part to clearly understand the church growth movement. Klaiber's recommendation that the seminary training of pastors should include less praxis and more theology, with each presentation of theology containing a theology of evangelism, is strongly opposed by this reviewer. It is valid that all theological presentations contain the elements of missional concern, but it is not correct that the practical application of that theology not be taught, when the practical application is what most pastors must spend most of their life performing.

If I were to believe the message of this book, I would conclude that there is no urgency to proclaim the message of Christ and that I have little part to play in its proclamation. On his final page Klaiber basically declares this concerning his own missional responsibility. If this is the theology espoused by most main-line churches, it is little wonder that these churches are in the process of decline.

On another note, this reviewer wished that Klaiber had spent more time exegisting the text rather than analyzing different theologians and their statements on evangelism and mission. A biblical theology must be developed out of the NT text itself, rather than out of a discussion of theological views. Also, the book is written in a style that is difficult to follow at times. This may be due to its being translated from the German, but it is not a book that is likely to be read by pastors.

This reviewer did appreciate Klaiber's attempt to point out a need for a theology of evangelism that drives our praxis, but the theology espoused here fails to ring true to the biblical text as understood by this reviewer. One can appreciate and commend his desire for the church to be more evangelistic, but a failure to see humanity as lost without Christ, of necessity limits the commitment to evangelistic persuasion.

Andrews University


This book is a well-crafted doctoral dissertation that investigates the validity of the way the author of Hebrews interprets the OT. Leschert's introduction provides an informative and critical appraisal of the views of a formidable array of scholars. He argues that "if, indeed, it is true that the writer of Hebrews uses inferior methods of interpretation to distort the meaning of the OT, the credibility of his message must also be called into question to the extent that it rests upon a faulty foundation" (4).

However, in spite of all the criticisms leveled against the author of Hebrews, Leschert contends that "the issue of its hermeneutical validity has still not been adequately addressed" (4). He notes background studies that have been aimed at comparing Hebrews' hermeneutics with first century works such as Philo's "Alexandrian school of Platonic thought", rabbinic-midrashic interpretations, and even the "apocalyptic exegesis of the Qumran community" (5). But all these studies, despite their valuable contributions, "have not addressed that issue in more than a passing way" (6).
Leschert claims that only a few scholars have attempted to reconcile Hebrews’ interpretation with historical-grammatical hermeneutics while still trying to hold on to the Epistle’s great spiritual value. S. Kistemaker, for example, has appealed to “cultural conditioning,” and pleads that Hebrews’ “methodology is not morally or ethically wrong, but technically inferior” (7). Richard Longenecker also sympathizes with this view and arguing further from the view point of “divine sanction,” posits that “Jesus and the apostolic writers had a special revelatory stance which permitted them to interpret in ways that are not permissible for non-inspired interpreters” (9). But this approach has not helped the situation.

Other scholars such as P. E. Hughes have evaluated Hebrews’ interpretation by the standards of the so-called “new hermeneutics.” “This new approach to hermeneutics allows an interpreter great freedom and creativity that are not possible in historical-grammatical hermeneutics” (10). However, Hughes has not provided a solution to the problem by concluding that Hebrews’ “interpretation cannot be ‘vindicated’ but ‘it is not illegitimate’” (12).

In the light of these criticisms, Leschert addresses the problem of Hebrews’ hermeneutics by examining in detail a few important OT citations in the book. In his estimation, core OT citations such as Ps 8:4-6; 95:7-11; 110:4 and Jer 31:31-34 “control the development of the book” (16). In order to deal effectively with the problem, Leschert makes a detailed study of a number of passages from the core citations which reflect the various types of hermeneutical criticisms leveled against the author of Hebrews.

He tackles the hermeneutical problem of Hebrews by comparing the Hebrews’ interpretation of core citations with their original meaning in their respective OT contexts, to determine if the author of Hebrews is consistent with the original OT meaning. In doing so, he exeges some OT passages cited in Hebrews 1, which the original writers apparently did not intend to be interpreted christologically. A good example of this is his treatment of Ps 45:6-7 (18).

