

## REVIEWS

Dominique Barthélemy. *Studies in the Text of the Old Testament: An Introduction to the Hebrew Old Testament Text Project*. Translated by Stephen Pisano, Peter A. Pettit, Joan E. Cook, and Sarah Lind. Textual Criticism and the Translator 3. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2012. xxxii + 688 pp. (cloth) \$79.50.

Reviewed by Mark A. Hassler, Faculty Associate in Old Testament Studies

In the realm of OT textual criticism, Jean-Dominique Barthélemy (1921–2002) gained widespread acclaim for his work on the Greek Minor Prophets Scroll and his *Devanciers d'Aquila* (xv–xvi). The present work translates from French into English the combined introductions to the first three volumes of Barthélemy's *magnum opus*, *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament* or *CTAT* (*Orbis biblicus et orientalis* 50, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982–92). Because the posthumous fourth volume of *CTAT* (2005) lacks a major introduction, it does not appear in this book (xii). The fifth, final, and forthcoming volume of *CTAT* will cover the Wisdom books (158n15). The Textual Criticism and the Translator series (TCT) by Eisenbrauns also includes Jan de Waard's *A Handbook on Isaiah* (vol. 1, 1997), *A Handbook on Jeremiah* (vol. 2, 2003), and *A Handbook on the Psalms* (vol. 4, forthcoming).

The current contribution, James A. Saunders says, provides “an in-depth review of the whole field of textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible” (xvi). In Emanuel Tov's words, this compilation offers “an almost complete introduction” to OT textual criticism (xii, xv, back cover).

To prepare the reader, the work commences with an “Editor's Preface” by the series editor, Roger L. Omanson (xi–xiii), an “Introduction” by Saunders (xv–xxviii), and a list of “Abbreviations” (xxix–xxxii). The back materials consist of a “Supplement” on “Norms concerning the Height of Columns in the *Sepher Torah*” (583–90), the “*CTAT* Preface” (591–606), a list of “Works Cited” (607–67), an “Index of Authors” (669–75), and an “Index of Scripture” (676–88). The absence of a subject index hampers the searchability.

The book divides into three parts, each part consisting of an introduction to one of the *CTAT* volumes. Part one, translated by Stephen Pisano and Peter A. Pettit, sketches the fascinating history of OT textual criticism from its inception to J. D. Michaelis (1–81), and introduces readers to the Hebrew Old Testament Text Project (HOTTP) of the United Bible Societies (UBS) and the Project's aims (82–141). Part two, translated by Joan E. Cook and Sarah Lind, fills in the background of the five modern versions consulted in *CTAT*, namely, the *Revised Standard Version* (RSV),

the *Bible de Jérusalem* (BJ), the Revised Luther Bible (RL), the *New English Bible* (NEB), and the *Traduction Œcuménique de la Bible* (TOB) (143–225). Part three, translated by Sarah Lind, analyzes the ancient textual sources (227–582), and by doing so, showcases “Barthélemy at his best” (xxvii).

Although *CTAT* has not been published in English, the non-French-speaking audience can engage the provisional five-volume set, *Preliminary and Interim Report on the Hebrew Old Testament Text Project/Compte rendu préliminaire et provisoire sur le travail d'analyse textuelle de l'Ancien Testament hébreu* (UBS, 1973–80). The research by Barthélemy and the HOTTP form the foundation for *Biblia Hebraica Quinta* (BHQ), the diplomatic and critical fifth edition in the *Biblia Hebraica* line. Currently *BHQ* is being released in fascicles, soon to supersede the fourth edition, *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (BHS).

Of the five thousand textual issues addressed in volumes 1–3 of *CTAT*, the HOTTP committee proposes 334 emendations to the MT (276). To their credit, the committee exercises “extreme caution” in proposing conjectural (unattested) emendations (94), primarily because “there is no evidence that [such emendations] functioned as sacred Scripture for a community” (96). As a catalyst to one’s own studies, technicians can compare the list of 176 textual variants from the Qumran Isaiah texts (392–409) to lists published elsewhere (e.g., Ulrich and Flint, *Qumran Cave 1. II, The Isaiah Scrolls*, pt. 2, *Introductions, Commentary, and Textual Variants*, DJD 32, Oxford, 2010).

By studying the writings of Judaeo-Arabic medieval exegetes, Barthélemy was able to show his colleges that “many texts that had been thought unintelligible or corrupt were actually examples of the intricacies of Hebrew grammar and syntax long since forgotten” (xix; cf. xxiv). In a helpful manner he lays out the criteria for evaluating textual forms (89–92, 598–603), and reinforces the importance of viewing textual difficulties diachronically (591–94).

As for drawbacks, the author suggests that ancient authorities *imparted* canonicity to Scripture by human sanction at the Council of Jamnia and other times (229–30). However, evangelicals, such as Gleason Archer, make it clear that God’s people merely *recognized* the documents for what they were—canonical and divinely inspired (*A Survey of Old Testament Introduction*, rev. ed., Moody, 2007, 67–68).

In dealing with the ancient translations, Barthélemy slights the Aramaic Targums and the Syriac Peshitta, much like Tov does in his *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (3rd ed., Fortress, 2012). Whereas the ancient Greek text receives fifty-five pages (412–67) and the Latin Vulgate thirty-eight pages (497–534), the Targums only gets two pages (540–41) and the Peshitta six pages (534–40). To plug the holes, inquiring minds can glean from the fine essays by Philip S. Alexander on the Targums (217–53) and Peter B. Dirksen on the Peshitta (255–97) in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, edited by Mulder and Sysling (Hendrickson, 2004). Concerning the Vulgate, Barthélemy fails to mention the value of Codex Amiatinus (AD 690–716) as a way of bypassing the Catholic corruptions of Pope Sixtus’ *Vulgata Sixtina* (AD 1590) during the Counter Reformation.

These matters aside, the present reviewer commends this tome for Bible translators, textual critics, advanced exegetes, graduate-level textual researchers, and religious academic libraries. The book provides a wealth of material to interact with, regardless of whether practitioners adopt every nuance of Barthélemy's methodologies and trajectories. Notwithstanding the fortes, this volume should not usurp Tov's *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* as the principle textbook for seminary classes on OT textual criticism. Some will find much of Barthélemy's introductions too detailed and technical. Such readers could peruse the more accessible introductions by Brotzman, *Old Testament Textual Criticism: A Practical Introduction* (Baker, 1994), and Wegner, *A Student's Guide to Textual Criticism of the Bible: Its History, Methods and Results* (InterVarsity, 2006).

Craig Blomberg, *Can We Still Believe The Bible? An Evangelical Engagement with Contemporary Questions*. Grand Rapids: Baker-Brazos Publishing, 2014. 287 pp. (paper) \$23.95.

Reviewed by F. David Farnell, Professor of New Testament Studies

Craig Blomberg has written a new work, *Can We Still Believe the Bible?* The publisher promotes this the book in the following terms:

Challenges to the reliability of Scripture are perennial and have frequently been addressed. However, some of these challenges are noticeably more common today, and the topic is currently of particular interest among evangelicals. In this volume . . . Craig Blomberg offers an accessible and nuanced argument for the Bible's reliability in response to the extreme views about Scripture and its authority articulated by both sides of the debate. He believes that a careful analysis of the relevant evidence shows we have reason to be more confident in the Bible than ever before. As he traces his own academic and spiritual journey, Blomberg sketches out the case for confidence in the Bible in spite of various challenges to the trustworthiness of Scripture, offering a positive, informed, and defensible approach (back cover).

He dialogues in questions of textual criticism, canon issues, translations, inerrancy, genre interpretation, and miracles, offering various solutions to various problems that center in these topics. This book is highly commended by Scot McKnight (Northern Seminary), Darrell Bock (Dallas Theological Seminary), Paul Copan (Palm Beach Atlantic University), Craig S. Keener (Asbury Theological Seminary) and Leith Anderson (National Association of Evangelicals). Bock himself encourages the reader to "read and consider anew how to think about Scripture" (ibid).

Blomberg immediately tips his hand regarding the true nature of this work when the dedication page says,

To the faculty, administration, and trustees of Denver Seminary who from 1986 to the present have created as congenial a research environment as a

professor could hope for, upholding the inerrancy of Scripture without any of the watchdog mentality that plagues so many evangelical institutions (v).

This statement reveals the dual nature of this work in that it not only reveals Blomberg's unusual take on inerrancy but is intended to deride those who would dare question Blomberg's positions that he sets forth in the work.

In evaluating this book, several thoughts immediately come to mind. Perhaps the term most summarizing the book is "angry rant" against anyone who would dare disagree with a critical British-trained scholar. The hubris and over-estimation of the writer is a stunning example of Paul's warning in Rom 12:3. Does not the Scripture warn against pride? Very little humility is displayed in this work.

He less than subtly compares "A handful of very conservative Christian leaders who have not understood the issues adequately" as having "reacted by unnecessarily rejecting new developments" (7–8). In this logic, disagreeing with Blomberg or those in the fraternity of critical scholarship means being labeled as ignorant at best or even Nazi-like. He tells of one of his professors warning students to avoid "the far left or the far right" as being related to "Nazism and Communism" (8). Rogers and McKim took a similar position in 1979 when they wrote about the 20<sup>th</sup> century, "In this century both fundamentalism and modernism sometimes took extreme positions regarding the Bible" (Rogers and McKim, *The Authority and Interpretation of the Bible*, Harper and Row, 1979, xxiii). This present reviewer had *deja vue* all over again when he read Blomberg at many places and recalled Rogers' and McKim's similar arguments to Blomberg's.

Discussing inerrancy, he attacks "extremely conservative Christians who continue to insist on following their modern understandings of what should or should not constitute errors in the Bible and censure fellow inerrantists whose views are less anachronistic" (10). Blomberg's escape from anachronism in inerrancy, however, is "genre" (10–11). He relates something that immediately causes the reader to take pause,

Most important, simply because a work appears in narrative form does not automatically make it historical or biographical in genre. History and biography themselves appear in many different forms, and fiction can appear identical to history in form (11).

He affirms, "the way in which the ancients wrote history is clearer now than ever before. Once again the result is that we know much better what we should be meaning when we say we 'believe the Bible,' and therefore such belief is more defensible than ever" (ibid). He attacks "ultraconservatives" who do not abide by his assessment in the following terms, "once again, unfortunately, a handful of ultraconservatives criticize all such scholarship, thinking that they are doing a service to the gospel instead of the disservice that they actually render" (ibid).

He takes issue with The Master's Seminary as a questionable reaction to Biola/Talbot: "founding of the Master's Seminary and breaking away from Biola University and its Talbot Theological Seminary in protest against their retreat from fun-

damentalism” (143). One note, he wrongly identifies Robert Thomas as a “point person” in the creation of TMS, when, in fact he didn’t join TMS until a year after the seminary began. He did this also in 2000 with his book, *Solid Ground* (Leicester: Apollos, 2000) where he publicly attacked The Master’s Seminary, the motives of those involved in its founding, and its president, John MacArthur (*Solid Ground*, 315). In the same work where he bemoaned, “I can hardly imagine such a book [i.e. *The Jesus Crisis*, Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1998] ever being published by a major Christian press in the UK and that “I do think that British evangelicals, however, have better developed mechanisms for formal co-operation and joint scholarship ventures” (*Solid Ground*, 313).

