

and Mannheim rather than from firm, datable evidence in the documents themselves. Hanson clearly intends for the "typologies" of poetic meter and prophetic genres to corroborate his reconstruction, but here again the lack of clear historical allusions in the oracles and the absence of analogous dated models weaken the force of his argument. Furthermore, the dominant impression gained from the biblical documents interpreting the postexilic era is that there was hardly enough life in Yahwism to support cultic life at all, much less two rival groups. Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Ezra and Nehemiah all depict the cult in need of major revival; yet Hanson projects two rival groups, each with a plan for restoration and each vying with the other for domination.

A tantalizing aspect of this study is the relationship of Hanson's theological stance to his treatment of the biblical text. The issue is raised explicitly on pp. 259-260 where he draws a parallel between the strife-torn community of Israel and the modern religious person's experience. He concludes that "the religious life . . . involves struggle, and can even be characterized as a dialectic of faith" (p. 260). The final chapter (V) develops these implications more completely as an appeal is made to maintain the dialectic of faith. The extremes to be avoided are "a flat theology of expediency" on the one hand, and a "utopian theology of escape" on the other. Hanson sees the prophet Isaiah as approaching the ideal: vision is integrated into politics without losing its normative character (p. 410). This preference for the classical prophetic tradition is evident in numerous passages throughout the study, as is Hanson's negative posture towards "hierocrats." The apocalyptic visionaries, however, are depicted more as tragic figures who are mercilessly alienated from the community by a heavy-handed hierocratic establishment.

In short, this reviewer is intrigued by *The Dawn of Apocalyptic*, but suspects that the influence of Weber-Mannheim-Troeltsch and Hanson's distinct preference for the classical prophets over oppressive hierocrats and escapist visionaries have perhaps unduly colored both his treatment of the text and his reconstruction of the postexilic era. Given the author's starting point, the work is brilliantly done, but its enduring worth remains to be established.

Walla Walla College  
College Place, Wash.

ALDEN THOMPSON

Kelsey, David H. *The Use of Scripture in Recent Theology*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975. x + 227 pp. \$11.95.

The author is best known through his *The Fabric of Paul Tillich's Theology* (1967) and serves as Professor of Theology at Yale University. The volume under review is "a descriptive study of some of the methods some theologians employ in doing theology" (p. 4). In contrast to Langdon Gilkey's *Naming the Whirlwind: The Renewal of God-Language* (1969), which treats the "problem of method" of theology as the problem about the "sources, content, and criteria of theology as a form of thought" (p. 121), Kelsey's monograph is confined to seven case studies of what theologians have *said* about the authority of scripture compared with what they *do* with scripture

in actual practice. The seven case studies reflect the modern theological pluralism and are drawn from a number of "theological positions" all claiming in some way or other to be in harmony with the Bible. The stated aim is "to help prompt fresh insight into theological positions that have come to be anyway" (p. 7).

Four leading questions are put to each of the cases studied: (1) What aspect (s) of scripture is (are) taken to be authoritative? (2) What is it about this aspect of scripture that makes it authoritative? (3) What sort of logical force seems to be ascribed to the scripture to which appeal is made? (4) How is the scripture that is cited brought to bear on theological proposals so as to authorize them?

The staunch, capable defender of orthodoxy of the late 1880s and 1890s, B. B. Warfield, the Calvinist theologian of Princeton, is the first to whom the questions are put. His view on the plenary inspiration of the Bible as expounded in his famous essay on "The Church Doctrine of Inspiration," published in his *The Inspiration and Authority of the Bible* (1948), is examined. For Warfield the content of the Bible is authoritative and the content is the Bible's doctrine which "biblical theology" puts into "one consistent system." In Kelsey's view this is "a kind of biblical positivism" (p. 23). The University of Frankfurt theologian H. W. Bartsch uses a much more recent version of "biblical theology" which Kelsey calls "biblical concept theology" because it deals with one or more interrelated concepts. For Bartsch the concept of reconciliation communicates peace. The demise of this approach is described, according to the author (p. 31 n. 24), by B. S. Childs, *Biblical Theology in Crisis* (1970). Both Warfield and Bartsch, although they differ radically on their view of inspiration, hold that the Bible is authoritative because of some intrinsic *property* of the biblical text.

