
This volume is a fitting addition to a prestigious series on the history of Biblical exegesis. Not only does it provide a comprehensive review of interesting interpretational material on a most practical subject from a crucial period in church history, but in so doing it also gives valuable insights regarding the hermeneutical principles used by various leaders of the Reformation as they have dealt with this subject. As the author indicates in his Foreword, the "investigation has been confined to primary sources, in which marriage and divorce have been considered in the light of the texts under discussion [logia on divorce recorded in Mt 5:32; 19:3-12; Mk 10:2-12; Lk 16:18; and Paul's treatment in I Cor 7:1-15]"; and an "attempt has been made to seek the answer as to what motivated the expositors in their interpretations and to compare the exegetical results of the various writers (p. iii).

The scope of coverage in the publication is evidently based on the consideration that in "the history of the interpretation of the New Testament logia on divorce during the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, there is a direct line from Erasmus to Milton" and that "by his concept of divorce Erasmus began to draw a circle which was closed by Milton. Within this circle the exegetical arguments of the Reformation period were exhausted" (p. 143).

The book is divided into four main sections: "The Interpretation of Erasmus and Roman Catholic Reaction" (pp. 2-42); "Martin Luther and Associates" (pp. 43-63); "The Reformed Theologians" (pp. 64-109); and "English Expositors" (pp. 110-142). The main text closes with a "Summary and Conclusion" (pp. 143-149). A valuable bibliography is given (pp. 150-157), followed by useful indices of names (pp. 158, 159) and Bible references (pp. 160, 161).

The first main division of the text not only treats Erasmus and his critics but also lays a necessary background by considering the traditional medieval Catholic approach to marriage and divorce. The following three divisions note the views of such individuals as Martin Luther, Philip Melanchthon, John Brenz, Huldreich Zwingli, Heinrich Bullinger, Martin Bucer, Peter Martyr, John Calvin, Theodore Beza, William Tyndale, Thomas Cranmer, John Hooper, William Fulke, John Raynolds, Joseph Hall, Henry Hammond, Lancelot Andrewes, Godfrey Goodman, Edmund Bunny, and John Milton. For most of these individuals there is a comprehensive review and analysis of their treatment of marriage and divorce. And consistently there is a serious effort to trace lines of influence and to provide comparisons and contrasts wherever possible, a procedure which greatly enhances the value of Olsen's work.
There is very little negative to say about this book. Even typesetter's errors are virtually absent (one example of such an error is "dubt" for "doubt" on p. 83, l. 23). One might question whether orthographically it would not have been better to refer to "Noel Beda" rather than to "Natalis Bedda" on pp. 30-33. Also, one wonders if the reference on p. 99 to the "Ecclesiastical Ordinances" of John Calvin in Geneva as being first proposed in 1545 and adopted by the "Little and Large Councils" in 1561 is not somewhat misleading. But any deficiencies of this kind are trivial and negligible when compared with the vast amount of material which has been supplied with such exceptional accuracy and clarity.

This book is competently done and authoritative; moreover, it provides fascinating reading. For anyone interested in NT Studies or in Reformation History—as well as for anyone interested in the simple human-interest element of seeing Reformation leaders seeking to mesh their concept of Scripture exegesis with the problems met in every-day life—this book is a "must." It is the kind of work which gives a reviewer pleasure to read and to recommend.
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If the alternative to a radical atheistic theology is not to be found in a retreat to silence, it must look to the future. It is to explore this possibility that the series of essays in this book were written.

One primary concern is with the distance between contemporary theology and the theology of the primitive Christian period (p. 6). Another is with the "history of Jesus" and the interpretations given to that history by the NT writers. The problem of "hermeneutic" is that of honoring the difference between perspectives of past and of present, and yet of "fusing the horizons" within which both see. The crisis of the "Scripture principle" lies in the fact that we no longer see as did the writers of the NT. We can no longer take its perspectives and make them our own, nor are we able to affirm the historicity of all that purports to be historical, in both of which respects we differ from Luther. To be able to speak in the universal terms demanded by theology, whose task is to talk about God, demands an understanding of the world as history and of God as the God of history; and there must be an attempt to see the totality of history. Then the modern and the Biblical horizons may be brought together within an encompassing whole. "Understanding the world as history" will lead in its turn to an understanding of the God of Scripture. But how is it possible to see the whole of history?

The principle of homogeneity in history (that present experience is the measure of what has happened in the past) is inadequate as a basis for interpretation of the past. Going against the grain of present-day