Because of limited space in a review, Chapter 4, “Don’t These Issues Rule Out Biblical Inerrancy” (119–46) and Chapter 5, “Aren’t Several Narrative Genres of the Bible Unhistorical” (147–78) deserve special scrutiny for any one who would affirm belief, and especially inerrancy, in the Bible. Blomberg here addresses the “fundamentalist-modernist controversy.” He claims that the idea of inerrancy as understood by American efforts is largely an American phenomenon: “Other branches of evangelicalism, especially in other parts of the world not heavily influenced by American missionary efforts, tend to speak of *biblical authority, inspiration, and even infallibility*, but not inerrancy” (119). He relates that some have “consciously rejected inerrancy as too narrow a term to apply to Scripture” (*ibid.*). He relates that these misunderstandings about inerrancy emerge especially “among those who are noticeably more conservative or those who are noticeably more liberal in their views of Scripture than mainstream evangelicalism” (*ibid.*). He mentions the following who, in his belief, have misunderstood inerrancy because they are too conservative: “from the far right of the evangelical spectrum, Norman Geisler, William Roach, Robert Thomas, and David Farnell attack my writings along with similar ones by such evangelical stalwarts as Darrell Bock, D. A. Carson, and Craig Keener as too liberal, threatening inerrancy, or denying the historicity of Scripture.” (120).

In response to this, the writer of this review would urge the reader to examine the latest book from Geisler and Farnell, *The Jesus Quest: The Danger From Within* (Xulon, 2014) to make up their own mind as to the interpretative approaches of Blomberg and these scholars, especially in terms of inerrancy (we report, you decide). Blomberg addresses the effect that creeds and confessions of Christendom especially in terms of inerrancy (120–21).

He relates that “[t]here are two quite different approaches [to inerrancy], moreover, that can lead to an affirmation that Scripture is without error” (121). These two approaches are an “inductive approach” that “begins with the phenomena of the Bible itself, defines what would count as an error, analyzes Scripture carefully from beginning to end, and determines that nothing has been discovered that would qualify as errant” (*ibid.*); and the “deductive approach” that begins with the conviction that God is the author of Scripture, proceeds to the premise by definition that God cannot err, and therefore concludes that God’s Word must be without error” (121). He reacts negatively against the deductive approach of “evidentialists” and “presuppositionalists” by noting that these two terms “ultimately views inerrancy as a corollary of inspiration, not something to be demonstrated from the texts of Scripture itself. If the Bible is God-breathed (2 Tim 3:16), and God cannot err, then the Bible must be inerrant.” Hence, the inductive approach to Blomberg requires that the Bible prove that

it is inerrant through critical investigation of the texts themselves rather than the others that just assume the texts are inerrant. Thus, he shifts the burden of proof from the Bible to that of the scholar. It is the critical investigator that must establish whether the text is truly inerrant.

Importantly, Blomberg believes that the real debate on inerrancy is one of “hermeneutics” (125). By his reasoning one could legitimately claim to be an inerrantist but still believe that a particular event in Scripture is really symbolic and not to be taken as literally an event in the time-space continuum (creation in six days, 126). As a result,

Genesis 1 can be and has been interpreted by inerrantists as referring to a young earth, and old earth, progressive creation, theistic evolution, a literary framework for asserting God as the creator of all things irrespective of his methods, and a series of days when God took up residence in his cosmic temple for the sake of newly created humanity in his image. Once again, this is a matter for hermeneutical and exegetical debate, not one that is solved by the shibboleth of inerrancy (126).

One must note, however, that Blomberg reveals his startling differences with inerrancy as defined by ICBI in 1978: “We affirm that the text of Scripture is to be interpreted by grammatico-historical exegesis, taking account of its literary forms and devices, and that Scripture is to interpret Scripture. We deny the legitimacy of any treatment of the text or quest for sources lying behind it that leads to relativizing, dehistoricizing, or discounting its teaching, or rejecting its claims to authorship.” Here Blomberg’s position is neither grammatical, historical, nor literal, for he argues, “defenders of inerrancy do not reflect often enough on what it means to say that non-historical genres are wholly truthful” (128). He also reflects a *deja vue* mantra of Rogers and McKim who wrote in 1979, “But often without realizing it, we impose on ancient documents twenty-first century standards that are equally inappropriate.” Rogers and McKim, said, “To erect a standard of modern, technical precision in language as the hallmark of biblical authority was totally foreign to the foundation shared by the early church” (Rogers and McKim, xxii).

The practical result is that genre can be used to deny anything in the Bible that the interpreter finds offensive as a literal sense. The allegorical school did such a thing, the gnostics did it to Scripture, and now Blomberg applies his updated version of it with genre being applied to hermeneutics. Blomberg’s use of genre, to this present review, smacks of an eerie similarity to Rogers’/McKim’s deprecation of literal interpretation when they noted Westerners’ logic that viewed “statements in the Bible were treated like logical propositions that could be interpreted quite literally according to contemporary standards” (Rogers and McKim, viii).

In Chapter 5, “Aren’t Several Narrative Genres of the Bible Unhistorical,” his use of hermeneutics continues to be the means by which he can redefine what a normal definition of inerrancy would be, and he uses it to deny the plain, normal sense of Genesis 1–3 (150), while advocating that we must understand the author’s intent in such passages, with the key question from Article 13 of ICBI, “standards of truth

and error that are alien to its usage or purpose.” Applying a completely wrong understanding of this clause of ICBI as well as the original intent of the founders of ICBI, Blomberg advocates the idea that “the question is simply one about the most likely literary form of the passage” (150). From there, he proceeds to allow for non-literal interpretations of Genesis 1–3 that are, in his view, fully in line with inerrancy, e.g. Adam and Eve as symbols for every man and woman (152), evolutionary and progressive creation (151–53), a non-historical Jonah (160), the possibility of three Isaiah’s (162), Daniel as apocalyptic genre rather than prophetic (163–64), fully embracing of midrash interpretation of the Gospels as advocated by Robert Gundry as not impacting inerrancy (165–68), as well as pseudepigraphy as fully in line with inerrancy in NT epistles under the guide of a “literary device” or “acceptable form of pseudonymity” (168–72). He argues that we don’t know the opinions of the first-century church well-enough on pseudepigraphy to rule it out:

[B]arring some future discovery related to first-century opinions, we cannot pontificate on what kinds of claims for authorship would or would not have been considered acceptable in Christian communities, and especially in Jewish-Christian circles when the New Testament Epistles were written. As a result, we must evaluate every proposal based on its own historical and grammatical merits, not on whether it does or does not pass some pre-established criterion of what inerrancy can accept (172).

Several summaries after reading Blomberg’s work are in order. First, under the logic of Blomberg, one would wonder if Galatians would not have been accepted by evangelical communities since in it Paul has quite a few charged statements against the Judaizers that to today’s evangelicals might seem unfair, such as,

If I or an angel from heaven preach to you a different gospel than that which you heard, let them be anathema. I am amazed that you are so quickly deserting Him who called you by the grace of Christ, for a different gospel; which is really not another; only there are some who are disturbing you and want to distort the gospel of Christ. But even if we, or an angel from heaven, should preach to you a gospel contrary to what we have preached to you, he is to be accursed! As we have said before, so I say again now, if any man is preaching to you a gospel contrary to what you received, he is to be accursed! For am I now seeking the favor of men, or of God? Or am I striving to please men? If I were still trying to please men, I would not be a bond-servant of Christ” (Gal 1:6–10).

In Gal 5:12 Paul says of those false teachers who advocated circumcision, “I wish that those who are troubling you would even mutilate themselves,” where Paul advocates that the false teachers who proclaimed works in salvation through circumcision should slip with their knife and cut off some important member. In Philippians, Paul calls out two ladies who are bickering with each other by name, “I urge Euodia and I urge Syntyche to live in harmony in the Lord.” In the Pastorals, Paul calls by name heretics and delivers them over to Satan, “Among these are Hymenaeus and Alexander, whom I have handed over to Satan, so that they will be taught not to blaspheme.” In 2 Tim 4:14, “Alexander the coppersmith did me much harm; the Lord will repay

him according to his deeds.” Would Paul’s warning to take every thought captive (2 Cor 10:5) not call for rigorous examination of all evangelical positions that we might be faithful to God’s Word (1 Cor 4:4). What about Jude’s warning about false teaching that “crept in unnoticed” or 2 Peter’s language of no uncertain terms, “But false prophets also arose among the people, just as there will also be false teachers among you, who will secretly introduce destructive heresies, even denying the Master who bought them, bringing swift destruction upon themselves. Many will follow their sensuality, and because of them the way of the truth will be maligned; and in *their* greed they will exploit you with false words; their judgment from long ago is not idle, and their destruction is not asleep” (2 Pet 2:3–4). Would critically trained evangelicals advocate such language as too harsh, too censorious or even Nazi-like? Surely Jesus’ condemnation of the Pharisees in Matthew 23 was within the bounds of evangelicalism today, one would hope at least.

Second, it is not only very poor logic, but also unprofessional to connect evangelicals who are concerned for inerrancy issues with “Nazism and Communism” (7). In light of the Scripture verses quoted above about certain NT books defending the faith, would some critically trained evangelicals call Paul’s concern for the inspiration and inerrancy of the Word in such terms? Surely Paul’s warning (2 Tim 4:2–4) that false teaching would arise would cause these evangelicals to have a concern: “Teach the word; be ready in season and out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort, with great patience and instruction. For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but wanting to have their ears tickled, they will accumulate for themselves teachers in accordance to their own desires, and will turn away their ears from the truth and will turn aside to myths.” Does a seminary education, Ivy League or critically-trained, immunize one from these concerns?

Second, Blomberg shows a remarkable lack of understanding of the ICBI 1978 and 1982 statements, and, at times, clearly is in opposition to them. He does not accept them as originally intended or as a guideline that he will abide.

Third, this book is often little more than an angry rant rather than a scholarly discussion. Blomberg’s anger completely overwhelms his discussion to the point of absolute distraction. His arrogance in his own personal assessment of himself as an evangelical-critical scholar who truly discerns the issue strikes one very negatively.

In conclusion, perhaps a better title for this book should be *Can We Still Believe Evangelical-Critical Scholars? Why?* Some, like Blomberg, say that they believe in inerrancy, but Blomberg’s book leaves much doubt as to whether they really do believe it the way the church has traditionally maintained that doctrine throughout the millennia. Indeed, the present review challenges all to re-read Rogers’ and McKim’s work (1979), as well as Rogers, *Biblical Authority* (1977) to discover startling parallels in many thoughts between their position and that of critical-evangelical scholars like Blomberg today. It is painfully obvious in this book that Paul’s warning of not to be taken captive by philosophy (Col 2:8) has been totally overlooked, ignored and disregarded by Blomberg, as well as Paul’s warning to take every thought captive (2 Cor 10:5).

Gary M. Burge. *Jesus and the Jewish Festivals*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012. 139 pp. (paper) \$14.99.

Reviewed by Gregory H. Harris, Professor of Bible Exposition

Gary M. Burge, professor of New Testament at Wheaton College and Graduate School, has written a book *Jesus and the Jewish Festivals*, part of the publishers "Ancient Context, Ancient Faith Series." Burge writes in a clear, easy-to-read format and his book is well illustrated with beautiful and fitting pictures. The educated layman or woman in the church could easily handle this book. The attempt of the author is to drop the reader down into the world of the Jewish people during Jesus' time so that the Jewish festivals make sense to the modern reader, especially as these feasts factor into the life and ministry of Jesus. Burge presents many valid points that would be beneficial to the reader in better understanding of this often alien setting to many Christians, far removed from these feasts in both time and culture.

After an initial chapter on "The Festivals of Judaism" (15–36), Burge follows the Gospel of John to develop the rest of the book. The book divides thusly: chapter two: "Jesus and the Sabbath" (John 5:1–47), chapter three: "Jesus and the Passover" (John 6:1–71), chapter four: "Jesus and Tabernacles" (John 7–8), chapter five: "Jesus and Hanukkah" (John 10), and chapter six, "Jesus and His final Passover" (John 13–19). The book concludes with a chapter entitled "The Early Christians and the Jewish Festivals" (Acts 1–2; Hebrews 9–10).

