

52.

- (37) *ibid*, 131
- (38) *ibid*, 132
- (39) SJT, 90f.
- (40) BMW, 179
- (41) This point has been developed in the works of J.Hamer, Langdon Oilkey, D.Tracy, C. van Til and G.Wingren where the theology of Barth is referred to.
- (42) BMW, 181
- (43) See on the function of the Spirit in creation the article of M.Kline, 'Creation in the Image of the Glory Spirit', *Westminster Theological Journal* 39: 254ff.

#### BOOK REVIEWS

'THE MAKING OF THE BIBLE'

William Barclay

The St. Andrew Press

£1.25 94 pages

William Barclay spent his brilliant literary life seeking to popularise the Bible. He was remarkably successful. But he was also sadly successful in achieving in the minds of many the exact opposite of what he had hoped to fulfil. Barclay always maintained the authority of Scripture as the Word of God but through a subtle erosion by inuendo, he in fact, left wide open doors of doubt concerning the accuracy and reliability of Scripture.

This book is the first in a proposed series of twenty-two under the title "Bible Guides" and edited by Barclay and F.F.Bruce. This volume is really concerned with the formation of the canon of Scripture. The introduction explains that the series, though written for non-theologically equipped readers who want to know what the Bible is about, is soundly based on all the generally accepted conclusions of modern Biblical research.

We are not surprised, therefore, to discover a total and uncritical acceptance of the critical theories of the compilation of the Pentateuch; the documentary hypothesis of the J.E.P.D. and H. sources are necessarily given a brief introduction as if they were proven facts and as if the scholars were totally agreed among themselves as to which source is responsible for what verses. According to Barclay, Deuteronomy emerged in 621 B.C. and we would not all agree with his assumption that the Pentateuch documents are full of different accounts of the same event. Daniel appeared about 165 B.C., which later places Dr. Barclay in some difficulty when he wishes to advance the quite proper view that after 450 B.C. no book could join the Old Testament canon. We are confronted with an absurd conclusion that at the time of the Jews/Samaritan rift (about 700 B.C.), the Scriptures must have consisted only of the law because that is all the Samaritans took with them. Surely there were quite strong natural reasons why the Samaritans did not want the detailed history of the Judges and early monarchy? The story of Nehemiah 8 to 10, we need not take 'absolutely literally', though why not is unstated. Similarly we may question whether Christ's references to 'law and prophets' is really evidence that in the first century the third division of the Jewish Scripture 'The writings' do not stand on the same level as the 'law and prophets', especially as later Barclay himself admits that in Luke 24:44 Christ included a reference to the Psalms which form part of the 'writings' and that Josephus claimed the 'writings' were fixed long before AD.70.

The second part of the book deals with the formation of the New Testament and once again it is sad to see such a ready acceptance of form criticism including its views of 'legends' and 'myths' which include the birth and infancy stories and baptism and temptation. It is little comfort to be told

that these words 'legends' and 'myths' do not necessarily preclude the historicity of these stories when, in fact, their use by form critics almost always means it does! It is frankly disappointing to find a scholar who is elsewhere so cautious liberally employing the phrase "we know" to refer to the hypothetical conjectures of source criticism. Barclay admits that the early church desperately needed an historical Christianity but will not commit himself to a belief that the Gospels are totally historical! On page 66 Barclay concludes from Paul's statements "*I speak in a human way*" and "*I have no command of the Lord*" that there were times: "when Paul made no claim to infallibility and made no claim that the Divine Voice spoke through him". This is no longer Barclay's *intuendo*, but Barclay's denial of infallibility.

Not all students of the Reformation would agree that the Reformers "were not in the least fundamentalists, if that word be taken to describe those who insist that every Word of Scripture is equally inspired, equally sacred and equally infallible."

Perhaps the point at which we must disagree strongly is in fact Barclay's conclusion. He rightly dismisses the Roman view of Scripture that it is made by the Church and its Councils but himself believes that they "became Scripture" because men found in them comfort and strength and a Saviour. This is surely as subjective as the view of Rome and not very different from it. On the contrary the reformed view of Scripture is that it is such because it comes from the prophets and apostles, has the authentication of Christ, and the authority of God stamped across it.

