

possible sites as well as the views of other scholars in this respect should have been given. The same criticism can be made with regard to another Philistine city, Gath, of which the problems of identification are even graver than those of Ekron. Aharoni suggests (p. 250) its location as *Tell es-Safi*, where scholars of an earlier day had placed it before others identified it with several other sites. In a few places he attaches a question mark to his proposed identification (pp. 23, 339), but in other passages his identification of Gath is made as if no problem existed (pp. 45, 149, 376 and elsewhere), and the student of the Bible, who may be neither an expert in geography nor acquainted with the intricate problems connected with the identification of this site, is not sufficiently warned that the proposed identification is rather uncertain. Many other examples of a similar nature could be cited. But the two samples used show that the serious student of Palestinian geography will still need Abel's discussion of, and bibliographical references to, the various Biblical sites which are presented in Volume II of his monumental work, although that work, published more than 30 years ago, is now badly out of date.

The translator deserves a special word of commendation. He has done a superb job. Hardly anywhere is the reader aware of the fact that the book is a translation. A. F. Rainey, a scholar in his own right, could hardly have found better expressions to transfer Hebrew idioms into English ones, than he does throughout the book. The maps are no masterpieces, being all in black-and-white. However, they show what the author wants them to present and are clear enough to be useful. The book is well produced and remarkably free from disturbing typographical errors. It certainly is a pleasure to recommend it highly to students of the Bible who want to have a good and quite authoritative historical geography of OT Palestine.

Andrews University

SIEGFRIED H. HORN

Braaten, Carl E., *History and Hermeneutics*. "New Directions in Theology Today," Vol. II. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1966. 205 pp. \$ 3.95.

Occasionally books appear which enable the serious reader to start with almost the rudiments of a particular discipline, by providing interesting and relatively brief but fair and summary treatment of the situation. With economy of words, involving economy also of the overall size of the book, the issues are focused and the main figures presented, so that one may thereafter move to further study. Such, essentially, is the book here under review. In it we are invited to consider the theology of Wolfhart Pannenberg as addressed to the chief problems of contemporary theologians (mostly German), and are provided the most suggestive approach to a contemporary constructive systematic theology.

The method of the book is to give an historical survey of the treat-

ment of the chief themes of current theological interest, and then to indicate Pannenberg's suggestions *apropos* to that theme. This method is consistently carried through each chapter (except the last, the sketchiest of them all, where Pannenberg's "proleptic eschatology" is only hinted at). A contrast is thus drawn in each chapter, the essence of which will become clear from the following summary.

Pannenberg insists upon the universal scope of history against views of revelation which play off kerygma against history, that is, against non-historical views of revelation, which result in an over-emphasis on the category of revelation as the answer to a modern epistemological skepticism.

Pannenberg insists on reason's knowledge of history and the co-essentiality of reason and faith in the "total act of a person" (p. 49). But reason must be brought to its natural condition in order to make it capable of historical knowledge. Here the aid of the Spirit and of the kerygma is necessary. So an integration of dogmatic and historical disciplines is recommended against the rejection of the historical-critical method, and against a "bi-focal" view (p. 37) which sets the two in co-existence but not in integrated relationship.

Pannenberg insists on the historicity of the resurrection, and refuses to by-pass it in his theological program. The resurrection resists all hypotheses which fail to reckon with its simplicity.

Pannenberg insists that the main features of the apocalyptic eschatology can be true for us today, that a theology of the resurrection must establish itself squarely upon the historical Jesus, that the historian's ideas (based on an alien epistemology) must be made as vulnerable as the documents he investigates, and the history be defined in the light of the reality of Jesus' resurrection. All this is held in opposition to a position which acknowledges that the NT writers believed in the historicity of the resurrection but which refuses that historicity dogmatically, and to a positivistic historicism which refuses to begin with the resurrection.

In opposition to that interpretation which finds radical discontinuity between the historical Jesus and the resurrection, Pannenberg insists on the existence of hope and also of an adequate language of hope in the pre-Easter situation (thus showing the continuity of pre-Easter with post-Easter), and appeals to the findings of a phenomenology of human existence to show that the idea of resurrection expresses meaningful truth for us.

Pannenberg insists on the importance of the OT and its relevance for dogmatic theology, and on the importance of the development of tradition within the context of historical reality, in opposition to a neglect of the OT by dogmatic theologians. Since Israel's history occurred both in the interpretation of historical episodes in new situations as well as in the historical episodes themselves, we find a relationship between the OT and the NT in the "historical" relationship between them (Braaten's fourth rubric). The NT enters into a history of promises and fulfilments, which characterizes the OT.