While *Jesus and the Jewish Festivals* does have merits to it, it also has significant drawbacks, which require mentioning. Burge's well-established views on eschatology and ethnic Israel show up in three specific areas. First, in keeping with Burge's previously released *Who Are God's People? What Christians Are Not Being Told About Israel and the Palestinians* (Zondervan, 1993), Burge understands that the Jewish people hold no special place in God's plan or program. Consequently, in his introductory chapter on the Jewish feasts he writes along the lines that all cultures had special holidays or seasonal observances, and so did the Jews (which is true), but treats these in the same way as all other cultures without acknowledging or accepting any special relation that Israel has with God (which is not true—for example, among numerous verses: Deut 4:6–8; 32:6–8).

Secondly, while noting Yahweh's original three feasts in Exodus 23 and sometimes citing Leviticus 23 in reference to other Jewish feasts, Burge does not note the eschatological significance that God places within this chapter. In Leviticus 23, Yahweh takes the original three feasts of Exodus 23 but adds and develops them to include not only feasts and occasions to be observed by the nation, but what become eschatological time markers as well. Leviticus 23 could well be entitled "The Appointed Times of Yahweh," since it contains five specific references to this in this chapter. The first two references occur in Lev 23:2: "Speak to the sons of Israel, and say to them, 'The LORD's appointed times which you shall proclaim as holy convocations—My appointed times are these . . .'" followed by the third reference, "These are the appointed times of the LORD" (Lev. 23:4). The fourth reference in this chapter is Lev 23:37: "These are the appointed times of the LORD." The final verse of this chapter concludes, and thus with the initial references cited, brackets all of Leviticus

23: “So Moses declared to the sons of Israel the appointed times of the LORD” (Lev 23:44). Space does not permit elaboration on this, but the first four “appointed times of Yahweh” have already been fulfilled in the person and work of Jesus, such as 1 Cor 5:7: “For Christ our Passover also has been sacrificed.” The final three occurrences—the Feast of Trumpets, the Day of Atonement and the Feast of Booths—do not have a New Testament fulfillment yet and remain unfulfilled prophecy as part of the appointed times of Yahweh, which calls to national repentance, to have the true Day of Atonement, followed by the Feast of Tabernacles with Messiah reigning.

Thirdly, Burge’s eschatological perspective is clearly evident in chapter four, “Jesus and Tabernacles.” Burge barely notes aspects of Zechariah 14 in relation to the Jews and the feast of Tabernacles:

The rabbis in Jesus’ day sought more than light and water in these ceremonies. Zechariah 14 was read during the feast, and there the prophet declared dramatically that God’s light would come and banish darkness forever (Zech. 14:6) and that living waters would flow continuously from the mountain of Jerusalem (14:8).

He further states,

But more was needed in Israel’s life. *Israel needed refreshment not merely through living water but from God’s own Spirit . . .* The water of Zechariah 14 was viewed as a promise of the Holy Spirit (80–81; italics his).

This is all that Burge has from Zechariah 14. Based on his eschatology, what he chose to omit were verses such as Zech 14:1–3, where the LORD will assemble the nations against Jerusalem for war, which will include the Yahweh Himself going out to battle. Zechariah 14:4 prophecies that the Messiah’s feet will stand on the Mount of Olives, and a massive split will occur. Zechariah 14:5 concludes with “Then the LORD, my God, will come, and all His holy ones with Him!” Zechariah 14:9 promises that returned King Jesus “will be king over all the earth; in that day, the LORD will be the only one, and His name the only one.” After Jesus has judged His enemies and established His kingdom on earth comes this specific prophecy regarding the future observances and celebrations of the Feast of Booths/Tabernacles, as Zechariah states,

Then it will come about that any who are left of all the nations that went up against Jerusalem will go up from year to year to worship the King, the LORD of hosts, and to celebrate the Feast of Booths [Tabernacles]. And it will happen that whichever of the families of the earth does not go up to Jerusalem to worship the King, the LORD of hosts, there will be no rain on them (Zech 14:16–17).

These Messianic prophecies—none of which Burge mentions—are just as scriptural and binding and must be fulfilled as any other promise of God and remain as part of the yet-to-be-fulfilled appointed times of Yahweh as it relates to the Feast

of Tabernacles (Lev 23:39–43). If you want to be biblically based, you must include Zech 14:16–17 as part of the significance of “Jesus and Tabernacles” because He will most assuredly be there and the recipient of worship properly due during that time as Lord and King.

Instead of worship of the King of kings in Jerusalem as the last and most blessed appointed time of Yahweh and having any eschatological significance, Burge sees a different significance, concluding his chapter “Jesus and Tabernacles” this way:

The Jewish Feast of Tabernacles is a helpful reminder that thanksgiving needs to be a vital part of our daily lives. In a wonderful essay on the centrality of gratitude for spiritual growth, Stan Guthrie notes how much research now proves that gratitude promotes emotional well-being, our sense of connection with the world, and a transformation in social attitudes. While this is encouraging, Tabernacles does not look at thankfulness with a view to our benefit. Tabernacles promotes gratitude because it reminds us of our ultimate dependence on God and His provisions. It is what the faithful man or woman ought to do. I am reminded of the story of the ten lepers in Luke 17 who were cured by Jesus. Only one turned back to express thanks. It is a story as well as a parable about human life.

At Tabernacles Israel looked back over the sweep of the year and was able to speak not merely a generic word of thanks, but gave specific thanks for the success of a completed agricultural seasons. From barley to sheep to pomegranates, God was given credit for sending goodness to his people. Of course there was labor (but labor without rain is futile). Of course there were human resources, human ingenuity, and time well spent. But a thoughtful person knows the capacities and opportunities we enjoy often should be credited less to ourselves and more to others and to God. Tabernacles says: bring samples of what God has given you to the temple. And with them in hand, wrapped in your personal *lulav*, thank him (81–82).

While these applications have some basis, and the Jews did indeed look backward, Zechariah 14 also looks forward to the day when King Jesus will reign in Jerusalem, and the nations will come up year by year to worship Him and celebrate the Feast of Tabernacles with Him and others. *Jesus and the Jewish Festivals* has merit and helpful points, but it also leaves out significant matters as it relates to prophetic aspects of what God has promised. For the fuller story, read Leviticus 23 and Zechariah 14 which, in plain terms, makes God’s purposes in the feasts clear.

Christopher M. Hays and Christopher B. Ansberry, eds. *Evangelical Faith and the Challenges of Historical Criticism*. London: SPCK and Grand Rapids: Baker, 2013. 241pp. (paper) \$19.78.

Reviewed by F. David Farnell, Professor of New Testament

A recently published work, *Evangelical Faith and the Challenge of Historical Criticism*, offers a salient example of the dangers involved in historical criticism for the orthodox church and its faithfulness to Scripture. Perhaps a better title should be “Evangelical Faith and the Magic of Historical Criticism Demonstrated” since it demonstrates clearly how historical criticism can be used to develop novel views of Scripture through its methodology. The book not only exemplifies the psychological operation that historical criticism conducts among evangelical students who desire to further their education for ministry but also opens these students up to heterodoxy and heresy, as well as highlighting the dangers of historical criticism that is rapidly overwhelming evangelical colleges and seminaries. The book in its essence constitutes a “Trojan Horse” that allows historical criticism to surreptitiously replace centuries of faithful, orthodox understanding of both the Old and New Testament, with aberrations that would not have been espoused by the church from its beginnings.

Written by evangelicals who were trained and influenced at either Wheaton Graduate School or in prestigious British schools (Oxford, Aberdeen, St. Andrews), it constitutes a warning among the evangelical camp that such British-influenced schools like this are rapidly gaining significant influence upon evangelical educational systems and theological positions in America through the hiring of those who are trained in pastoral and higher education from such places.

One editor/author, Christopher Hays, thanks “the British Academy for funding my postdoctoral research, for it was under the aegis of the British Academy that this book came to completion . . . I owe a debt of gratitude to the Warden and Fellows of Keble College, and to the Faculty of Theology and Religious Studies at the University of Oxford” (x). The other editor/author is a doctoral graduate of Wheaton.

The book’s purpose is “a call for conservative interpreters of the Bible to be both critical and evangelical” (17). The book “aims to stimulate evangelicals to engage seriously with the historical critical method by demonstrating that the very fact of such engagement does not jeopardize one’s Christian’s confession” (18). If this is the stated purpose, the book proves the opposite and highlights the central thesis of *The Jesus Quest: The Dangers from Within* (Xulon, 2014). The book also contends that “it is not our intention to offer our pennyworth to the inerrancy debate” (3) so that it attempts to distance itself from the impact its assertions would make on such a cardinal doctrine. Indeed, it wants to ignore the doctrine of inerrancy for a special purpose, “we would like to set aside the subject of inerrancy, especially because evangelicals have been leery of joining historical criticism for another reason: fear of heresy (i.e., fear of beliefs that imperil the legitimacy of one’s claim to Christianity)” (4). They editors argue, “[w]hat this book provides is an accessible and succinct account of the theological consequences of historical-critical scholarship” (9) An examination of its contents reveals that the book only succeeds in what it is not trying to accomplish, i.e. it raises startling, shocking fears about the abdication of evangelicals from the historical position inerrancy and orthodoxy, as well as its presentation of views that may be considered heretical by the orthodox Christian community. It constitutes a *raison d’être* for an immediate, urgent clarion call among evangelicals to re-examine how far the drift from this cardinal doctrine is ongoing as exemplified among its young, future scholars in evangelicalism. The book provides many examples for alarm.

In Chapter 2, Hays and Herring use historical criticism to examine the historicity of Genesis 2–3. The chapter contends that “[i]n the end . . . wherever the debate about the historicity of Adam may end, essential Christian doctrine will remain on sure footing, even though certain features of that doctrine may need to be refined” (20). It argues that Paul’s account of human sinfulness in Romans 5 “does not include original guilt” and that his teaching about Christ’s work does not require originating sin” (45). They also assert that James 1:13–15, along with Romans 5, “propound a hamartiology of concupiscence, without requiring originating sin or original guilt” (46). To the authors, a historical-critical denial of the historicity of Adam’s fall,

would require rejigging of the way that one understands hamartiology and how one reads some specific texts. But sometimes people fail to realize that historical criticism can help ameliorate certain problems created by older doctrinal constructions (49).

The authors assert, “if we were to agree with a historical-critical perspective and deny the historicity of the fall, would we be obliged to deny the existence of concupiscence? That seems quite unlikely” (51). They contend, “original guilt is not an idea endorsed in Scripture, not even in Romans 5” (54). While they label their chapter as an “imaginative and speculative endeavor,” they argue that,

[n]one of this [chapter] is to conclude that Genesis 2–3 must be unhistorical or that original guilt must be false; we have been speculating; imagining, musing. What we do hope to have shown is that a historical criticism reading of Genesis 2–3 does not destroy Christian faith, even if it would challenge some parts of our theological framework” (53–54).

So, the reader is left with the definite impression that whether Adam’s fall was historical is not really pivotal to the Christian faith, i.e. it has no important impact to theology. In Chapter 3, “The exodus: fact, fiction or both?” Ansberry contends,

[H]istorical criticism also indicates that the exodus even may not have occurred in history the way in which it is portrayed in the biblical text. This does not mean that we should despair of our theological convictions that God acted in the exodus, nor does it entail that we cannot be Christians and listen to historical criticism. There is much more middle ground between these two extreme positions. We can still hold to our religious understanding of the exodus’ meaning and countenance a critical assessment of the historicity of the exodus narrative, as long as we maintain that God achieved some sort of deliverance of his people from Egypt.

Whether this deliverance is described in terms of several smaller movements by distinct groups that were conflated into a single theological narrative or conceptualized through Israel’s liberation from Egyptian hegemony within Canaan, something of its historical occurrence is essential to Israel’s identity, her theological vision, as well as Christian orthodoxy. Without some sort of “exodus”

through divine intervention, the grounds for Israel's election, identity and unique relationship with Yahweh are bogus. Without some sort of "exodus" through divine intervention, Israel's future hope of redemption from exile is baseless. In the same way, without some sort of Israelite "exodus" through divine intervention, the Christian hope of release from spiritual bondage and the "Babylon" of this present age are diminished, thinned, attenuated (71).