It goes without saying, because it is Barclayan, that the book is well written, carefully worded, full of valuable information and it breathes a high view of Scripture as the Word of God. There



his eye was particularly attracted to fragment 5 (7Q5). Half the nineteen letters visible in this papyrus had been already certainly identified and O'Callaghan thought he could read part of the word 'Gennesaret'. This led him to the passage in Mark 6:52,53 and after meticulous checking he concluded that the papyrus fragment was part of an early copy of that portion of Mark's Gospel. What made the discovery all the more exciting was the fact that C.H.Roberts, a notable expert in dating papyrus scrolls and who, in 1935, had dated and published the John Rylands fragment of John 18 (known as P.52), had already reliably dated the contents of Qumram 7 between 50 B.C. and A.D. 50. If O'Callaghan has made a correct identification we now have almost indisputable evidence of a portion of Mark's Gospel in existence within 20 years of our Lord's death. O'Callaghan went on to discover further portions of the New Testament among the fragments of Qumram 7. Of course the world of scholarship is divided but at the time of publishing this book, Estrada could claim: "After five years, many suggestions, dozens of learned papers and a number of computer trials, no alternative identification has emerged." (p.41)

This book is not merely an excellent introduction to Papyrology, and Estrada makes that excitingly simple, there is also a discussion on the development of Biblical criticism and textual criticism, a survey of discoveries at Qumram and the history of the community there, and a sketch of the life and the work of O'Callaghan himself. Bruce Metzger once described O'Callaghan as "an accomplished papyrologist whose previous publications have been characterised by scholarly insight and balanced judgement". O'Callaghan is a careful papyrologist and, according to Estrada, "Does not approach his work with evangelical presuppositions and the hope of discovering an early date New Testament". There can be no serious

doubt upon this man's ability or genuine scientific approach to his subject.

Although the fragment under discussion (7Q5) contains only 19 letters in five lines, this is perfectly within the limits that papyrologists are accustomed to work. Another fragment from the same cave (7Q2) contains part of just 22 letters, only 12 of which are certain letters, in five lines; nevertheless, this has been identified as part of the 'Apocryphal letter of Jeremiah' and no one questions this identification. The condition of (7Q5) is quite as good as many other fragments positively identified. It is not generally appreciated that the John Ryland's fragment (P52) consists of only 14 part lines some consisting of parts of two letters only. One of the features of Estrada's book is the excellently reproduced plates and illustrations which leave little for the reader to guess or imagine. Some of O'Callaghan's further identifications from Q7 are as convincing as his identification as 7Q5. Fragment 4 he identifies with 1 Timothy 3:16; 4:1-3 and since this is a right-hand margin in the fragment, the identification is much easier to establish.

If the identification of these fragments from Qumram 7 with the New Testament Scriptures are proven and accepted, and if, as Estrada believes, there are quite likely to be more New Testaments awaiting discovery from Qumram to Pompeii, then we have evidence that the New Testament records were in written form well before the end of the first century. That means, as William White declared back in 1972, that "All contemporary Barthian and Bultmannian views of the New Testament's formation will come crashing down in one inglorious heap." Or, as a scholar put it more cynically in *Time Magazine*, "They can make a bonfire of 70 tons of indigestible German scholarship"!

'THE INDENTITY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT TEXT'

Wilbur N. Pickering

Thomas Nelson Inc.

(\$7.95) 1977

(Obtainable from Mayflower Books, Southampton)

In 1851 at the age of 23 Fenton Hort wrote to a friend of "that vile Textus Receptus". This was long before he had sufficiently studied the Greek texts of the New Testament to be in a position to make such a devastating statement. Consequently, according to Pickering, "He deliberately set out to construct the theory that would vindicate his pre-conceived animosity for the Received Text." We appear to have lived under the tyranny of that pre-conceived animosity for the past seven decades.

Wilbur Pickering is a linguistic consultant with Wycliffe Bible Translators in Brazil and he must be warmly congratulated not only for his scholarly and painstaking research into the complex world of New Testament textual criticism, but particularly for his careful ability to bring the subject into the world of the reader who is not equipped to grapple with the intricacies of the subject. This book is an excellent introduction to textual criticism and for that reason alone is to be strongly recommended. But it is much more than this reason that leads us to claim this book to be essential reading for every minister and theological student. We are living in an age of translations and they are all largely based on the conclusions of Hort and his collaborator Brooke-Westcott. Unfortunately, today 'eclectic' generally does not mean the use of all available textual material, (and we have some 5,000 Greek texts of the New Testament ranging from whole Testaments to a few scraps), but a cursory use of the majority texts and a strong bias in favour of

those preferred by Westcott and Hort. This is what is meant by the liberal use of the phrase in modern translations: "Translated according to generally accepted standards of textual criticism".

