

known among Christians in England for his evangelistic preaching, his rapport with university students, his sharp wit and gifted turn of phrase. Eschewing pedantry, he writes with a racy style that conceals a real grasp of the subjects he treats.

*I Believe in the Holy Spirit* begins by raising questions about the Holy Spirit, and then examines the Scriptures' teaching in the Old Testament, the Gospels, and Acts. The second half of the book focuses largely (but not exclusively) on Pauline passages, dealing with the Spirit in the individual and in the church, going on to the Spirit's baptism, fullness and gifts. The last chapter evaluates the charismatic movement. A helpful bibliography is included.

I find the book very difficult to evaluate, for it is alternately excellent and poor. For example, there is deep insight into "Spirit" in the Old Testament, coupled with confusion when Green refers repeatedly to *ruach adonai*, even though the OT term is almost always *ruach YHWH*. There is telling force to his exposition of Acts 11:27-30 (p. 105), and especially to his treatment of Acts 19:1ff. (pp. 134ff.), but rather slipshod exegesis at some other points.

Green is moderately pro-charismatic while being non-charismatic, in the sense that those terms are understood today. He rejects the idea that tongues, or any other gift, is a criterion of spirituality in any sense, and will not countenance second-blessing theology — except in the sense that he would accept third- or fortieth-blessing theology. Nevertheless he is sure that the gifts of tongues, prophecy and the like are operative today, and should be tolerated. Unfortunately, he does not really consider the gift of apostleship.

Green is aware of the dangers of this position. He tries to strike an effective balance in his presentation. His pungent pen warns charismatics with more force (and affection!) than most readers of this *Journal* would allow. For instance, he says: (p. 54):

There is real danger in prizing, let us say, speaking in tongues. . . so highly that those who lack it are regarded as second class Christians if Christians at all. So far as we know, Jesus never spoke in tongues. And the Spirit is the Spirit of Jesus. It cannot, therefore, be a

*I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, Michael Green (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1975, 223 pp., paper, \$2.95).

*I Believe in the Resurrection of Jesus*, George Eldon Ladd (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1975, 156 pp., paper, \$2.95).

These two books are the first in a new series entitled *I Believe*. The purpose of the series "is to take a fresh look at controversial areas of the Christian faith". Published simultaneously by Hodders in England and by Eerdmans in the U.S.A., these books largely forego the luxury of the apparatus of scholarship in favour of addressing the general reader. This legendary "general reader" must not, however, be a lazy reader: both of these books deserve thoughtful concentration.

The author of the first book, Michael Green, is also the series' editor. Until recently the Principal of St. John's College, Nottingham (an evangelical Anglican theological college), Green has just been appointed Rector of St. Aldate's, Oxford. Green is well-

*Christian* insight to urge that speaking in tongues is an indispensable mark of life in the Spirit of Christ; whereas it is an undeniably Christian insight to insist that love and holiness, so manifest in the life of the incarnate One, should mark those who claim to have His Spirit.

Again, after showing the wide variety of meanings of *charisma* in the New Testament, Green correctly concludes (p. 196):

To be a Christian is to be a charismatic... All are alike charismatics; for all alike are eternally in debt to the sheer *charis* of God who sought us, rescued us, equipped us with varying gifts, and shared his own loving nature with us through the Spirit which he has lavished upon every one of us who are in Christ.

At the same time, Green is no less pungent with those who allow no valid contemporary gift of tongues, or of interpretation of tongues, or of prophecy, or the like.

Whether we accept his detailed position or not, two things must surely be admitted, things frequently lost to view in the heat of discussion: (1) Many of neo-charismatic persuasion are our brothers and sisters in Christ, and that is an eternal link, a link more fundamental than the issues which divide us. This fact ought to moderate the language used in debate. (2) The deepest offence of the charismatic movement is the use of alleged gifts as *criteria* of spirituality. Where this offence is removed, the charismatics need not feel superior and arrogant, and the non-charismatics need not feel inferior (or superior in an inverted sort of way!) and insecure. Such is the route Green advocates. Whether it is practical in any situation will largely depend on whether *both* the charismatics *and* the non-charismatics can come to accept this as the teaching of God's Word. In any case, there are important lessons to be learned from this book.

Perhaps there are three other criticisms of the book which should not go unmentioned. First, Green is somewhat repetitive. Compare, for example, p. 78 and p. 112. Second, his connection with the Church of England issues in typically ambiguous statements in the realms of baptism, ecclesiology, the relation of the Spirit to the "sacraments", and the like. This is in addition to incidental reference to dog-collars and vicars. Again, his charge that our Christianity has appeal only for the educated (p. 197) reflects the situation in the C. of E. in England; our own weaknesses are elsewhere (Can anyone imagine Rex Humbard

going down well in England?). Lastly, and most seriously, although Green warns against experience becoming the criterion of truth (eg. p. 208), it seems to the present reviewer that Green's categories of what constitutes a Christian are disturbingly broad.