Yet, even if the "exodus" did not happen in the way Scripture indicates, "[t]he Christian tradition is able to withstand the ahistorical nature of the exodus, since the primary ground of our belief is in God's redemptive action in Christ" (71). Yet, the writer does not explain how if the Old Testament has misreported historically the Exodus, how then does the writer think that the New Testament accurately recorded Christ's redemptive act? The writer contends that "[i]n suggesting that some sort of historical exodus occurred via divine intervention, we have moved beyond the realm of historical inquiry and entered into the realm of faith" (72). Moreover, "we must recognize that direct historical evidence for the exodus does not exist and that the precise historical minutiae of the event will most likely not materialize in our lifetimes . . . our faith is one that is rooted in history; it demands historical-critical inquiry" (ibid). So, the reader is left with the definite impression that whether the Exodus was historical does not really matter to the Christian faith, i.e. it has no important impact to theology.

In Chapter 4, "No covenant before the exile?" Ansberry and Jerry Hwang argue that "reflections on authorship and reappropriation of Deuteronomic covenant suggest that historical-critical research on Deuteronomy can make evangelicals more attuned to its locus of authority as well as to the way in which Deuteronomy's theological ideas have been received by Israel throughout her history" (93). Ansberry and Hwang contend that scholars must make a "decisive move away from modern construals of authorship and authority, which have often hobbled the work of both evangelical scholars and their more skeptical interlocutors" (93–94). Moreover, the "urgent dynamism of the Mosaic voice in Deuteronomy simply cannot be relegated to a single time or place, whether, Mosaic, Josianic or otherwise; nor can the authority of the document be located in a single person." Those evangelicals who contend for the importance Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy have the wrong focus, "[w]hen Deuteronomy's authority as Christian Scripture is located in the content of the document in general and the Holy Spirit's work through authorized tridents in particular, even the most trenchant attacks on its Mosaic authorship fail to usurp its authoritative status or muffle its revelatory voice" (94). To them, such a perspective, "coupled with the canonical posture of Deuteronomy, indicates that historical-critical work on the document does not pose a threat to Orthodox Christianity" (ibid). So, the reader is left with the definite impression that whether Deuteronomy was written by Moses or many authors or in diverse periods of Israel's history does not really pivotal to the Christian faith, i.e. it has no important impact to theology.

In Chapter 5, "Problems with prophecy," Warhurst, Tarrer and Hays argue that while "all evangelicals recognize the importance of prophecy" (95) the Scripture has places where "prophesied events do not occur as foretold" (96). They argue that

“[t]here is no denying that the Old Testament harbours examples of prophetic predictions not materializing in the manner adumbrated by the prophets” (123). They conclude,

[O]ur study has focused on the apparently ‘problematic’ instances of prophecy, it was also quite often the case that things did occur in history as they were foretold. But prophecy can also be a much more flexible phenomenon than that: sometimes fulfillments overflowed what the prophet foretold, all the while remaining congruous with the essential will of God revealed in prophecy (123–24).

They also assert,

[S]ometimes prophecy could be composed “after-the-fact,” not in an effort to deceive, but as an expression of the confidence of God’s people that God has been sovereign over history and that God will indeed deliver them. Once one appreciates how prophecy professes to work, the apparently trenchant problems in the biblical record of prophecy and fulfillment/failure melt away (ibid).

So, the reader is left with the definite impression that accurate fulfillment of prophecy is not really pivotal to the Christian faith, i.e. it has no important impact to theology.

In Chapter 6, “Pseudepigraphy and the canon,” Ansberry, Strine, Klink, and Lincicum argue that pseudepigraphy in the Old and New Testament is quite possible. To them, evangelicals must understand that,

ancient conceptions of authorship and authority provide a framework through which to understand the phenomenon and theological implications of pseudepigraphy in the canonical Pentateuch (129).

Furthermore, those in the modern era must understand the “environment of the ancient world...[w]hen the Pentateuch is understood within the conceptual environment of the ancient world, questions concerning its authorship appear anachronistic” (130). Furthermore, “[w]hen the Pentateuch is understood within the conceptual environment of the ancient world, questions concerning its authorship appear on several accounts” (ibid). Two especially are cited: first, the Pentateuch is an anonymous work and second, the striking lack of interest in authorship throughout the Hebrew Bible, as well as the absence of the term ‘author’ in the Classical Hebrew language, indicates that the search for the ‘author’ of the Pentateuch is misguided” (ibid).

One must understand “ancient conceptions of authorship” where “author” represented not necessarily an individual as in modern conceptions of the notion, but “the ancient oriental world valued the group as well as collective tradition over autonomous, individual expression” (136). To these evangelicals, “‘authorship’ does not represent a claim of literary origins; it represents a claim of authoritative, revelatory tradition” (146). This is key. Accordingly, they allow for the possibility of three Isaiahs, the “product of multiple authors” (136), the Gospel of John as a collective work of the “Johannine ‘community’” (146), as well as some in the Pauline group

(e.g. the Pastorals, 147–56). They argue that “the historical evidence suggests that new models are needed for evangelicals to make sense of pseudepigraphal compositions that may at some level have an intention to deceive, but still function as canonical Scripture” (154). Furthermore, “[t]o claim that pseudepigraphy is irreconcilable with infallibility can arguably only result in subjecting Scripture to our own autonomous standard of perfection, instead of seeking the perfection Scripture has in a historically a posteriori act of discipleship” (155). Their conclusion is quite startling:

If the biblical documents locate authority in the context and canonization of the inspired text rather than their “author(s)”, then historical criticism helps us to problematize modern conceptions of authority and to understand the nature of the biblical text. And if ancient perceptions of authorship and the realities of text production were more fluid than are modern conceptions, then historical criticism opens new horizons for thinking about the way in which God worked through the Holy Spirit to compose and codify the biblical text (156).

Furthermore, “the acceptance of pseudepigraphy or pseudonymity in the biblical canon neither undermines the principal tenets of the Christian faith nor operates outside the boundaries of Christian orthodoxy.” So, the reader is left with the definite impression that pseudepigraphy or pseudonymity does not really matter to the Christian faith, i.e. it has no important impact to theology.

In Chapter 7, Daling and Hays contend that “the discipline of historical Jesus scholarship does not lead inevitably to heresy, so much as it engages both believing and non-believing scholars in debates of real significance for the beliefs of the Church.” They contend, “Christian theology ought not to resist the idea that Jesus was ignorant of certain things” (Mark 13:32; Matt 24:36). Accordingly, “Jesus was a human, and thus experienced human ignorance, not as an ontological defect but as a constitutive feature of his humanity.” Again,

[W]e should also ask if it is theologically necessary that Jesus possessed or disclosed awareness of his own divinity. Probably not. It is imaginable that Jesus could have been God without ever knowing it. What’s more, even without a divine self-awareness, one could conceivably still affirm that Jesus was fully obedient and faithful to God unto death, accomplishing whatever was necessary for our salvation without knowing precisely how or why he was doing it (164).

They are to be commended that they affirm the virgin birth, “the present authors would eschew” its rejection (174), as well as the resurrection of Jesus, “the facticity of Jesus’ unique and divinely effected resurrection from the dead in space and time is the defining trait, the *conditio sine qua non*, of the Christian faith” (180). One is left wondering, however, at their logic in this work. That is, why if God was responsible for the miracle of the virgin birth as well as the historical resurrection of Jesus, could He not guard in His faithfulness other parts of His Word in the Old and New Testaments from such dubious assertions found in the rest of this work about history, authorship, prophecy, and faithfully preserving his Word from error. These writers seem rather arbitrary in their picking and choosing!

Finally, in Chapter 9, Ansberry and Hays, sum up their work. They contend that “historical criticism is not a dead-zone, irradiated and left lifeless by atheistic historiography” (204). They admit that “[t]his book does not doubt that historical criticism can be dangerous fuelled by atheistic hostility or over-weaning skepticism, some historical critics have suggested devastating theses” (205). This reviewer suggests that these young evangelicals have failed to apprehend that they too have fallen into an alarming pattern of thought. The trap of historical criticism has been sprung on them. The form of “historical criticism” they present is just as dangerous for evangelicalism. They argue that “conservative Christian seminaries and academics can cease their embargo of historical criticism” (206) based on their book’s presentation. The book, however, fails significantly here. It actually is a proverbial “poster child” for avoiding historical criticism. These writers accept historical criticism in a vacuum away from its philosophical presuppositions and historical antecedents. They contend, “this book has aimed to show that historical criticism can provide the Church with exciting and significant resources, especially once that criticism has been harnessed by the perspective of faith” (ibid). This statement demonstrates that these young writers exhibit incredible naïveté. They do not understand history. They do not remember or regard evangelical history; they do not realize the ever-present dangers historical criticism possesses (James 3:1). The whole book constitutes a warning to evangelicals that historical criticism has not changed; no modification of it is redeemable for evangelical study. A key question remains, Do these young evangelicals believe that they have found a form of “historical criticism” that should be acceptable to evangelicals in their presentation? If so, that is also incredible hubris.

Walter C. Kaiser, Jr., *Mission in the Old Testament: Israel as a Light to the Nations*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2012. xix + 107 pp. (paper) \$16.99.

Reviewed by Mark A. Hassler, Faculty Associate in Old Testament Studies

At first glance, certain passages like Acts 13:46–47 can make it seem like the gospel message was reserved for the Jews until Paul’s time (xii). But as the author contends (xiii–xiv), the good news in the OT extends even to the Gentiles. The gospel is for everyone of every era.

Kaiser is president emeritus and Colman M. Mockler Distinguished Emeritus Professor of Old Testament at Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary in South Hamilton, Massachusetts. In building his case, Kaiser points to various OT passages, peoples, and periods. Three biblical passages form the OT’s core teaching regarding evangelistic outreach to the Gentiles: Deuteronomy 28, Gen 12:1–3, and Exod 19:5–6 (18). The Great Commission (Matt 28:18–20; Mark 16:15) finds its OT counterpart in Gen 12:3 (xi).

Missionary accounts come from Melchizedek (38), Jethro (38–39), Balaam (39), Rahab (39–40), Ruth (40), the captured Israeli girl and Naaman (40–48), Jonah and the Ninevites (65–71), select Major and Minor Prophets (71–74), select psalms: 67, 96, 117 (28–34), and Paul as the apostle to the Gentiles (75–82). The book of

Jonah possesses a missionary purpose: to prompt God's people to evangelize their enemies (69–70).

"An Excursus on Enoch" (4) addresses the prophet Enoch (Jude 14–15), but the Prophet Abel goes untreated (Matt 23:35; Luke 11:50–51; Heb 4:11). Also untreated are the conversions of the sailors on Jonah's ship and the (probable) conversion of Nebuchadnezzar. Kaiser bypasses the salvation speeches by ancient Gentiles outside of Israel, namely, Job (9:30–35; 16:18–22; 19:23–27) and Elihu (33:23–28). He does not explore the possibility that the Gentile Abram became a believer by reading the gospel in Job, the oldest book of Scripture (cf. Gal 3:8).

Some published English translations obscure the meaning of missionary texts like Gen 4:1 (3), 9:27 (5), 12:3 (11), and 2 Sam 7:19 (23–24). In the four servant songs (Isa 42:1–7; 49:1–6; 50:4–9; 52:13–53:12), Kaiser construes the servant of the Lord as the Messiah *and* Israel collectively (56–62), just as he does with the seed of Abraham in 41:8 (57). In 42:1, he says, the servant will bring true religion (not "justice" NAU) to the nations (59–60).