Pickering fairly sets out the view of Westcott and Hort and then subjects it to a close critical examination. Hort claimed that there is no evidence of texts being altered on dogmatic grounds, but Pickering shows that there is abundant evidence of this and even Colwell in 1952 admitted: "The majority of the variant readings in the New Testament were created for theological or dogmatic reasons." Hort's "family trees" of texts, to explain the origin of text types, is shown to be a complete fabrication. Hort's Lucianic Recension, suggesting that the Syrian (Majority) Text was a deliberate 'cut-and-paste' job of Lucian in the fourth century, is shown to be a pure figment of Hort's imagination with no shred of historical evidence to support it.

Pickering also ably deals with the traditional Hort principle that the shorter reading is best. Professor A.C. Clark of Oxford has recently concluded: "The error to which classical Greek and Latin Scribes were most prone, was not interpolation but accidental omission". There is similar evidence against the dictum that "the harder reading is to be preferred". It is equally uncertain that the "oldest is best". It is not without significance that the oldest text 'so dear to Hort' came from Egypt to which not one original autograph of the New Testament Epistles was designated. In answer to the question whether the textual witnesses should be weighed (evaluated) or counted, Pickering wisely concludes "both"!

Perhaps the most enlightening and valuable chapter is that which deals with the history of the text. (chapter 5) It is an excellent summary of the care of the early church fathers in transmitting the text of the New Testament. Against some of our

present day alarmists who give the impression that the text behind the New Testament is hopelessly and irretrievably confused, Pickering reminds us that one hundred per cent of the manuscripts agree in 80% of the text and that in only 3% do less than 90% agree. 80% to 90% of extant manuscripts belong to the Massoretic Text and the remaining 10% to 20% do not belong to a single textual form. B and Aleph disagree with each other over 3,000 times in the Gospels alone and these are the two sacred texts of Hort's theory! In 1 Timothy 3:16 300 manuscripts read 'God', eight have an alternative reading of which only five have 'who', yet translators still offer 'who' as a viable alternative reading! (It is incredible that the translators of the New International Version opt for the word 'he' in this verse, preferring one very obscure miniscule fragment of the fourth or sixth century, 061, and one copy of Codex Bezae, D, which is renowned for its later editing against the 300 Greek manuscripts mentioned above! - (Reviewer). Pickering's analysis of the inaccuracies of the 'Five Old Uncials' of Hort's theory is devastating. But Pickering is not simply negative. He has positive and optimistic suggestions for the recovery of an accurate text of the New Testament.

In a recent review of this book John Wenham claimed "this is a shocking book" and admitted that Pickering had shaken him out of many years of complacent acceptance of the theories of Westcott and Hort. The present reviewer can do no better than conclude with the words of John Wenham himself "This is not an academic matter, for it affects the wording of the hundreds of millions of Scriptures which we are distributing across the globe. It is shocking to think that we may have been giving the world a bad text."

Rev Brian H. Edwards, BD  
Surbiton

## 'THE BOOK OF DANIEL'

by A.Lacoque

Published by S.P.C.K.

£11.50 pp 302

This recent volume is undoubtedly a major contribution to the growing corpus of literature on the Book of Daniel. Although the introduction is thin (Lacoque promises another book to fill the gaps), the commentary on the text is extremely thorough and the separate sections of critical notes on textual and exegetical problems useful. The work is thoroughly furnished with footnotes and provides an excellent all-round example of the contemporary studies in the Book of Daniel being produced within the framework of liberal criticism. It will doubtless become one of the standard works on Daniel and sustain that position for some time to come.

The Thesis

'Daniel' is a work of two sections. Section 'A' corresponding to chapters 1-6, represents the reworking of the generally older 'folk-lore' material of a 'Daniel cycle' within a second century B.C. context and by means of a midrash on the Book of Genesis. The problems of the 'faithful' during the time of Antiochus Epiphanes are never far below the surface and Daniel 'A' seeks to answer them. So Lacoque tells us of chapter 4 "it is evident, however, that a reader in the second century B.C. would have no difficulty in distinguishing, beneath the features of Nebuchadnezzar, Epiphanes whom his adversaries called Antiochus Epimanes, the mad man" (p74). Of chapter 5 we read "it is possible to see Antiochus behind the Belshazzar of this chapter" (p92).