Furthermore, Leschert examines the way the writer of Hebrews applies OT passages for “hortatory purposes.” In this connection, he considers Ps 95:7-11 and shows how the writer of Hebrews applies the eschatological “today” for rhetorical effect. Finally, Leschert compares Hebrews’ interpretation of the selected OT citations with “other relevant interpretations” in early Christian and Jewish literature (19).

Leschert’s dissertation reveals considerable linguistic ability, carefully organized progression of thought, and sound exegesis. The details of the work show a broad background knowledge of the issues under consideration. A typical case in point is the painstaking effort he applies to the study of Ps 45:6-7 cited in Heb 1:8-9. He presents the cases both for and against the nominative and vocative interpretations of Ὄθεός Ἰησοῦς of Heb 1:8-9 in a very remarkable way. This attitude of scholarly integrity is characteristic of the whole work. The way he handles the “‘Adam’/‘Son of Man’” Christological question of Ps 8 in Hebrews says a lot for the author of Hebrews’ understanding of functional Christology. He shows a distinctive difference between Philo’s use of Melchizedek and that of the author of Hebrews. Whereas Hebrews “begins with a historic person, Melchizedek, and
terminates on a historic person, Christ, . . . Philo begins with a mere symbol which dissolves into the abstract realm of Platonic ideas."

Leschert’s work is appreciated for its effort to vindicate the hermeneutics of Hebrews on a sound scholarly basis. However, in his appeal to subject final judgment “to truth as it may be found anywhere in the universe,” he appears to hide his personal conviction behind an academic cloud.

Hermann V. A. Kuma


Since its appearance in its first edition in 1957, The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church has been a standard reference work, indeed the most comprehensive one-volume publication of its kind in its field. The first edition was edited by Frank Leslie Cross. A revised edition, for which E. A. Livingstone joined Cross in the editorship, appeared in 1974. This 2d edition was reprinted with corrections in 1977 and 1978, and then again in 1983 with some revisions. The 1983 printing, also known as the “fourth impression” of the 2d edition, is the publication with which the 3d edition is compared and contrasted below.

In the present edition, some articles have been dropped, but a larger number of new articles have been added. For instance, in the early pages the articles in the 2d edition on “Abbott, Edwin Abbott” (3) and “Acceptilation” (9) no longer appear (and so also “Africa” [22], given only as an entry with cross-references to more specific regions in Africa), but new articles in the 3d edition include “active life” (12), “Admission to Candidacy for Ordination of Deacons and Priests” (18), “Admission to Holy Communion Measure 1972” (ibid.), and “African Missions, Society of” (25-26). The same proportion does not necessarily apply to the entire volume, but it is safe to say that there are more additional articles than deleted ones. A fair share of the articles have been carried over verbatim (or nearly so) from the earlier edition, but for quite a number of these there has been revision and updating of the bibliographical references which follow the main text of the articles.

One measure of the added input is the fact that some 500 distinguished scholars have contributed to the 3d edition, almost precisely double the number who prepared the articles appearing in the previous edition. The size of the new volume may also seem to suggest that there has been considerable expansion of the main text—1784 pages rather than 1514 (an increase of 270), with the two-column printed page, exclusive of running heads, measuring about a half inch longer and seven-eighths inch wider than in its immediate predecessor (now about 8.25" x 6.0" as versus 7.75" x 5.125"), and with the trim size also increased by one-half inch in height and one-and-three-eighths inches in width (now about 9.625" x 7.5" as versus 9.125" x 6.125"). The added pages and increased space devoted to the text on each page do not, however, reflect accurately the expansion of material, for a larger (and also less-compact) typeface is used in the new edition. According to my calculations, the extra material if it had been formatted in the style and typeface of the 2d edition would have increased the total number of main-text pages by only