Concerning the interpretation of Scripture, Kaiser advocates an inaugurated eschatology (63). The reference to "the Hebrew perfect tense" (10) differs from the view that Hebrew verbs derive their tense solely from the context, as per Chisholm, *From Exegesis to Exposition* (86) and Waltke and O'Connor, *IBHS* (347).

The second edition adds "Study and Discussion Questions" (83–86) for each of the book's eight chapters. The back cover advertises "two new chapters," but the "Preface to the Second Edition" (ix) lists three new chapters: Chapter 1, "God's Preparation for Missions in Genesis 1–11" (1–7); Chapter 2, "God's Plan for Missions in the Patriarchal and Mosaic Eras" (9–18); and, Chapter 3, "God's Promised Person for All—The Davidic King of Promise" (19–26). Kaiser does not update his research, as evidenced by the lack of sources in the footnotes published after the first edition (2000). The book retains its one table (57).

In the back, the "Glossary" (87–89) with its twenty-two items remains basically unaltered. The ninety bibliographic entries of the original edition become 113 in the current "Bibliography" (91–97). Twenty-four resources were added; one was eliminated. From the last decade (2002–12) Kaiser adds only four works to the bibliography, two of which are his: *The Promise-Plan of God: A Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments* (Zondervan, 2008) and *Recovering the Unity of the Bible: One Continuous Story, Plan, and Purpose* (Zondervan, 2009). A set of indexes concludes the volume: "Scripture Index" (99–102), "Subject Index" (103–6), and "Author Index" (107).

Whether a budding believer or seasoned saint, one can profit from this edifying and enjoyable read. When it comes to missiology, we dare not neglect the OT in our doctrinal formulation.

Andreas J. Köstenberger, L. Scott Kellum, and Charles L. Quarles. *The Lion and the Lamb: New Testament Essentials from The Cradle, the Cross, and the Crown*. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2012. xviii + 445 pp. (cloth) \$39.99.

Reviewed by Keith Essex, Associate Professor of Bible Exposition

As the subtitle indicates, *The Lion and the Lamb* is an abridgement of *The Cradle, the Cross, and the Crown* (see *MSJ* 24, No. 1 [Spring, 2013]: 158–59). The original NT introduction was over 900 pages and contained not only basic information, but also intermediate and advanced knowledge. By contrast, *The Lion and the Lamb* “focuses on introductory-level core knowledge for each book of the NT” (xvi). While the first volume was designed for seminary-level students, the present book is planned to be a resource for undergraduate students and beginning readers of the NT.

The content of *The Lion and the Lamb* mirrors that in *CCC*. Only the final chapter in *CCC*, “Unity and Diversity in the New Testament,” has been completely dropped from the new volume. The other 20 chapters of the present book correspond to the original. The first two chapters (Part One) lay the foundation dealing with (1) the nature and scope of Scripture, and (2) the political and religious background of the NT. The authors’ rationale for these beginning chapters is clearly stated. “It is vital for all students of Scripture to have a proper understanding of the *doctrine* of Scripture, so chapter 1 discusses the formation of the NT canon, its inspiration and inerrancy, the preservation and transmission of the Bible over the centuries, and issues pertaining to the translation of Scripture” (xiv). Further, “As we approach our study of the NT, we need to acquaint ourselves with the political and religious background of the NT (the contents of chap. 2). This is an ingredient not always found in standard NT introductions, an omission that when teaching NT survey courses in the past has sent us scrambling for other resources to prepare our students adequately for entering the world of the NT” (xiv). The authors affirm that Scripture’s self-attestation leads to the conclusion that Scripture is inspired and inerrant. “This follows both from specific scriptural references regarding the nature of Scripture as entirely trustworthy and is also required by the character of God as the ultimate source of Scripture” (16).

Chapters 3–20 progressively move through the NT books themselves. Part Two (chapters 3–7) begins with a chapter on Jesus followed by introductions to each of the four Gospels. Part Three (8–15) starts with a chapter on the book of Acts, then a chapter introducing Paul before the Pauline letters are discussed. Part Four (16–20) introduces Hebrews through Revelation. As in *CCC*, each NT book is discussed as to its history, literary structure, and theological themes. The historical section has been pared down by omitting challenges to the book’s traditional positions concerning authorship, date, and audience. Omitted in the literary discussions are treatments of literary rearrangements and partition theories. However, the book outlines and unit-by-unit discussions are verbatim from *CCC*. Finally, the theological themes have been trimmed. The volume concludes with an abridged glossary and name, subject, and Scripture indexes. Two additions to *CCC* are Points of Application to the end of each chapter dealing with the biblical books and sixteen pages of maps taken from the *Holman Bible Atlas* at the end of the book.

*The Lion and the Lamb* is a highly recommended introductory survey of the NT. It will be most helpful to those teachers familiar with the discussion in *The Cradle, the Cross, and the Crown*. However, it will also prove beneficial for those who do not know the original. When evaluated against other NT surveys (especially Gundry and Elwell & Yarbrough), this new work has a more traditional design. The visuals and graphics are meager in comparison. However, the content here is “meaty” and well presented; this is the book’s best feature.

Scott M. Manetsch. *Calvin's Company of Pastors: Pastoral Care and the Emerging Reformed Church, 1536–1609*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013, 428 pp. (cloth) \$66.60.

Reviewed by Jonathan Moorhead, Samara Center for Biblical Training (Samara, Russia)

Scott Manetsch is Professor of Church History and Christian Thought at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School. He has written numerous articles on Reformation history, as well as publishing his dissertation, *Theodore Beza and the Quest for Peace in France, 1572–1598* (Brill, 2000).

In 1994 William G. Naphy lamented the nature of original resource study by contemporary scholars on Geneva. He writes, “research at the state archives in Geneva has shown that the sources commonly used represent only a small fraction of the total amount of material available for studying the social and political context of Calvin’s situation in Geneva.” Furthermore, “Suffice it to say that an examination of the works used by most scholars shows an almost total reliance, for secondary sources, on the works of nineteenth-century historians such as Roget and Galiffe” (*Calvin and the Consolidation of the Genevan Reformation* [Westminster John Knox Press], 2).

Manetsch has taken up this challenge and through the course of a decade immersed himself in the original resource materials of Geneva. He has produced fresh insight into the nature of pastoral ministry in Geneva from 1536 to 1609. As the definitive date for Geneva’s religious reformation and the beginning of Calvin’s ministry in the city, 1536 is the starting date for the author’s study. This is then concluded in 1609, which is four years following the death of Calvin’s successor, Theodore Beza. Enriched by these archives, Manetsch writes, “The central purpose of this book is to examine the pastoral theology and practical ministry activities of this cadre of men who served as pastors in Geneva’s churches during nearly three-quarters of a century from 1536 to 1609” (2). Of particular interest to the author is the extent of change that took place after the death of John Calvin.

One of the great benefits of exposing his audience to Geneva’s archives is that they experience a lively account of day-to-day life in Geneva from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. There are vivid and specific details on the challenges that faced Geneva’s pastors, and how they responded. Manetsch assiduously explains the reform of Geneva, the Company of Pastors, how Genevans thought of the pastoral vocation, how pastors were expected to run their households, the liturgical practice of the Genevan churches, the nature of preaching, how the pastors gave moral oversight, shepherded their flock, and how publishing was a significant ministry of the pastors.

Concerning the evolution of ministry from 1536 to 1609, the author concludes that the pastors largely maintained the traditions of the church during Calvin’s tenure until 1609. While the pastors were not mindless followers of Calvin, and although there were changes and advancements, the pastors in large part preserved Calvin’s theological vision. Manetsch also gives a corrective on the theological trajectory of Calvin’s successors. He writes, “Scholars of the reformed tradition have sometimes

pitted Calvin against later Calvinists, arguing that Protestant ‘scholastic’ theologians such as Beza, Daneau, Chandieu, and La Faye were guilty of adopting a rationalistic scheme of theology that fundamentally betrayed the doxological and Christological focus of Calvin’s theological work. My study of the books published by Geneva’s ministers from 1536 to 1609 challenges this thesis” (302).

Considering the depth of research, breadth of topics and engaging style of writing, it would be hard to improve upon Manetsch’s book. It is an impressive example of scholarship that should be emulated by future historians. The reader should understand that the work is more academic in nature, so it does not read as a practical guide for contemporary pastoral ministry. For those interested in Reformation studies, particularly that of Geneva, this book is highly recommended.

Michael J. McClymond and Gerald R. McDermott. *The Theology of Jonathan Edwards*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012, 757 pp. (cloth) \$52.49.

Reviewed by Jonathan Moorhead, Samara Center for Biblical Training (Samara, Russia)

Michael J. McClymond and Gerald R. McDermott are two of the world’s leading scholars on Jonathan Edwards. McClymond is Associate Professor of Theological Studies at Saint Louis University, and McDermott is Jordan-Trexler Professor of Religion at Roanoke College. They have both written extensively on Edwards, and are qualified to write such a groundbreaking work. Although Yale is partnering with the Eerdmans Publishing Company to produce an encyclopedia on Jonathan Edwards, comprising of 450 entries, *The Theology of Jonathan Edwards* is the most comprehensive treatment of Edwards’s theology currently available in one volume.

The book is comprised of three parts: (1) “Introduction: Historical, Cultural, and Social Contexts;” (2) “Topics in Edwards’s Theology” (with sections on “Methods and Strategies;” “The Triune God, the Angels, and Heaven;” “Theological Anthropology and Divine Grace;” and “Church, Ethics, Eschatology, and Society”); and (3) “Legacies and Affinities: Edwards’s Disciples and Interpreters.” Throughout the work, the authors identify five driving forces behind the theology of Edwards: trinitarian communication, creaturely participation, necessitarian dispositionalism, divine priority, and harmonious constitutionalism (4–6). Behind these five constituent forces lie two of his chief intellectual strategies: (1) “concatenation,” or the search for the interconnectedness of metaphysics, and (2) “subsumption,” in which Edwards’s theology trickled down into all other aspects of theology (11–12).

Taken as a whole, *The Theology of Jonathan Edwards* is a significant contribution to Edwardsean studies. Whereas detailed treatments of his works have been isolated to disparate books, articles, and introductions to the Yale editions of the Works of Jonathan Edwards, this volume contains a detailed treatment of all the significant areas of Edwards’s thought. It also takes advantage of the 73-volume edition of the *Works of Jonathan Edwards* (<http://edwards.yale.edu>).

Of particular interest is how the authors discuss Edwards in relation to the history of Catholic and Orthodox thought. Comparing Edwards' writings on the sacraments and justification to Catholicism, or his thought on divinization with that of the Eastern tradition is thought provoking. However, herein lies a point of caution concerning the book. By imposing these concepts onto Edwards, the reader could interpret Edwards as promoting that which he categorically denied. For example, Edwards was a champion of the doctrine of justification by faith alone, which was the subject of his *Quaestio*, his first published treatise, and the impetus of the initial phase of the First Great Awakening. Yet, Edwards's stress on works and perseverance as the great sign of regeneration cause the authors to assert, "Edwards seems to have rejected or significantly qualified *sola fide* . . ." and instead maintained "conditions" for salvation that were analogous to Catholic views on "merit" (696; cf. 81–82; 392–404; and 722). While Edwards's use of words such as "condition" and "infusion" are understandable with definition in a Protestant context, the authors chose to push for Edwards being a bridge to Catholicism by employing a questionable semantic strategy. A similar course was used for interpreting Edwards's compatibility with the Orthodox view of "divinization." Although the authors note that Edwards never used the term, and likely never read authors espousing the unique qualities of divinization in the Eastern paradigm, they justify Edwards as a bridge to Orthodoxy (albeit under the guise of early modern Neo-Platonism; 413, 423). One may imagine that suggesting Edwards was a bridge to Arminianism would be just as palatable to him as that of Catholicism or Eastern Orthodoxy.