The second section of Daniel - 'B' (chapters 7-12), the mainly apocalyptic section, ties in with 'A' through a common *sitz im leben*. The material begins in chapter 7, which is the centre of the whole book of Daniel to Lacoque, in which older material is

again re-worked and the four kingdoms of chapter 2 (Assyria, Media, Persia and Greece) reappear. Of 7:23-24 we read "it is certainly Antiochus who is in question" (p153). Chapter 8 is seen as a parallel account to chapter 7. About this "everyone agrees" (p156). Chapter 9, based on a "liturgical fragment of seventh century origin" (p180) continues to speak in the same context, and the 'weeks' find their fulfilment in the events of the 160's B.C. Chapters 10-12 are a midrash on Isaiah in which chapter 10 is to be interpreted in the light of chapter 7 as also is chapter 11 which is "in an enigmatic form designed to establish the fiction of a prophecy ante eventum" (p214). Chapter 12 is an appendix to answer two questions: how much time before the end?; who will be the beneficers at the parousia?

### CRITIQUE

There is very little that is new in the position advanced by Lacoque. Both his conclusions and his many assumptions are those of critical 'orthodoxy'. In addition to the late date of Daniel and the insistence upon an almost complete 'fulfilment' in the 2nd Century B.C. goes along his assertion that the book is full of historical inaccuracies. We read that chapter 6 "opens with an enormous historical error" (p106) to which Lacoque adds "we already know how little this embarrasses our Author". In the same chapter we learn that "the royal pretension to divinisation is anachronistic" (p112) and are reminded on several occasions of the lateness of the language especially evidenced in use of Persian loan-words. Such accusations by Lacoque can be multiplied almost without limit. However, the reviewer found that the majority of such alleged inaccuracies are dealt with in Young and Leopold (both written 30 years before the production of the present work) and answered satisfactorily.

This leads directly to a second major criticism of

Lacoque's work. Throughout the book, as so often with the work of liberal criticism, there is a blithe disregard for any of the productions of conservative scholarship. A consultation of the Bibliography (p253-256) in which 60 authors are mentioned reveals not one conservative. Similarly in the index of authors cited (p261-265) Leopold is ignored. Young is only mentioned in a footnote in which another person quotes Young, and Calvin has a footnote which he shares with several other Protestant reformers in which their view on a particular matter is cited. No others are mentioned (e.g. R.D.Wilson) so far as the reviewer can ascertain except J.G.Baldwin (again in a footnote). Do our liberal critics really expect us to take their 'scholarship' seriously if they never take any notice of our views or the defence of a position they ignore, merely asserting the 'assured' nature of their own?

Lacoque is not alone in apparently being actuated by an unwillingness to accept that (except for inspired guesswork - which, of course, sometimes goes wrong as in the case of Epiphanes death in chapter 11 verse 30) prophecy before the event can take place. Thus bolstered by a number of subjective arguments this appears to explain the characteristic attitude of the book. It is assumed (never proved) that the dating of a section of the text is to be made according to the accuracy of the portrayal of the events. Where it is accurate it must have been written after the event. A further feature is that throughout it is assumed that if a passage applies to a particular period then it must have been that period itself which gave birth to it. At no point is it conceded that there can be a difference between the original *sitz in leben* and the time to which it applies.

A consequence of this approach is that Lacoque has sometimes to force the material into an alien context. So, although he concedes that the Author is

incorrect if he considered that the four World Empires could be equivalent to Assyria - Media - Persia - Greece, since Media never had a separate existence after the Assyrian empire, yet he requires 'Daniel' to have thought so in order that all the events might refer to Antiochus. This rather than consider his own interpretation might be in error. The difficulties in establishing a parallel between chapters 7-8 are ignored with the statement "everyone agrees" to the parallel. In fact he means all his liberal critical colleagues are thus agreed. Similarly in chapter 9 he adopts a position (demolished earlier by E. J. Young) in which the 70 weeks have to be reduced to 62 to fit (see especially p195).

#### CONCLUSIONS

It is unlikely that conservative students will take much notice of a book which refuses to ever admit the existence of another viewpoint, much less deal with the arguments of that position. Perhaps, its main usefulness will be the encouragement it provides when it is witnessed how paper thin most of the assured results of liberal criticism in the Book of Daniel really are.

Rev Stephen Dray, MA BD  
London