In contrast to this "biblical concept theology" of "classical Protestant orthodoxy, current 'evangelical' theology, and pre-Vatican II Roman Catholic theology" stand in opposition to all the others that "understand 'authority' functionally, i.e., as a function of the role played by biblical writings in the life of the church when it serves as a means by which we are related to revelation" (pp. 29-30). G. E. Wright's influential study *God Who Acts* (1952), in which he emphasizes that the Bible is "recital, in which Biblical man confesses his faith by reciting the formative events of history as the redemptive handiwork of God" (p. 38), is contrasted with K. Barth's famous discussion of the humanity of Jesus Christ (*Church Dogmatics*, Vol. 4, Pt. 2). Both Wright and Barth employ narratives to authorize theological proposals; the former *directly*, the latter *indirectly*, by providing rules guiding what a theologian says today.

The last three theologians, L. S. Thornton, P. Tillich, and R. Bultmann, are grouped together because for them the authoritative aspect of scripture is neither its doctrinal (Warfield) and conceptual (Bartsch) content nor its recital (Wright) and narrative (Barth), but its "images" (Thornton) or "symbols" (Tillich) or "myths" (Bultmann). The "images," "symbols," or "myths" signal the occurrence of the revelatory event. Scripture is a collection of such revelatory occurrences that men have expressed verbally in concrete iconic ways. Scripture is important not because it provides a set of factors accessible to a historian or because it tells a story, but because by "expressing" in "images" or "symbols" or "myths" the occurrence of the revelatory,

saving events, it somehow links us with those events. Kelsey reacts to Tillich: "Why insist that saving events today depend in any way on Jesus? . . . If there is no connection between what is said (with only indirect appeal to scripture) about making human life whole today and what is said (with direct appeal to scripture) about the person of Jesus, then Christology would seem to have become logically dispensable for contemporary Christian theology" (p. 74). And to Bultmann's view that the revelatory, saving event is located in the subjectivity of the man of faith it is countered that Bultmann opens himself to the objection "that he thereby systematically distorts an obvious and central feature of most canonical scripture" (p. 84). Kelsey sees L. Gilkey and P. Ricoeur using scripture in the manner of Tillich.

The second part of this tome deals with the issue of "authority." It is argued that there is no single concept of authority, but that there are rather a number of related but importantly different concepts. Kelsey's proposals concerning scriptural authority for theology involve analyses about the relations among the concepts "church," "tradition," "scripture," and "theology."

This is a rich book. No one can lay it aside without being stimulated in a variety of ways. It is an exposé of neo-orthodox theology's achievements and failures. The most crucial question any reader will ask, if he is eager to transcend the limits of a theology conditioned by modern culture, is, Where do we go from here? That question begs for an answer.

Andrews University

GERHARD F. HASEL

Kubo, Sakae, and Specht, Walter. *So Many Versions?* Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 1975. 244 pp. \$5.95/2.95.

With so many new versions of the Bible (over 100 so far this century) confronting the English reader today, a book to aid in their appraisal and selection is especially appropriate. The task of furnishing such an aid is carried out in the present volume with the thoroughness and care that have come to be expected of Kubo and Specht.

In an introductory statement, significant trends in twentieth-century Bible translations are observed. Three are outstanding: (1) Abandonment of the KJV tradition in the "official" Bibles, (2) the almost complete dominance of the use of the best Greek text in the NT, and (3) incorporation of the principles of linguistics. The continued appearance of new translations is said to be necessary because of the discovery of older and better manuscripts, an improved understanding of the original languages, and the constant changes occurring in the English language itself.

Next the authors proceed to their primary purpose of providing a fairly comprehensive and detailed evaluation of 20 or so of the most important English versions. These include the RSV, Phillips', The Modern Language Bible, The Living Bible, The Jerusalem Bible, Today's English Version, The NEB, The New American Standard Bible, and the New International Version, among others. Generally a full chapter is given to each version so that the book reads somewhat like a series of book reviews. Kubo and