Viewing Edwards as a bridge to the Pentecostal/Charismatic movements was also discussed, with the conclusion that Edwards "would likely have found much to affirm in this global [Pentecostal-Charismatic] movement, as well as much to criticize" (725). Considering the theological basis upon which Edwards evaluated such movements (cf. *Distinguishing Marks and Religious Affections*), it is difficult to imagine him responding to these movements with anything but displeasure.

The authors push the limits of Edwards's thought by affirming his openness to world religions and comparing his thought to neo-orthodox and liberal authors such as Karl Barth and Friedrich Schleiermacher. The authors write, "Edwards's writings are a challenge for contemporary Christian thinkers to reexamine non-Christian religions and to do so without the presumption that this line of inquiry requires them to abandon Christian truth claims or affirmations of Christianity's distinctiveness" (726).

While a majority of the book is stellar in its representation of Edwards's thought, the reader discovers the constituent factors behind the authors' narrative of Edwards's writings by making him a theological bridge to other belief systems. For example, the book concludes with the following scenario: "Imagine a Christian dialogue today that included adherents of ancient churches—Roman Catholic, Orthodox, Coptic—with various modern church bodies—Lutheran, Anglican, Methodist, Disciples of Christ—as well as an ample representation from the newer evangelical and Pentecostal-Charismatic congregations from around the world. If one had to choose one modern thinker—and only one—to function as a point of reference for theological interchange and dialogue, then who might one choose? Our answer

should be clear” (728). If one understands Edwards’s Puritan heritage, and reads extensively from his theological treatises, miscellanies, letters and sermons, this claim is difficult to accept. In short, this is a reinvention of Edwards. One must consider the authors’ own warning, “Studies of Edwards thus reveal as much or more about the interpreter as they do about the interpreted” (720).

Despite the above listed shortcomings, the forty-five chapters of this volume provide the reader with a wealth of information on the staples of Edwards’s theology, such as theocentrism, divine beauty, the sovereignty of God, and the nature of revival. Being the most comprehensive, in-depth, one-volume work on Jonathan Edwards’s theology, it is essential reading for any serious student of Edwards (notwithstanding its size and cost). It is not for the uninitiated, however, as it contains the intricate depths of Edwards’s theology and philosophy.

George M. Schwab. *Right in Their Own Eyes: The Gospel According to the Book of Judges*. The Gospel According to the Old Testament. Phillipsburg, NJ: P & R Publishing, 2011.

Reviewed by Michael A. Grisanti, Professor of Old Testament Studies

This series, the Gospel According to the OT, has three clear aims: to lay out the pervasiveness of the revelation of Christ in the OT, to promote a Christ-centered reading of the OT, and to encourage Christ-centered preaching and teaching from the OT (xi).

George Schwab received his Ph.D. from Westminster Seminary, is a trained biblical counselor, and is an OT professor at Erskine Seminary. The first three chapters of his commentary set the stage for how to understand the book of Judges. He summarizes his goal in this section as exploring “how Judges was formed and shaped over time, how it wants to be interpreted, and what principles should guide the Christian in that effort” (1). Midway through his third chapter, he presents six perspectives that guide him in his interpretation of Judges (34). First, he assumes that the people described in the book really lived and events actually happened. Second, he presents how the text advanced David’s cause, preparing the way for Samuel. Third, he views the book of Judges as a sermon on Deuteronomy. Fourth, he pursues what Judges says about Jesus and His gospel. Fifth, he inquires into how the book should speak to the church today. Sixth, he asks, How does the text anticipate the final judgment and glory that will be revealed in us?

In his focus on what the text of Judges meant, Schwab makes several helpful observations and provides clear visuals (charts and maps). He provides several charts that help him make his point. He correctly affirms that the judges were not national, but regional rulers, some of whom had overlapping reigns. He shows how the book of Judges paves the way for the books of Ruth and Samuel by preparing for a pro-David and anti-Saul environment (exalting the tribe of Judah and indicting the tribe of Benjamin).

Although Schwab makes a contribution to one’s understanding of the text of Judges, I have several concerns about his basic approach and various conclusions he

reaches. Doubtless, my grave concerns about a Christocentric hermeneutic (needing to find primary Christocentric significance in each OT passage) occasions many of these concerns. The below paragraphs offer a narrow selection of potential examples of these issues.

One of my concerns about Schwab's commentary involves the word plays to which he points. He suggests that Samson's encounter with the lion carcass evokes the concept of God's future judgment on the nations (xvi). Although two different words for "carcass" occur in Judg 14:8 (with different meanings), he connects the idea with various other passages to reach this conclusion. A reader would easily assume a strong connection of a word in Judges with these other passages, but that is not the case. I could not find another commentary that made this connection either. In Judg 14:9 he affirms that the word for Samson "scraping" the honey from the carcass always means, "to rule, have dominion." This points to an anointed one, empowered by the Spirit, who will rule over all nations. As a matter of fact, the verb (*rdh*) used in Judges 14 is a homonym for the word to which he refers. According to *HALOT*, it means to take bread out of an oven or honey out of a beehive (1190). He points out that Samson was a Nazirite (Judg 13:5) and then refers to Jesus as the Nazarene who has similar characteristics. The proximity and similarity of these two names suggests a connection, when one refers to a unique life pattern (Nazirite), while the other refers to Jesus' hometown (from Nazareth). In Judg 14:8 he connects the word for "swarm" of bees with the nation of Israel and ultimately, the church. He emphasizes that the noun '*edah* often signifies the nation of Israel. He affirms that it "elsewhere always refers to people" (xvi). Schwab points out that honey is a divine blessing for the covenant nation. After building on the other word plays he cites in Judges 14, he concludes, "Under his sovereign rule, the church thrives in the midst of a hostile world and produces good fruit, sweet like honey, to God" (xvii). However, various lexical resources show that the basic idea of the noun is a "gathering." It can refer to a gathering of bees or flock of birds (Hos 7:12) as well as a gathering of different smaller groups of people (Pss 22:17; 68:31; Job 16:7). Although it is true that the land of Canaan is called "the land of milk and honey" in numerous passages, is the divine author of Judges intending to signify something about the nation of Israel and the church by this reference to a swarm of bees?

Another area of concern deals with historical issues. Schwab fairly presents the early date of the Exodus view and affirms that this book does not take issue with that view (4). However, in subsequent comments, he does not regard most numeric references at face value. He suggests that the reader of Judges "should be attuned to some possible reshaping or formatting of the time references" (14). He regards most of these time references as symbolic. Also, he proposes that Judges represents "stylized history" (11) or "interpreted history" (17). On the one hand, one must recognize that biblical history is selective and presented with a theological point. On the other hand, Schwab seems to go beyond this. He refers to Sisera's nine hundred chariots (Judges 4). He writes: "to read [this passage] as real history requires stretching our imaginations to devise a scenario wherein it is plausible" (17). Schwab later affirms that he accepts Judges as history, but seeks to avoid a literalistic as well as a liberal approach to these issues.

A final area of concern deals with Schwab's efforts to delineate parallels between a given passage in Judges and the life of a believer in the church or transitions to Christology. After referring to Spirit-empowered leaders in Israel (which I would call theocratic anointing), Schwab likens the role of judges in Israel to God's willingness to accomplish His mission for the world through "very fallible and wayward people who make up his church" (42). He regards the judge Othniel as a type of Christ (47). He also argues that in light of the New Covenant, NT writers "co-opt" (69) OT language to make a different point than that found in the OT. For example, Schwab concludes that Paul's citation of the law about not muzzling an ox (Deut 25:4) demonstrates that this command is not really about oxen but is about people (67). In response, the OT law did concern treatment of oxen. It is correct to point out the fundamental truth of this law is kindness and compassion. The NT does not co-opt this language and show that the law is really about people. Rather, the NT draws on the fundamental principle and shows how this should govern human relationships as well.

On the one hand, in this volume Schwab provides a number of helpful insights in the book of Judges. I must admit, however, that I cannot wholeheartedly recommend this book for the average reader or for a pastor. Fundamentally, the Christocentric impetus occasions several examples of exegetical fallacies.

John H. Walton and D. Brent Sandy. *The Lost World of Scripture: Ancient Literary Culture and Biblical Authority*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2013). \$24.00

Reviewed by F. David Farnell, Professor of New Testament Studies

The writers state that their "specific objective is to understand better how both the Old and New Testaments were spoken, written and passed on, especially with an eye to possible implications for the Bible's inspiration and authority" (9). They add, "part of the purpose of this book is to bring students back from the brink of turning away from the authority of Scripture in reaction to the misappropriation of the term *inerrancy*" (ibid). They assert that as Wheaton College professors, they work "at an institution and with a faculty that take a strong stand on inerrancy but that are open to dialogue" and that this openness "provided a safe context in which to explore the authority of Scripture from the ground up" (10). John Walton wrote the chapters on the Old Testament, while D. Brent Sandy wrote the chapters on the New Testament. W/S have written this book especially for "Christian students in colleges, seminaries and universities" with the hopes that they will find their work "useful," as well as writing for "colleagues who have a high view of Scripture, especially for those who hold to inerrancy" (ibid). The book is also "not intended for outsiders; that is, it's not an apologetic defense of biblical authority." Rather, "we're writing for insiders, seeking to clarify how best to understand the Bible" (9). The writers also assure the readers that they have a "very high view of Scripture; "[w]e affirm inerrancy" and that they "are in agreement with the definition suggested by David Dockery that the,

Bible properly interpreted in light of [the] culture and communication developed by the time of its composition will be shown to be completely true (and

therefore not false) in all that it affirms, to the degree of precision intended by the author, in all matters relating to God and his creation” (David S. Dockery, *Christian Scripture: An Evangelical Perspective on Inspiration, Authority and Interpretation*, Nashville: B & H, 1994, p. 64).

The central thrust of the book is that the world of the Bible (both Old and New Testament) is quite different from modern times: “Most of us a probably unprepared . . . for how different the ancient world is from our own . . . We’re thousands of years and thousands of miles removed. It means we frequently need to put the brakes on and ask whether we’re reading the Bible in light of the original culture or in light of contemporary culture. While the Bible’s values were very different from ancient cultures’, it obviously communicated in the existing languages and within cultural customs of the day” (p. 13). Such recognition and the “evidence assembled in this book inevitably leads to the question of inerrancy” (13). “[T]he truth of the matter is, no term, or even combination of terms, can completely represent the fullness of Scripture’s authority” (13). W/S then quote the Short Statement of the Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy of 1978 (14). This creates the impression that they are in agreement with the statement. However, this is deceptive because book constitutes an essential challenge to much of what the Chicago Statements asserted. This uneasiness with the Chicago Statement can also be seen in those who are listed as endorsers of the work, Tremper Longman III who chairs the Robert H. Gundry Professor of Biblical Studies, as well as Michael R. Licona who recently, in his *The Resurrection of Jesus*, used genre criticism to negate the resurrection of the saints in Jerusalem in Matt 27:51–53 at Jesus crucifixion as apocalyptic genre rather than indicating a literal resurrection, and Craig Evans, Acadia Divinity College, who is not known for his support of the Chicago Statements.

The book consists of 21 propositions that seek to nuance biblical authority, interpretation and an understanding of inerrancy, with the essential thought of these propositions flowing basically from two areas: (1) their first proposition, “Ancient Near Eastern Societies were *hearing dominant* [italics added] and had nothing comparable to authors and books as we know them” [in modern times since the printing press] while modern societies today are “*text dominant*” [italics added] (19, see also, 17–28) and (2) speech-act theory that they frequently refer to in their work (41–46, 48, 51, 200, 213–18, 229, 288). They qualify their latter acceptance of speech-act theory:

We do not agree with many of the conclusions with speech act theory, but we find its foundational premise and terminology helpful and have adopted its three basic categories. The communicator uses *locutions* (words, sentences, rhetorical structures, genres) to embody an *illocution* (the intention to do something with those locutions—bless, promise, instruct, assert) with a *perlocution* that anticipates a certain response from the audience (obedience, trust, belief) (41).

