

preted only as 'concomitant phenomena . . . ' of faith. It is not the case that this is the only interpretation possible. Harvey means that this is the only adequate interpretation. The use of the term "concomitant" is thus not helpful, for it tells us nothing. The resurrection is indeed dispensable for Harvey since he cannot allow miracle, and since he does not have to refer to Jesus' person for the faith perspective (p. 274).

One wonders how it is possible to give so much away in acknowledging the "scientific" spirit of critical history.

The following misprints were noted: sigilography for sigillography (p. 56), expecially for especially (p. 113), bibilical for biblical (p. 151), regin for reign (p. 272).

Andrews University

EDWARD W. H. VICK

Ladd, George Eldon, *The New Testament and Criticism*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1967. 222 pp. \$3.95.

The purpose of the author is to demonstrate by means of clear-cut illustrations the fact that the various critical methodologies, *i.e.*, textual, linguistic, literary, form, historical and comparative-religion, are not inherently destructive of conservative faith. In fact, they are necessary for a sound conservative understanding of Scripture. Some conservatives will question this thesis, for they will feel that their rigid authoritative regard for the Bible will be affected by accepting any of the critical methodologies mentioned above. Nevertheless, Ladd would insist that if faith is affected by these methods *per se*, such faith needs to be purged since "an adequate study of the Bible demands a historical-theological methodology" (p. 14).

Each chapter is profusely illustrated to show how the method can be applied in a conservative context. The most conservative reader, it seems to me, would have to concede the author's point. These methods are absolutely necessary in order to study the Bible intelligently. Too often any type of criticism concerning the Bible is considered from a pejorative point of view. But criticism in itself is a neutral term and an inescapable activity in studying the Bible. Ladd defines it thus: "Criticism means making intelligent judgments about historical, literary, textual, and philological questions which one must face in dealing with the Bible, in the light of all the available evidence, when one recognizes that the Word of God has come to men through the words of men in given historical situations" (p. 37).

While the reviewer agrees with Ladd's basic conclusions and conservative tendencies, he feels a certain uneasiness resulting from the author's approach and attitude. Why does Ladd, especially in chapters 6-8, set in opposition to *his* conservative use of these methods the usage of the radical critics without making allowance for other conservative views which may deviate from his? By attacking the results of these

radical critics, he, in effect, is attacking all those who do not agree with *his* particular conservative positions. There are conservative scholars who would accept more of the results of these methodologies than he, without sacrificing a "high view" of Scripture.

His use of the critical methods will seem to be quite arbitrary even to some conservatives. He chooses where he will use criticism and where he will not. On p. 182, 2 Macc is cited and the miraculous event recorded there is considered as the "product of devout imagination, not sober history," but Ladd seems to feel that the exercise of critical judgment which is used to arrive at the above conclusion cannot be applied in the same way to the Bible. Many *conservatives* with a "high view" of Scripture would disagree with him. Again if a book is anonymous, Ladd is quite free to use all of his critical judgment in determining the author, but if a book claims to be written by someone, no critical judgment can be used. This claim must be accepted (pp. 116, 128). This will seem too arbitrary to some. Ladd's use of criticism seems too rigidly bound by presuppositions which restrict his integrity in its use.

One especially disturbing stylistic peculiarity is Ladd's use of the expression "in terms of." This is predominantly so in ch. 8. On the first page alone, it is used four times.

The author himself forecast that his book would meet with varying reactions from the theological right and left. Some will feel he has yielded too much ground, while others will feel he has not gone far enough. Liberals will feel that he seems to be fighting battles long since won and thus that he is "piddling with trivia." But they must be tolerant, for only those like Ladd can understand that to many conservatives this problem is not trivial. Besides, he is not addressing liberals in this book. A good group of conservatives who have looked at the inescapable phenomena of literary and historical criticism will in large part applaud the efforts of Ladd.

The criticisms offered above in no way invalidate the value of the book for its intended readers. It will fill a real need among conservative students for a handy volume discussing the relationship of conservative scholarship to these critical methodologies. Ladd's basically positive attitude to these methodologies and his judicious approach throughout will enhance its value.

Andrews University

SAKAE KUBO

Laeuchli, Samuel, *The Serpent and the Dove: Five Essays on Early Christianity*. Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon Press, 1966. 256 pp.  
\$ 5.95.

*The Serpent and the Dove* is in a sense a continuation of the author's *Language of Faith*. This is so although its form is that of a series of essays rather than a monograph and although these essays "represent at many points either a qualification or even a break with positions held