in Honor of H. G. May, eds. H. T. Frank and W. L. Reed [Nashville, 1970], pp. 206-236) was apparently unknown to Holmgren. The theme of universalism is also investigated in the chapter entitled "The Servant of Yahweh and the Nation" (pp. 49-70). The "Servant" is identified with many scholars as Israel, i.e., "a select community of Jews living among the Babylonian exiles" (p. 49). The impressive titles given Yahweh in Isa 40-55 dominate the next chapter (pp. 71-96). Yahweh as King of Israel is treated on pp. 97-106. The emphasis is placed in Isa 40-55 not so much on God as Creator and Ruler of the World but on Yahweh's activities in Israel's past: "Yahweh is Israel's king; Israel is the people over whom Yahweh reigns" (p. 105). The grand title "Holy One of Israel," which appears 11 times in Isa 40-55, is under investigation in pp. 107-116. This title is understood as another expression of nationalism. The five-time designation of Yahweh as "Savior" is treated in pp. 117-121 and the six-time usage of "Yahweh of Hosts" in pp. 122-123. In summary: The divine titles speak both of Yahweh's special relationship to Israel and of his protection of her. Holmgren's study goes against the view that Isa 40-55 envisions a future in which Yahweh's salvation is offered to Jew and Gentile alike. These chapters in the book of Isaiah are supposedly much more nationalistic than appears at first sight. The controlling motif is the deliverance of Israel. The strong emphasis on nationalism in Isa 40-55, which is the central thesis of this volume, may be expected to receive mixed reaction. This reviewer has not been convinced of the soundness of the thesis both on the grounds of methodology and on the cogency of the arguments. 

Notes take almost as much space as the text itself (pp. 127-204), but that could have been remedied through the use of a smaller type on the typewriter. (The book is a photomechanical reproduction of a typescript.) Indexes of biblical references on Isa 40-55, subjects, and authors enhance the usefulness of this study.

Andrews University

GERHARD F. HASEL


This book is the first of several the author proposes to publish on anthropological themes. As its title suggests, Professor Johnsen maintains that man is not a compound of essentially isolable entities, but a unity or totality, comprising several distinguishable but indivisible aspects. The salient feature of his study is its extensive critique of the rejected view, as found in ancient Greek, medieval, and early modern philosophy, and its central thesis is that dualism in its various forms provides an utterly inadequate view of man and represents a disruptive force in Western culture. The basic characteristic of dualism is the bifurcation of man into radically different elements—usually mind and body, or soul and body—to which various functions are respectively ascribed, and its inevitable effect is to depreciate the significance of one element and exaggerate that of the
other. According to Johnsen, this view of man originated in the Persian religion of Zoroaster, and received its definitive philosophical expression in the two giants of Greek philosophy, Plato and Aristotle. While their views, he interestingly observes, are not to be uncritically identified as those of the ancient Greeks in general, and while there were important differences between them, the view of man they handed down to posterity is that of “a hybrid creature, composed of a body too low to be worthy of true esteem and true salvation, and on the other hand a soul too high to be actually human” (p. 181). Although dualism persisted through the Middle Ages, as the prevalence of the Platonic idea of immortality indicates, its effects were somewhat mitigated by the influence of Christianity and the biblical view of man, which is evident, for example, in the positive medieval assessment of the human body and in the prestige accorded the individual human being which blossomed with the Renaissance. Despite such elements in the medieval view of man, modern philosophy has, if anything, accentuated dualism, as the absolute distinction made between soul and body in Descartes’s Discours de la méthode illustrates.

While Johnsen’s study is devoted to a rigorous critique of dualism, he does of course make frequent reference to the preferred alternative, which he identifies as “totality.” When man is viewed as a totality, a single indivisible reality, all the dimensions of his being can be fully appreciated with none of them accorded an exaggerated significance. On such a view of man, no radical distinction can be made between inward and outward, between soul and body, for the different aspects of his being are nothing more than different dimensions of one indivisible whole, and the notion of immortality as the inherent characteristic of man’s soul is consequently eliminated. This view of man is not, however, the product of philosophical investigation. While it reflects most adequately the natural common-sense convictions regarding man, such as one finds in the naïveté of a child, historically it has but one source, namely, Christianity.

A final assessment of Johnsen’s study of man must, of course, await the publication of his forthcoming books, but it is apparent that this volume will be useful. It covers a wide range of thinkers and is particularly informative in its analysis of the anthropology of Plato and Aristotle. It is not, however, without its shortcomings. The most obvious is its failure to deal with the anthropological reflection of more recent thinkers, particularly those whose views might corroborate the author’s own. Paul Tillich, for example, speaks of “the multidimensional unity of life,” and Paul Ricoeur, in his massive study of human volition, systematically rejects dualism, emphasizing the incarnate and finite character of human freedom. Attention to such discussions would not only increase the value of Johnsen’s study, but might soften the impression it gives of being a polemic against the inevitable dualism of all philosophical anthropology. Another shortcoming is Johnsen’s failure to demonstrate the biblical and Christian origin of totality. Throughout the book this view is consistently identified as that of biblical Christianity, but this identification is asserted rather than anywhere systematically established. Perhaps this awaits the publication of another volume. Finally, and this obviously reflects the stylistic preference of the reviewer, the book lacks readability. The reader is brought back time and
again to points which are never hammered home once and for all in a definitive way, and in many places discussion could be abbreviated with no loss of content. Nevertheless, the book contains many helpful insights and addresses a problem of indisputable philosophical and theological significance.

Loma Linda University
Riverside, California

Richard Rice


This book was originally constructed as a project in lieu of a thesis toward a Th.M. degree from Dallas Theological Seminary. McDaniel’s professors encouraged him to have it printed and bound in book form. In his Introduction he states that the publication is “designed to provide the student with an aid in the reading of the Hebrew Old Testament. It is not to be regarded as a substitute for those complete lexicons and concordances needed for thorough exegesis. Nothing can take the place of these in the detailed study of the Hebrew Scripture. Rather, this aid is intended to allow the reader to gain a fuller perspective of the Old Testament through extended reading...”

The numerous unfamiliar words discourage the usual student from accomplishing this goal; hence the author considers his booklet “a pragmatic solution.” However, the words included are only those occurring less than ten times, and proper nouns are excluded. It doubtless would seem to most teachers of Hebrew that their students need help on many more words than merely those occurring less than ten times.

The arrangement of words is alphabetical by chapter in sequence through the Hebrew OT, following recognized word counts and giving standard definitions, especially choosing the definitions fitting the context of each location. The words are given only in Hebrew consonants, typewritten as are also the meanings and all other text. The result is a neat little reading aid, but it has, in the opinion of this reviewer, a very limited usefulness.

Sakae Kubo’s similar *A Reader’s Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Andrews University Press, 1971) contains the words, by chapter and verse, occurring less than 50 times, but Appendix I contains the words in one alphabetical list occurring 50 or more times, Appendix II the verbal forms in alphabetical order, and at the head of each book is a special vocabulary list of words occurring less than 50 times in the NT but more than 5 times in that book. This is a very useful tool. Some such expansion would make McDaniel’s book much more useful.

Andrews University

Leona Glidden Running