Ladd's book, *I Believe in the Resurrection of Jesus*, is in many ways strikingly different from Green's. Ladd writes in no racy style, but with considered prose. He pauses rarely for anecdotes and cannot be charged with needless repetition. His book requires more concentration, and, this granted, is more rewarding and generally more precise.

The purpose of the book must be clearly understood. Ladd is not another Frank Morison of *Who Moved the Stone?* fame, trying to marshall massive, if sometimes superficial, evidence against nineteenth century liberalism. Rather, Ladd is presenting a positive case of the literal resurrection of Jesus in a corporeal body in space-time history, against the background of the most recent scholarly theological denials.

Those who have read Ladd's other books will already have their appetites whetted. And they will not be disappointed. Ladd makes out an excellent case without implying that the evidence is so compelling that only a fool could disbelieve. Just as some in Jesus' day interpreted Jesus' exorcisms as the work of the devil, so the raw data can be variously interpreted today. Ladd sets out to show that the bodily resurrection of Christ is the only adequate explanation to account for the resurrection faith and the admitted historical facts; but he rightly insists that the acceptance of this truth still depends on faith. "It is the thesis of this book that there must be interaction between historical evidences and faith" (p. 12). Thus, if the historical data showed that Jesus' body was found, no amount of faith would overcome the evidence, the stigma that the thing believed was a lie; but granted that the historical data point to the resurrection, faith is nevertheless required to believe in the resurrection of Jesus.

Ladd's method is largely the method of biblical theology. He surveys resurrection in the Old Testament, in Judaism and in its relation to the Messiah. Resurrection in Judaism is important because Ladd seeks to show that Jesus' disciples, true to their background, did not think in terms of a Messiah who would rise

from the dead. Therefore the resurrection came as a surprise to them: it was not a hallucination prompted by wishful thinking and naive expectation. Then Ladd focuses on the witness of the Gospels, then of Paul. Chapter 10 surveys and tellingly criticizes various modern explanations; and the last chapter, titled "Does It Matter?", is largely an excellent exposition of I Cor. 15:14-18.

There are many high spots in this book. The exposition of I Cor. 15 is superb; Ladd has, I think, rightly understood the nature of the resurrection body insofar as it can be understood this side of the *parousia*. His well-known presentation of the "already" and the "not-yet" aspects of the kingdom enrich his synthesis in this study. And his comments on Rom. 4:25 ("He was delivered over to death for our sins and was raised to life for our justification.") are among the best I have seen.

A certain level of technical awareness is presupposed of the reader. I recall recommending this book to a Christian friend a few months ago, only to have him return quite perplexed a few weeks later. Why, he wanted to know, did Ladd say that Isa. 53 does not refer to Jesus? In fact, Ladd says no such thing. He points out, rightly, that Isa. 53 does not refer to *Messiah*, but to an unnamed suffering servant. It is a matter of fact that, so far as we know, no Jew before Jesus connected the suffering servant of Isa. 53 and the kingly Messiah. The connection was made under specifically *Christian* revelation. This is integral to Ladd's argument that the disciples did not *expect* Jesus to die and rise again; but it could lead the unsophisticated astray.

Ladd leans on I Enoch for first century A.D. conceptions of the Son of Man. I remain unconvinced that the similitudes of Enoch are as early as he thinks; but even if they are early, it is just one source: how representative is it of Jewish thought? I confess I still prefer the more hesitant presentation of R. N. Longenecker, to whom Ladd does not refer.

What I found more disturbing was clear evidence that Ladd, who is Professor of New Testament at Fuller Theological Seminary, has succumbed to what is coming to be thought of as the Fuller position on Scripture. The Scriptures, he thinks, are accurate in their main (theological) points, and the (historical) details are not really too important: see pp. 76f. This position

works itself out in two or three ways. For example, the four Gospels, he says are not eyewitness accounts. Of course, Luke is not, and neither is Mark; much more could be said for Matthew (cf. N.B. Stonehouse, *Origin of the Synoptic Gospels*); and as for the Fourth Gospel, I think it must be admitted that, although the author never names himself, he unambiguously purports to be the Apostle John. I am aware of all the arguments advanced to deny John the immediate authorship of the Fourth Gospel, a few of some weight; but the self-witness of that Gospel, I maintain, unambiguously points to John. Therefore I find Ladd's position regrettable.

In some ways, Ladd is excellent in his analysis of "history" and "faith". However, I think he is unaware of the many meanings he is giving to "history" and "historical". I think that although he is basically right, his terminology needs to be tightened up. Similarly, his use of "prove" and "proof" is simplistic, not to say naive: a healthy beginning antidote might be G. I. Mavrodes, *Belief in God*.

These objections aside, this is one of the best books on the resurrection I have ever read.

D. A. Carson

Vancouver, B. C.