wealth of illuminating detail and well-reasoned analysis that Olsen provides. The book is a distinct and important contribution to the literature in the fields of ecclesiology, ecclesiastical history, and development of prophetic interpretation.

Andrews University

Kenneth A. Strand


This dissertation attempts to be "a comprehensive investigation of all problems" (p. 7) connected with this famous chapter which has been considered by some as fictitious without any real historical value (Wellhausen and others), by some as a historicizing legend (Jeremias, Dhorme, de Liagre-Böhl, Eissfeldt, Rowley), and by others as a historical document (Franz Delitzsch, Jirku, Deimel, Haag, Schedl, etc.). That there is still no consensus of opinion on the matter of the historicity of Gen 14 is illustrated by the position of W. F. Albright who declared in 1918 that Gn 14 has no historical basis. Fifty years later he states that the chapter "has an historical foundation" (*Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan* [1968], p. 69; see now also his posthumously published article in *BA*, 36 [1973], 5-33, esp. 15). On the other side is the position of the eminent R. de Vaux who maintained until 1965 that Gn 14 has a historical basis, whereas he now designates this chapter as a midrash (*RB*, 72 [1965], 5-28).

This monograph opens with a detailed history of research (pp. 13-61), which is followed by a new translation of Gn 14 based upon text-critical observations (pp. 63-80). After a brief discussion dealing with the composition (pp. 81-84) there comes next an historical investigation of the individuals and nations (pp. 85-167) and a treatment of the geography (pp. 169-206), upon which Schatz brings to bear the available comparative data from the ancient Near East. Then the author turns to a philological and religious-historical study of the names for deity (pp. 207-240). This is followed by an investigation of the vocabulary that notices in which so-called pentateuchal sources a particular term or phrase appears (pp. 241-262). The section entitled "History of Tradition" (pp. 263-289) seeks to throw light on the relationship between Abraham and Lot, Abraham and the Amorites, and Abraham and Melchizedek, as well as on the war narrative. A short chapter treats the subject of the style of Gn 14 (pp. 291-307). The summary (pp. 309-324) is concerned with the complicated story of the handing down of Gn 14. A comprehensive and very valuable bibliography is provided (pp. 335-384), but indexes of Scripture references, names, and Hebrew terms are unfortunately missing.

In a short review it is difficult to summarize the various conclusions reached by Schatz. The following are typical and representative of the entire work: Gn 14 is assumed to be made up of three separate traditions, i.e., the war of the kings of the East, Abraham meeting the king of Sodom, and Abraham's relation to Melchizedek. The author of the supposed J source combined these three traditions into a literary document which was expanded and enlarged by the alleged Dtr (Deuteronomist) at about 550 B.C., and later
the author of the supposed P document worked this over. Still later other elements were added to the text. Thus while Schatz rejects the late midrash hypothesis (de Vaux) and the theory of an adaptation of a non-Hebrew document (E. A. Speiser), he develops an extremely complex and unconvincing hypothesis. His interpretations and evaluations of the pertinent questions reflect a strong bias against the abundant archaeological evidences which favor the position that Gn 14 is a historically reliable document. Despite this serious defect, which calls his conclusions into question, the author has provided the student of Gn 14 with a very rich collection of pertinent materials in terms of historical reports, sources and literature, as well as attempted solutions and hypotheses. On this account, this study is of great value although it is certainly not the last word on Gn 14.

Andrews University

Gerhard F. Hasel


In recent years much has been written about eschatology from various points of view. NT eschatology itself has been interpreted differently by scholars (consistent, existential, ethical, transcendental, fulfillment and promise). And then there have been the theology of hope, secular eschatology such as Marxism, and scientific eschatology in such varied forms as Chardin's evolutionary approach, Heim's dimensional approach, and ecological eschatology. One of the values of this book is its bringing all of these together systematically, with careful analysis and critique. Because of the wide range of his coverage, the author's discussions of the different views are necessarily short. However, they are quite clearly and lucidly set forth.

He first treats the eschatology of the OT and the NT, then discusses and criticizes various views of eschatology including the scientific types. His third part includes his own views on eschatology. He rejects four "blind alleys of eschatology—setting a date, purgatory, universal homecoming, and millennialism" (p. 136). He opposes what he calls "travelog eschatology," a detailed description of heaven and hell, with respect to what lies beyond death. He considers occultism as anti-Godly and immortality of the soul as non-biblical and believes in the resurrection of the whole being. He says that there is not much one can say about the state between death and resurrection, but he looks with favor on Luther's description of it as a "deep sleep without dreams."

His "new world to come" is not the secular and materialist utopia of Marx and Bloch. But in saying this he is aware of the charge of otherworldliness, with its accompanying weakness of neglecting the present world. His rejoinder to this charge is that "this process of active anticipation strives for a better man, a more just society, and a more worldly world to live in. But since it is only anticipation, Christian faith is realistic enough to take into account the intrinsic self-alienation of man. Thus we must reject the illusion that we could even create a good man, a just society, or a new world" (p. 225). It is still not convincingly shown how the Christian takes part in the betterment of a world in which he sees no future.