They go on to assert that God accommodated His communication in the Scripture: “[a]ccommodation on the part of the divine communicator resides primarily in the locution, in which the genre and rhetorical devices are included.” (42). And,

{G}enre is largely a part of the locution, not the illocution. Like grammar, syntax and lexemes, genre is a mechanism to convey an illocution. Accommodation takes place primarily at the locutionary level. Inerrancy and authority related to the illocution; accommodation and genre attach at the locution. Therefore inerrancy and authority cannot be undermined, compromised or jeopardized by genre or accommodation. While genre labels may be misleading, genre itself cannot be true or false, errant or inerrant, authoritative or non-authoritative. Certain genres lend themselves to more factual detail and others more toward fictional imagination” (45).

While admittedly the book’s propositions entail many other ideas, from these two ideas, an oral-dominated society in ancient times of the OT and NT vs. a written/text dominant-society of modern times and the implications of speech-act theory cited above, flow all that W/S develop in their assertions to nuance their take on what a proper view of inerrancy and biblical authority should be. The obvious implication of these assertions is that Robert Gundry, who was removed from ETS due to his dehistoricizing in 1983, was wronged because value judgment about genre does not impact the doctrine of inerrancy. Gundry was perfectly in the confines of inerrancy to dehistoricize because, according to W/S, it was ETS that misunderstood the concept of inerrancy as not genre driven. It is the illocution (purpose or intent) not the wording that drives inerrancy. Gundry’s theorizing of a midrashic genre, according to this idea, had nothing at all to do with inerrancy. Gundry believed sincerely in inerrancy but realized the midrashic, not historical, nature of Matthew 2.

This review will give commendations of the book. First, W/S are to be commended for their affirmation of inerrancy and their sincere desire to explore the authority of Scripture. Second, they also recognize that there exists no perfect attempt by theologians of representing the fullness of Scripture’s authority. As the IVP “Academic Alert” (22, no. 4 [Winter 2014]) noted on the front page, “Where Scholars Fear to Tread, *John Walton and Brent Sandy take on the juggernaut of biblical authority in *The Lost World of Scripture*.*” Since they have taken on this “juggernaut,” their theorizing about inerrancy opens itself up to critique.

Unfortunately, their propositions create more problems for inerrancy than they attempt to solve. Their idea of the orality of the ancient Near East in which the OT and NT often gives the impression W/S imagine that these ancients were not only different in approach (ear-dominant vs. text dominant) but also rather primitive as well as unscientific in what they held in terms of their concept of the material world around them. Walton’s and Sandy’s work is reminiscent of Rogers and McKim, in their now famous, *The Authority and Interpretation of the Bible* (1979), *An Historical Approach*, who made a similar error in their approach to Scripture. They also spoke of “the central Christian tradition included the concept of accommodation;” that today witnesses a “scholastic overreaction to biblical criticism;” “the function and purpose of the Bible was to bring people into a saving relationship with God through Jesus Christ;” “the Bible was not used as an encyclopedia of information on all subjects;” and “to erect a standard of modern, technical precision in language as the hallmark of biblical authority was totally foreign to the foundation shared by the early church.” (R/M, xxii). W/S similarly assert in their implications of an oral society that

“The Bible contains no new revelation about the material workings and understanding of the Material World” (*Proposition 4*, 49–59) so that the,

Bible’s “explicit statements about the material world are part of the locution and would naturally accommodate the beliefs of the ancient world. As such they are not vested with authority. We cannot encumber with scriptural authority any scientific conclusions we might deduce from the biblical text about the material world, its history or its regular processes. This means that we cannot draw any scientific conclusions about such areas as physiology, meteorology, astronomy, cosmic geography, genetics or geology from the Bible. For example, we should believe that God created the universe, but we should not expect to be able to derive from the biblical texts the methods that he used or the time that it took. We should believe that God created humans in his image and that through the choices they made sin and death came into the world. Scientific conclusions, however, relating to the material processes of human origins (whether from biology in general or genetics in particular) may be outside the purview of the Bible. We need to ask whether the Bible is making those sort of claims in its illocutions (55).

They continue,

The Bible’s claims regarding origins, mechanics or shape of the world are by definition of the focus of its revelation in the theological realm (55).

According to W/S, what the Bible says plainly in the words of Genesis 1 may not be what it intends. Immediate special creation cannot be read into the text; rather the door is open for evolution and the acceptance of modern understandings of science. Thus, Genesis 1 and 2 may well indicate God’s creation but not the means of how he created, even when the locutions say “evening and morning”; “first day” etc. Much of what is in Genesis 1 reflects “Old World Science”:

One could easily infer from the statements in the biblical text that the sun and moon share space with the birds (Gen. 1). But this is simply a reflection of Old World Science, and we attach no authority to that conclusion. Rather we consider it a matter of deduction on the part of the ancients who made no reason to know better” (57).

For them, “[t]he Bible’s authority is bound into theological claims and entailments about the material world.” For them, “since the Bible is not a science textbook,” its “authority is not found in the locution but has to come through illocution” (54). Genesis 1–2, under their system, does not rule out evolution; nor does it signify creation literally in six “days.” Such conclusions press the text far beyond its purpose to indicate God’s creation of the world but not the how of the processes involved. They conclude, “we have proposed that reticence to identify scientific claims or entailments is the logical conclusion from the first two points (not a science textbook; no new scientific revelation) and that a proper understanding of biblical authority is

dependent on recognizing this to be true” (59). They assert that “it’s is safe to believe that Old World Science permeates the Old Testament” and “Old World Science is simply part of the locution [words, etc.] and as such is not vested with authority” (300).

Apparently, W/S believe that modern science has a better track record at origins. This assumption is rather laughable. Many “laws” of science for one generation are overturned in other generations. Scientific understanding is in constant flux. Both of these authors have failed to understand that modern science is predominated overwhelmingly by materialistic philosophies rather than presenting any evidence of objectivity in the area of origins. Since science is based on observation, testing, measurement and repeatability, ideas of origins are beyond the purview of modern science too. For instance, the fossil record indicates the death of animals, but how that death occurred and what the implications of that fossil record are delves more into philosophy and agendas rather than good science. Since no transitional forms exist between species in the fossil record, evolution should be rendered tenuous as an explanation, but science refuses to rule it out due to a dogmatic *a priori*.

While W/S quote the ICBI “short statement” their work actually is an assault on the articles of affirmation and denial of the 1978 Chicago Statement on Inerrancy. In article IX, it noted that,

“**We affirm** that inspiration, though not conferring omniscience, guaranteed true and trustworthy utterance on all matters of which the biblical authors were moved to speak and write” and Article XII, “**we deny** that biblical infallibility and inerrancy are limited to spiritual, religious, or redemptive themes, exclusive of the fields of history and science. We further deny that scientific hypotheses about earth history may properly be used to overturn the teaching of Scripture on creation and the flood.” Article XI related, “far from misleading us, it is true and reliable in all matters in addresses.”

Another area that is troubling is in their theorizing of text-canonical updating. W/S’s adoption of multiple unknown redactor/editors who updated the text over long periods of time in terms of geography, history, names, etc. actually constitutes an argument, not for inerrancy, but for deficiency in the text of Scripture and hence an argument for errancy, not inerrancy. Due to the OT being an oral or ear-dominated society, W/S also propose a text-canonical updating hypothesis: “the model we propose agrees with traditional criticism in that it understands the final literary form of the biblical books to be relatively late and generally not the literary product of the authority figure whose words the book preserves” (66). This while Moses, Isaiah, and other prominent figures were behind the book, perhaps multiple, unknown editors were involved in any updating and final form of the books in the OT/NT that we have. For them, in the whole process of Scripture, “[t]he Holy Spirit is behind the whole process from beginning to end” in spite of the involvement of unknown hands in their final development (66). W/S negate the central idea of inerrancy that would center around original autographs that were inerrant, or that such autographs even existed,

Within evangelical circles discussing inerrancy and authority, the common affirmation is that the text is inerrant in the original autographs . . . since all copies were pristine, inerrancy could only be connected with the putative originals (66).

Modern discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls has made it “clear that there was not only one original form of the final literary piece” of such books as Samuel and Jeremiah” (67). Which version is original cannot be determined. Under W/S it does not make any difference because “in the model that we have proposed here, it does not matter. The authority is associated with Jeremiah, no matter which compilation is used. We cannot be dependent on the ‘original autographs,’ not only because we do not have them, but also because the very concept is anachronistic for most of the Old Testament” (ibid).

For W/S, “inerrancy and authority are connected initially to the figure or the authoritative traditions. We further accept the authority represented in the form of the book adopted by faith communities and given canonical status” (ibid). “Inerrancy and authority attach to the final canonical form of the book rather than to putative original autographs” (68). Later on in their work, W/S assert that “inerrancy would then pertain to the role of the authorities (i.e. the role of Moses or Isaiah as dominant, determinative and principle voice), not to so-called authors writing so-called books—but the literature in its entirety would be considered authoritative” (281). For them, “[a]uthority is not dependent on the original autographs or an author writing a book. Recognition of authority is identifiable in the beliefs of a community of faith (of whom we are heirs) that God’s communications through authoritative figures and traditions have been captured and preserved through a long process of transmission and composition” (68). For them, Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch “does not decide the matter” regarding its authority, “for many may have been involved in the final form of the first five books of Moses” (69). The final form involved perhaps many unknown editors and updaters: “Our interest is in the identifying of the prophet as the authority figure behind the oracles, regardless of the composition history of the book” (72). Thus, while Moses, Jeremiah, for instance were the originator of the tradition or document and names are associated with the books, this approach of many involved in the product/final form of the book and variations, “allows us to adopt some of the more important advances that critical scholarship has offered” (74). For them, unknown editors over long periods of time would have updated the text in many ways as time passed. They argue “it is safe to believe that some later material could be added and later editors could have a role in the compositional history of a canonical book” (299). Their positing of such a scheme, however, is suggestive that the text had been corrected, updated, revised, all which smacks of a case for errancy more than inerrancy in the process.

Again, orthodox views of inerrancy, like the 1978 Chicago Statement, were not so negative about determining the autographs as Article X related, “**We affirm** that inspiration, strictly speaking, applies only to the autographs of Scripture, which in the providence of God can be ascertained from available manuscripts with great accuracy.”

W/S also assert that “exacting detail and precise wording were not necessary to preserve and transmit the truths of Scripture” (181) because they were an “ear” related culture rather than a print related culture (Proposition 13).