In the brief survey of the history of hermeneutics, Braaten presents Pannenberg as avoiding problems which others have not. If one insists on the likeness between the one who writes history and the one who makes it (as did Schleiermacher, Dilthey and Bultmann) the uncommon cannot be accounted for. If one insists on narrow concerns (as do Fuchs, Ebeling and Bultmann), essential elements in the tradition will be overlooked. Pannenberg insists on the enlargement of the horizon of the present-day interpreter so that the concern of the text may be encompassed. An over-arching perspective, that of *historical process*, is necessary to bring together the two different perspectives of interpreter and interpreted. The totality of history is incorporated within a Christian theology of history. This will mean that attention must be given to the particular structures within the contemporary church through which the hermeneutical process takes place, and will involve re-opening the whole question of the relationship between Scripture and tradition.

In the final chapter Braaten welcomes Moltmann's *Theology of Hope* as employing the Biblical category of promise rather than that of the Greek *logos*, and states criteria for adequate eschatological discussion: it must be existentially relevant, controlled by the kerygma derived from Scripture, Christological, and futuristic. Pannenberg's proleptic eschatology fills the bill.

When much is said in little space, there is always the risk of over-simplification. With this we need not tarry, for one who is concerned with the problem of over-simplification can always go to the texts indicated if he is serious enough. There are, however, certain one-sided observations which cannot be accounted for on the basis of lack of space, as for example the criticism that Barth overlooks the category of reconciliation for that of revelation. The twofold assertion "that Jesus Christ is not the sole medium of revelation and . . . that much more than revelation was accomplished by him" (p. 14) is intended as a criticism of Barth's theology!

But since the purpose of the book is to present an *apologia* for the theology of Pannenberg, a few questions relative to that presentation seem in order. In what sense is the basic notion of "universal history" to be taken? Does the concept of revelation through universal history mean that revelation is universally available to all men, or that, in some way or other, all men participate in the revelation of God by participating in universal history, which is by definition all-inclusive? This is not simply a theoretical question, since the term "revelation" has soteriological connotation as well as epistemological. As Braaten himself observes, it is absolutely essential that the significance of a slogan such as that of "revelation through history" be most carefully defined if it is to convey anything specific. In the summary which expounds this term (pp. 28, 29) a distinction is drawn between God's direct acts of revelation and his historical acts, which are indirect revelations, available for everyone to see! We need further specification in order to make this far-reaching contention intelligible. This is

especially the case in the light of the quite fundamental assertion that revelation occurs at the end of history. Theology has always found terminological ambiguity convenient. It appears to be playing with words to talk of an "end" having occurred proleptically, since "end" in normal parlance means *finis* in a temporal sense. How can history go on if its end has occurred? We have great sympathy with the idea being expressed and would want to endorse it, but consider the terminology unfortunate, even if the meaning of "end" as "goal" or "fulfilment" or "purpose" makes it plausibly ambiguous. The adjective "final" (p. 95) is a more obvious pun than the noun "end." We also welcome the insistence that an epistemology which will be at all adequate to the NT kerygma will have to start with the resurrection, from "the substantive, historical nucleus of the apostles' resurrection affirmations" (p. 84), although we are not told what *that* is. The argument from phenomenology, that man is constituted by hope, is a most effective way of indicating the meaningfulness of eschatological assertions. Here we have one of the more useful employments of the notion of the universal. But, it must be pointed out, the status of the phenomenological account of man as hopeful does not prove anything about the truth of that which he anticipates, namely the resurrection, but only that the hope is meaningful. Nevertheless, it provides a useful argument against those who will confine discussion (at least at the outset) to the problem of meaning.

The following errata were noted: "betwen" for "between" (p. 68); "clean" for "clear" (p. 70); "hinderances" for "hindrances" (p. 101); "difference" for "different" (p. 133); "pre-supposes" for "pre-supposes" (p. 135); "escatology" for "eschatology" (p. 164).

Andrews University

EDWARD W. H. VICK

Breen, Quirinus, *Christianity and Humanism: Studies in the History of Ideas*, ed. by Nelson Peter Ross. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publ. Co., 1968. xviii + 283 pp. \$ 6.95.

In his editor's note, Nelson Peter Ross indicates the purpose and occasion which have brought forth this volume: "When Quirinus Breen retired from his professorship of history in the University of Oregon in 1964 some of his colleagues, students, and friends sought to mark the occasion with a permanent tribute. The result is this collection of some of his essays, now published in his honor" (p. ix).

In the Preface, Heiko A. Oberman characterizes an aspect of Breen's work which manifests itself well in the present publication: "comprehensiveness and comprehension" which "may entail a risky trek into a 'no man's land' between fields." He also points out that Breen, with "his humanistic respect for rhetoric as a method *cum fundamento in re* . . . would not wince when this trek is compared with the ongoing search to expose and combat that *veritas duplex* which Breen has described as an eminent problem in the symbiosis of Christianity and 'humanism'" (p. vii).