does rejecting the New Testament's interpretation of Old Testament Messianic passages qualify as being in harmony with the inerrancy of the New Testament? It would appear to this reviewer that this commentary has not escaped the errors of the historical-critical method.

Raymond F. Surburg

**DANIEL. THE DAILY STUDY BIBLE SERIES.** By D.S. Russell. Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1981. 234 pages.

*The Daily Study Bible* on the New Testament, written by William Barclay, was found to be very popular in Great Britain. Its popularity prompted the Saint Andrew Press of Edinburgh to extend it to the Old Testament. The General Editor is John C.L. Gibson. The same pattern found in the New Testament series has been adopted for the Old Testament. The publishers contend that this study Bible is invaluable for group discussion as well as for private study.

D. S. Russell, former Principal of Rawdon College and Joint Principal of Northern Baptist College of Manchester, England, is the author of the volume on Daniel, whose composition Russell places in the second century B.C. The author of the Book of Daniel was not the prophet Daniel but some anonymous writer who wished to encourage the persecuted Jews in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes to resist the Hellenization attempts of the Syrian monarch. This

commentary sets forth the higher-critical stance on the Book of Daniel which can be found in any of the liberal commentaries cited on pages 233-234 of Russell's bibliography. One conservative commentary is mentioned, namely, that of Edward Young. Although Robert Dick Wilson, Boutflower, Young, Yamauchi, Whitcomb and others have answered the various objections that have been raised relative to the problems found by critical scholarship, these answers are ignored and the same old standard objections are repeated and presented as unanswerable. The Messianic interpretation of Daniel 7:13-24 and 9:25-27 are rejected.

One can, however, agree with the assertion of Russell that "Daniel is a fascinating book which speaks as profoundly to our day as when it was first written . . . its message declared unequivocally that the sovereign Lord God was in control not only of history but also of the end of history." The Book of Daniel offers trust, hope, and reassurance for God's people in any century.

Raymond F. Surburg

**THE TRANSLATION DEBATE: WHAT MAKES A BIBLE TRANSLATION GOOD?** By Eugene H. Glassman. InterVarsity Press, Downers Grove, 1981. 131 pages. \$4.25.

The debate which this book discusses is the old question as to whether the Scriptures should be rendered as a translation or as a paraphrase. The entire thesis of this book can be summarized from two sentences on pages 21 and 22: "I do not believe that translation and paraphrase are either undesirable or alternatives. . . . About translation and paraphrase I would also ask whether the question is one of either/or or rather one of both/and. I am convinced that the latter is the correct point of view." The author of this little book points out that ever since the days of Jerome anyone who attempted a translation of the Scriptures was subject to severe criticism. Jerome, Tyndale, and the translators of the King James Version were severely criticized in their day for their rendering of the Scriptures into another language. Therefore, the debate is not a modern phenomenon. The author points out that Luther's principles of translation involve a number of points which we today call paraphrase. He also states that Etienne Dolet's principles of translation (Luther's contemporary) are still applicable today. Glassman is himself well acquainted with the problems involved in translation, for he has assisted in the revision of the Bible in Urdu, a Hindustani language spoken in West Pakistan.

Either Glassman is unaware of Beck's *An American Translation* or purposely avoided it. Nor, oddly enough, does he discuss *The New King James Bible*. Though this book was published in 1981, perhaps Glassman wrote it before the NKJB was published in 1979. It would seem that Glassman's favorite translation is that of J. B. Phillips. He says on page 30: "Clearly Phillips has produced one of the most readable and meaningful versions of the New Testament in present-day English." The problem with this statement is that hardly anyone any longer uses or refers to Phillips' translation. There is much food for thought in this little book. Scholar and layman alike can read it with great benefit. It is recommended, although we don't agree with everything which Glassman says. The best basic principles for good translation are still the Lutheran rules of interpretation. Glassman does not mention these principles.

Harold H. Buls

CHRIST ABOVE ALL, THE MESSAGE OF HEBREWS. By Raymond Brown. InterVarsity Press, Downers Grove, Illinois, 1982. 272 pages. Paperback. \$5.95.

First of all the reader must be informed that this Raymond Brown, principal of Spurgeon's College, London, is not the same man as Raymond E. Brown, S.S., the Roman Catholic scholar who authored the two volumes of the Gospel of John in the Anchor Bible series. The author of this volume on Hebrews (in "The Bible Speaks Today" series), a simple but thorough exposition, not a commentary in the traditional sense, is plainly Calvinistic in his theology. It is clear that he is conservative in his theology and wants nothing to do with the negative work of the high critics.

Both pastor and layman, if warned about the Calvinism can read this book with profit. Brown writes in his preface: "It is the clear, Christocentric message of this letter which makes it an extremely important document for our time." He goes along with Luther in saying that probably Apollos was the author of this book. Brown wants nothing to do with modern religious pluralism and insists on the necessity of God's salvation in Christ. He writes (page 48): "There is more about Christ's ministry on earth in this letter than in any other New Testament book outside the gospels." He is constantly saying in this volume that mere religious conviction is not enough because Christ's sacrifice is the only means for the salvation of mankind. He warns the frustrated and disappointed in our society about turning to the cults and eastern religions for answers. He reminds us that "adversity is rarely a vicious enemy; it is often a valuable ally. It reminds us of the imperishable things which matter most of all" (page 193).