In reply to W/S, while this may be true that the New Testament was oral, such a statement by W/S needs qualification in their propositions throughout. No matter what the extent of orality in the OT and NT as posed by W/S, the reportage in these passages is accurate, though it may not be, at times, precise. While they are correct that “exacting detail and precise wording were not necessary to preserve and transmit the truths of Scripture,” two competing views need to be contrasted in that oral reportage that was written down in the text of Scripture: an orthodox view and an unorthodox view of that reportage. This important distinction is lost in W/S’s discussion (see Norman L. Geisler, “Evangelicals and Redaction Criticism, Dancing on the Edge” [1987] for a full discussion):

<b><i>ORTHODOX VIEW</i></b>	<b><i>UNORTHODOX VIEW</i></b>
<b><i>REPORTING THEM</i></b>	<b><i>CREATING THEM</i></b>
<b><i>SELECTING THEM</i></b>	<b><i>CONSTRUCTING THEM</i></b>
<b><i>ARRANGING THEM</i></b>	<b><i>MISARRANGING THEM</i></b>
<b><i>PARAPHRASING THEM</i></b>	<b><i>EXPANDING THEM</i></b>
<b><i>CHANGE THEIR FORM (Grammatical Change)</i></b>	<b><i>CHANGE THEIR CONTENT (Theological Change)</i></b>
<b><i>CHANGE THEIR WORDING</i></b>	<b><i>CHANGE THEIR MEANING</i></b>
<b><i>TRANSLATE THEM</i></b>	<b><i>MISTRANSLATE THEM</i></b>
<b><i>INTERPRET THEM</i></b>	<b><i>MISINTERPRET THEM</i></b>
<b><i>EDITING</i></b>	<b><i>REDACTING</i></b>

Article XIII of the 1978 Chicago Statement was careful to note that inerrancy does not demand precision at all times in reportage. Any criticism of the Chicago Statements in this area is ill-advised, “We further deny that inerrancy is negated by biblical phenomena such as a lack of modern technical precision, irregularities of grammar or spelling, observational descriptions of nature, the reportage of falsehoods, the use of hyperbole and round numbers, the topical arrangement of material, variant selections of material in parallel accounts, or the use of free citations.” W/S’s caveat on harmonization needs qualification: “it is not necessary to explain away the differences by some means of harmonization in order to fit modern standards of accuracy” (151). While anyone may note many examples of trite harmonization, this does not negate the legitimacy or need for harmonization. Tatian’s *Diatessaron* (c. 160–175) is a testimony to the ancient church believing that the Gospels could be harmonized since they were a product of the Holy Spirit. From the ancient Christian church through to the time of the Reformation, the church always believed in the legitimacy and usefulness of harmonization. It was not until modern philosophical presuppositions (e.g. Rationalism, Deism, Romanticism, etc.) that created the historical-critical ideology that harmonization was discredited. The orthodox position of the church was that the Gospels were without error and could be harmonized into a unified whole. The rise of modern critical methods (i.e. historical criticism) with its

accompanying low or no views of inspiration discredited harmonization, not bad examples of harmonization. For harmonization during the time of the Reformation, see Harvey K. McArthur, "Sixteenth Century Gospel Harmonies," in *The Quest Through the Centuries: The Search for the Historical Jesus* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1966) 85–101).

On page 274, W/S assert "[o]ur intention is to strengthen the doctrine of biblical authority through a realistic application of knowledge of the ancient world, and to understand what inerrancy can do and what it can't do." They believe that the term inerrancy is a term that "is reaching its limits" and also that "the convictions it sought to express and preserve remain important" (274). "Inerrancy" is no longer the clear, defining term it once was and that "has become diminished in rhetorical power and specificity, it no longer serves as adequately to define our convictions about the robust authority of Scripture" (275). They cite several errors of inerrancy advocates in the past. Most notably are the following: inerrancy advocates, "have at times misunderstood 'historical' texts by applying modern genre criteria to ancient literature, thus treating it as having claims that it never intended." Apparently, this position allows W/S to read the findings of modern "scientism" into the ancient text that often conflicts with today's hypothesis of origins (i.e. creation). "They have at times confused locution [words, sentences, rhetorical structures, genres] and illocution [the intention to do something with those locutions—bless, promise, instruct, assert]. Inerrancy technically applies on to the latter, though of course, without locutions, there would be no illocution." W/S here confuse inerrancy with interpretation and understanding of a text with this supposition. Each word is inspired but the understanding or interpretation of those words may not be considered "inerrant" but a process of interpretation of those words in the context in which those words occur. If Genesis 1 says "evening and morning" and "first," "second" day, it is tenuous to imply that these terms are so flexible in interpretation to allow for long periods of time to accommodate evolutionary hypotheses. "They have been too anxious to declare sections of the Old Testament to be historical in a modern sense, where it may not be making those claims for itself." Here, this principle allows W/S to negate any part of the Old Testament that does not accord with modern sensibilities. It creates a large opening to read into the text rather than allow the text to speak for itself. They assert that positions such as "young earth or premillennialism may be defensible interpretations, but they cannot invoke inerrancy as a claim to truth" (282). For W/S, "the Israelites shared the general cognitive environment of the ancient world . . . . At the illocutionary level we may say that traditions in the early chapters of Genesis, for example served the Israelites by offering an account of God and his ways and conveying their deepest beliefs about how the world works, who they are and how it all began. These are the same questions addressed by the mythological traditions of the ancient world, but the answers given are very different" (303–04).

One other area where the elasticity of W/S's concept of history centers is that they allow for hyperbolic use of numbers in the Old Testament: "It is safe to believe that the Bible can use numbers rhetorically with the range of the conventions of the ancient world" (302). For them, "we may conclude that they are exaggerated or even that contradictory amounts are given in sources that report the same event" (302). "These may well be inaccuracies or contradictions according to our conventions, but

that doesn't mean that they jeopardize inerrancy. Again, numerical quantity is locution. Authority ties to the illocution and what the narrator is *doing* with those numbers" (302). Whatever he is doing, he is doing with the accepted conventions of their world" (302).

Finally, W/S argue that "our doctrine of authority of Scripture has become too enmeshed in apologetics . . . . If we tie apologetics and theology too tightly together, the result could be that we end up trying to defend as theology what are really just apologetic claims we have made" (306).

Finally, W/S contend: "ill-formed versions of inerrancy have misled many people into false understandings of the nature of Scripture, which has led to poor hermeneutics for interpreting Scripture and to misunderstandings of Bible translations. Even more serious, certain views of inerrancy have led people away from the Christian faith. Such views can also keep people from considering more important matters in Scripture. If there is a stumbling block to people coming to the faith, should it not be Christ alone rather than a wall that we inadvertently place in the way of spiritual pilgrimages?" (308).

This reviewer has one reply to the illogic of W/S. If the documents are cannot be trusted in their plain, normal sense (e.g. creation), then how can their testimony about Christ be trusted? If the documents have as much flexibility as hypothesized by W/S, how can they be trusted to give a reliable, accurate and faithful witness to Him? While W/S have wrapped their work in an alleged improvement of current concepts of inerrancy and its implications, they have actually presented a system that is (1) quite inferior to that of the ICBI statements of 1978 and 1982 and (2) one that really is designed to undermine the years of evangelical history that went into the formulation of those documents against the onslaught of historical-critical ideologies that W/S now embrace. They treat that history and reasons of the formulation of ICBI statements in a dismissive fashion that is perilous, for those who do not remember the events of the past are doomed to repeat its mistakes, as evidenced in this work of W/S. A better title for this book would have been "The Lost World of Inerrancy" since W/S's system undermines the very concept.

Barry G. Webb. *The Book of Judges*. The New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing, 2012. xx + 555 pp. (cloth) \$50.00.

Reviewed by Keith Essex, Associate Professor of Bible Exposition

The NICOT is one of the best evangelical commentary series on the OT. The reputation of the series will only be enhanced with this superb work on Judges. The author, Barry Webb, is Senior Research Fellow Emeritus in OT at Moore Theological College, Sydney, Australia, where he taught for thirty-three years. He writes, "My labors on Judges began a long time ago. I spent most of 1982–84 in Sheffield, England, working on it for my Ph.D." (xvii). His dissertation was subsequently published in 1987 with the title *The Book of Judges: an Integrated Reading*. In his new work, "New material has been added, and old material reworked in light of new research

that has been done since the 1980s. The result is a new and different kind of work. I had to start again, even if building on old, proven foundations” (xvii). The result of thirty years of intense study is evident on every page of this NICOT volume. Moreover, Webb writes in a warm, personal style that makes this commentary unusual, it is very readable.

An eighty-seven page introduction begins the commentary (1–87). Thirty-two of these pages are devoted in one way or another to a discussion of the previous writings on the Book of Judges, both Jewish and Christian. Webb concludes that Judges is a conceptual unit with a clear literary strategy. He writes, “Such is the book this commentary is concerned with. It is a given entity, a received object for study, not one whose existence or parameters must be postulated before interpretation can begin” (8). Webb states that his essential purpose is the same as Daniel Block in his NAC volume published in 1999: “First, it focuses on the final form of the text as the primary datum for exegesis; it focuses on the canon as the primary context in which Judges must be read to access its theology; and finally, it has strong interest in what lies in *front of the text* (in the life if the church) as well as what lies behind it (in the history of Israel)” (45). Ultimately, the historical, literary, or canonical study of biblical text must move to the task of theological exegesis for the contemporary church. “The main focus of this commentary is literary and theological” (10). However, while concentrating on the literary aspects of Judges, Webb does not discount its historical reliability. He writes, “While making full allowance for the theological agenda of Judges and its literary quality (to which we will give a lot of attention in this commentary), there is no reason in principle why it should not preserve, and indeed be anchored in, real historical knowledge of the period in question. Nor is it necessary, or even right, to subordinate its witness about this history to reconstructions based on the current state of archeological knowledge” (17). There is no attempt to give a precise chronology of the period of the Judges in this volume, but the author does state his preference: “However, on balance I am more convinced by the arguments for the earlier date [for the Exodus], and will assume for the purpose of this commentary that the exodus took place about 1446 B.C., giving us a date of 1326 B.C. for the beginning of the judges period. So we can think of the judges era as extending roughly from 1326 to 1092 B.C., about 234 years in all” (12). Webb also describes how Judges contributes canonically to OT theology (53–55), and notes connections of the book with other parts of Scripture in his literary analysis.

Toward the end of the Introduction (55–74), Webb tackles major issues associated with Judges. First, he deals with Judges as Christian Scripture. His foundation is the fact the NT does not repudiate the book, but rather invokes four of the judges as examples of faith (Heb 11:32). This does not mean “that we must whitewash the judges and turn them into paragons of virtue and models in all respects for Christian behavior” (57). Yet to point out their faults and not find “faith” in them is to miss something important. The book speaks realistically of the shameful abuse of women and the extreme violence during this era of Israel’s history. However, in both these cases, Webb points out that Judges is balanced. Concerning women, some were leaders, others manipulative, one a traitor, but some were victims of male power, insecurity, ambition, or folly. As for violence, there are three kinds of wars presented and, since there is no perfect justice in the world, arms can be taken up in a just cause.

Thus, these issues demand of the interpreter an identification of the theology that frames and interprets the data in the book. Second, the *BHS* text of Judges is relatively well preserved, and known variants from it contain the same subject matter in the same order throughout. Third, three translation issues are addressed. Webb's own translation given throughout the commentary tends to be "direct" rather than "functional equivalent," with few emendations of the Masoretic text as it stands. Also, the personal name of God is rendered "Yahweh" throughout. Finally, the large numbers in the text (20:15–18 for example) are allowed to stand since "no workable solution to the problem of the large numbers has been so far found, and the advantages of leaving them as they are outweigh any gains in changing them" (74).

The Text and Commentary section discusses the book sequentially (89–512). Webb adopts the standard threefold division of the book: Introduction (1:1–3:6), Careers of the Judges (3:7–16:31), and Epilogue (17:1–25:25). The strength of the commentary is the literary analysis of the units of the text with multiple diagrams provided. At the end of the Introduction discussion, the provisional theme of the book as a whole is stated: "Yahweh's reluctant but just judgment on Israel" (156). This tension between Yahweh's need to discipline His disobedient and ultimately unrepentant people with his desire to show compassion and mercy to them is highlighted throughout the rest of the book. The book concludes with indexes of authors (531–14), subjects (515–33), and Scripture references (534–55).

This NICOT volume is a highly recommended complement and supplement to Block's NAC work, *Judges, Ruth*. It also complements well the new (2013) volume by Robert Chisholm, Jr., *A Commentary of Judges and Ruth*, in the Kregel Exegetical Library (KEL). Chisholm provides historical and grammatical discussion, which supplements Webb's emphasis on literary analysis. The works of Webb, Block, and Chisholm have found expositional expression in *Judges: Such a Great Salvation* by Dale Ralph Davis. With these resources now available, there is no excuse for Judges not to be preached by evangelical expositors.