

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.

Andrews University

KENNETH A. STRAND

Pannenberg, Wolfhart. *Basic Questions in Theology*. Vol. I. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1970. viii + 238 pp. \$ 9.75.

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

assumptions in historical work, Pannenberg contends that rather than assume a fundamental homogeneity of all events as a prelude to an assessment of what happened, one should be prepared to recognize a revelatory significance in the events themselves. That a reported event, the resurrection, for example, bursts analogies is not ground for disputing its facticity (pp. 48-49). Bultmann is criticized for failing to relate the text to the present by not allowing the text to speak in its disparateness from the present. The remedy of this essential failure (similar to that of Schleiermacher and of Dilthey) would be to consider the question of "universal history" (p. 113).

The NT interprets the particularity of the history and person of Jesus (p. 156). Such is the character of his history that the expression "revelation of God" may be used in connection with it. Pannenberg argues repeatedly that understanding of the significance of part of history involves viewing it from the perspective of the whole of history. If the whole of history (the whole of reality) is unknowable, the significance of the part remains a mystery. Anticipation of the future provides a key to the interpretation of the past. The alternative is a thorough-going relativism. One must maintain the relativity of all thought and at the same time insist that the "whole of reality" has come to view in the history of Jesus.

A future-oriented theology also provides an answer to a long-standing and fundamental problem—of analogical speech about God. Rejecting the classical Thomist approach (seeing the world as caused, and thence inferring God as Cause) that an analogy exists between our speech and God, Pannenberg contends that the analogy exists only between theological and non-theological speech. At the point where, in Thomas, the analogical move is made from the world to God as Cause of the world, Pannenberg puts the act of God in revelation in history. The particular history when the revelation is made, where the "totality of reality" comes to focus, is the history of Jesus. Jesus' claims were attested by the resurrection, in which, proleptically, the "final future of man" came (p. 236). "Doxological," in contrast to "analogical," speech about God is speech rooted in the adoration of God, deriving from experience of a specific divine act. The Resurrection, being an anticipation of the end, cannot be fully understood now, but only at the end. We are thus borne forward to the eschaton.

Pannenberg's concept of a proleptic revelation of the end is a difficult one, as indeed is his understanding of the "future." Speaking naïvely, how can the future be present and not be present? We would certainly want to endorse his insistence on the dynamic character of revelation and link it with the ongoing acts of God in history—specifically in the history of Jesus Christ—and with the central importance of the Resurrection. We would also insist that revelation must point forward and satisfy hope, by keeping hope alive. If this dimension (the future, hope) must be preserved, it will stand in tension with the present and the past, the Being-Becoming duality expressed in temporal terms. It is characteristic of the culture in which we live that

we think historically. But the unsolved problem of eternity-temporality, universality-particularity cannot be easily solved by a change of terminology.

Revelation in the present can be understood as an extension of the understanding of a revelation (experienced) in the present. What sense does it make to speak of future revelation extended, in part, "prophetically" backwards into history, and known in the present? Insistence upon the provisionality of revelation-apprehension of revelation and its inevitable grounding in past history are important steps beyond Barth and Bultmann. Whether one can take the further steps required must depend upon further considerations.

Nottingham, England

EDWARD W. H. VICK

Rackman, Emanuel. *One Man's Judaism*. New York: Philosophical Library, Inc., 1970. 397 pp. \$ 8.95.

Emanuel Rackman, having previously published two well-received volumes on Jewish values and many studies and reviews, has become a major interpreter of Judaism among American Jewish thinkers. In this volume containing 24 articles published previously in journals, he sets forth his philosophy of Judaism. His discussion is not encyclopedic nor is it a systematic analysis of his belief and practice, but it is analytical and creative. Not only are the comparisons to law, political science, and social philosophy correctly drawn; not only is there a mastery of the *tanna'im*, *'amora'im*, and response literature; not only are the contemporary expressions of American Judaism effectively discussed, but all is adorned with a polite polemic against the detractors of Halakha who have rejected the revealed character of both the Written and Oral Law. What this amounts to is a radical Halakhic treatise on Jewish norms, practices, and mores which argues for innovations in Jewish law to meet the needs of modern man.

Rackman begins with a detailed definition of his traditionalist belief based on the primacy of Torah teaching and guided by a teleological approach which proclaims that the purpose and end of human existence has been established by God. Man's role is conditioned by these pristine ends in developing the living rabbinic law or Halakha. He then analyzes the scope of Jewish law pertaining to festivals and Sabbaths, health and holiness, medical and legal problems, human rights and equality. He devotes a number of chapters to the multi-hued make-up of American Jewry. He speaks with authority in relating the existential experiences of the contemporary observant Jew, and he is sympathetic to the non-observant elements in the Jewish community. His account on God and man and his thoughts on the encounter between Israel and God make little advance over what is already generally known and often accepted by informed circles of Jews. Turning to the methodology of Jewish law, he maintains that the