This does not mean that we subscribe to everything in the book. With reference to Hebrews 10:14 Brown says: "Salvation is a continuing process; we are being made holy." Hebrews 10:10-18, in which section *hagiazo* is a synonym for the Pauline *dikaioo*, is speaking of the universal atonement, not progressive sanctification. Brown does not consider Psalm 8 Messianic (page 55). With reference to Hebrews 5:9-10 Brown quotes Calvin (page 102): "He did this for our benefit, to us the instance and the pattern of His own submission . . . If we want the obedience of Christ to be of advantage to us, we must copy it." This destroys the Gospel in this passage. On page 111 Brown plainly says: "Those who are committed to a Reformed or Calvinistic doctrine of grace rightly emphasize God's sovereignty and have been careful to point out that once a person is saved, he is always saved." Page 139 brings this synergistic observation: "We must constantly renew our trust in him, knowing that he will never fail us." On page 154 he speaks of the limited pardon of Old Testament saints. It was surely not limited. In keeping with this idea he says (page 156): "Under the law one could never be sure of forgiveness." Brown's Nestorianism comes out on page 184: "Now he [Christ] lives in heaven . . . These verses [10:19-22] explain how we must enter the holy place of prayer." Furthermore, this last statement implies that the message itself is not the means of grace.

We have cited sufficient instances to show that, despite many good things in this volume, the theology of this volume is Calvinistic. But it is well written and well outlined. Once in a while it is a good idea for a pastor to read a book which comes from a different persuasion simply to sharpen himself in distinguishing the truly Biblical from that which is not so.

Harold H. Buls

---

THE NEW KING JAMES BIBLE: NEW TESTAMENT. Thomas Nelson, Nashville, Tennessee, 1979. Paperback, \$4.00.

The King James Version still outsells all other English versions of the Bible. But, as everyone knows, during the last forty years a number of translations have been produced and the English-speaking world is in confusion, attempting to determine a single version best suited to all Christian denominations. The King James Version was revised for the third time in 1769. That is the version we know today. The New King James Bible is the fourth revision of the original King James Version. The entire New King James Bible, both Old and New Testaments, was published by Thomas Nelson this year. This review, however, limits itself only to the New Testament. The reviewer will leave the appraisal of the Old Testament translation to others who have more expertise in assessing that part of the New King James Bible.

Anyone who is acquainted with the study of textual criticism is aware of the fact that scholars have changed their minds about the conclusions made by scholars about 1880. The twenty-sixth edition of Nestle's Greek New Testament states (page 47): "The nineteenth century was the age of the uncials; the mid-twentieth century was the age of the papyri — this marked a striking advance over the nineteenth century. Now we are entering the age of the minuscules." No one is saying that we should now go back to the Textus Receptus, but we are closer to this text than we have been for a century. The Greek text of the Textus Receptus is variously called the Byzantine, Koine, or majority text.

The English-speaking world is at a loss because of the plethora of English translations during the last generation. How often people ask: "Which translation of the Bible do you recommend?" Attend a Bible class, even a small one, and you find five or six translations used in the same Bible study. People are at a loss and confused. It is just possible that the NKJB will help bring order out of this chaos. For years an international and interdenominational team of 119 scholars, editors, and church leaders have been working on this updated King James Version. All participating scholars had to sign a document of subscription to the plenary and verbal inspiration of the original autographs of the Bible. And these scholars were aware of the fact that the nineteenth-century text suffers from over-revision. The traditional Greek text is much more reliable than previously supposed. Therefore, this edition of the NKJB comes at a most opportune time.

At John 3:13 the words "even the Son of Man who is in heaven" are preserved. We say "preserved" because, since the beginning of the century, they have been deleted by scholars. Look at Luke 9:54-56, where text critics have deleted three phrases and clauses for one hundred years. In verse 54 "just as Elijah did," in verse 55 "You do not know what manner of spirit you are of," and in verse 56 "For the Son of Man has not come to destroy men's lives but to save them" are all restored. For one-hundred years commentators have agonized over the deletion of these phrases or clauses. The bracketed words at Luke 22:19-20, 22:43, and 23:34 have been restored. Luke 24:12, which Wescott-Hort relegated to the apparatus, has been restored in NKJB as well as in the twenty-sixth edition of Nestle's Greek text. The pericope concerning the adulterous woman in John 8 is included without comment as well as the ending of the Gospel of Mark. At Hebrews 10:34 the reading of the Textus Receptus has been preserved: "For you had compassion on me in my chains."

From this point on we limit our remarks to one entire book so that the reader can examine matters for himself. Galatians is a short book but requires careful work in translation. The translators of the NKJB have done their homework

well — in fact, have improved the KJV in places. At 1:13 the NKJB has “Judaism” where KJV had “the Jews’ religion.” At 3:1 NKJB reads “has been clearly portrayed among you as crucified” where KJV has “hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you.” At 3:9 “faithful Abraham” has been changed to “believing Abraham.” At 5:22 “faith” has been changed to “faithfulness.” At 6:2-5 where KJV reads “burden” twice, the NKJB distinguishes the words “burden” and “load.” At 5:24 “affections and lusts” has been changed to “passions and desires.” At 4:17 “zealously affect” has been changed to “zealously court.” That the old Koine text has been followed is clear from the translations at 3:1 and 5:1. It would seem that at 4:15 the NKJB has outdone the KJV in going back to the Koine text: “Where is then the blessedness you spoke of?” We are glad to see at 4:3 “the elements of the world,” because some modern translations have played havoc with these words.

The archaic language of the KJV has been brought up to date. Words which have changed meaning over the centuries have been replaced by modern words. But the precision of thought and beauty of language found in the KJV have not been sacrificed in the NKJB. Much more could be said but, without burdening the reader with further observations, the NKJB New Testament is heartily recommended.

Harold H. Buls