

of hallucination, such an acknowledgment of the historical evidence had already been made? If this is the case, then why is resurrection so central and apparently indispensable to Kaufman for revelation? If resurrection is thus necessary, is it irrational and inexplicable? The transcendent element supervening upon lower-level meanings found within history, as history (i.e., a piece of it) is appropriated in human (community and individual) experience. Indeed, going beyond the sphere of the empirical historian by speaking of God's transcendent activity in history, has the argument not left the public sphere? Is it a feature of historicism and historicist understanding of man that it recognizes as a given within experience such affirmations of meaning which are not to be further questioned? How can we move from a claim which speaks of God's act? The best one can do is to find a parallel in human experience that will illuminate what is given. This, I suspect, is the reason for preferring "hallucination" to resurrection (raising of the dead) as historically verifiable event. It is easier to find visionary experiences than testimony to raising of dead people. Hume had followed a similar argument.

By revelation is meant (I think) the making known of what was not known before by what is other than the subject. By resurrection, Kaufman means "the appearances theologically interpreted" (p. 425). Given these definitions it needs to be made clear how resurrection is revelation.

Such a brief review cannot substitute for the reading of the book. It is a courageous effort to attempt systematic theology, even when it is based upon man's relativity. If such relativity is taken seriously there may be hope of speaking *theologically* to secular man. This may involve a more radical rethinking of traditional and biblical imagery than Kaufman was here prepared to undertake.

Nottingham, England

EDWARD W. H. VICK

Keck, Leander E. *A Future for the Historical Jesus*. Nashville and New York: Abingdon Press, 1971. 271 pp. \$6.50.

The trend in recent NT studies is opposed to any optimistic prognosis of a future for the historical Jesus, especially in preaching and theology where Professor Keck directs his attention. He flies in the face of much recent NT and theological discussion when he asserts forcefully that there is such a future. What Keck does is to show the cruciality of the historical Jesus for faith, how this historical Jesus can be used in preaching, and the theological implications of this historical Jesus.

In affirming his position, the author does not retreat to an uncritical historiography. On the contrary, he insists more sharply on a sound critical method that evaluates the historical evidence without trying to impose on it any *a priori* assumptions. He opposes those who feel that the search for a historical Jesus is an attempt to secure one's salvation by objectification (Bultmann), those who find the historical Jesus so self-validating and compelling (Jeremias, Ebeling, Fuchs, Hermann), those who use Jesus to fit

a mold which is *a priori* to a study of the historical Jesus (van Buren, Tillich). His criticism of these writers from the historical point of view is devastating.

Several major points underlie Keck's argument: (1) The historical Jesus is crucial for the believer, the preacher, and the theologian; (2) "The Gospels have solid information though the present form of the material may not be historically accurate" (p. 24); (3) The relationship to Jesus is better understood as trust rather than faith since the opposite of this relationship is not disbelieving something but lack of trust, and it is personal and social; (4) The historical data concerning Jesus permit trust without requiring it; (5) Trust is not possible without some kind of knowledge but not the inevitable outcome of accurate information. Experiential not intellectual truth leads to trust; (6) The total life of Jesus including his death and resurrection must be considered and his paradoxical teachings must be held in tension; (7) Trusting Jesus is salvific; (8) Trusting Jesus leads to trusting God.

One of the significant contributions of this study is showing how trust is a more meaningful definition for one's relationship to Jesus than faith and the carrying out of this relationship with respect to traditional Christian concepts of conversion, repentance, and salvation. Another important contribution is Keck's effective rebuttal of Bultmann's contention that the search for the historical Jesus is salvation by works.

Keck continually affirms that the Gospels "provide us with sufficient data about Jesus that the contour of his life as a whole can come into view," but unfortunately he nowhere systematically presents this "contour." While he argues persuasively for the need of historical criticism, he does not explicitly perform this task in detail so that one is not altogether clear as to what the "sufficient data" are. The direction in which he would move is clear when he suggests that the Gospels have solid information though not historically accurate, when he opposes "the tyranny of the negative criteria" and insists on the "characteristic Jesus" rather than the "distinctive Jesus," and by what he accepts as solid data in his evaluation of Mk 1:16-20 (p. 24). It is unfortunate, also, that the book contains numerous typographical errors. A list of these would take up too much space.

The reader will find in this book a cornucopia of provocative ideas and suggestions. Throughout the reviewer found himself writing on the margin, "Should expand further." There are many latent ideas waiting for further development. This is a wide-ranging book and a short review cannot do full justice to it.

Andrews University

SAKAE KUBO

Kenyon, Kathleen. *Royal Cities of the Old Testament*. New York: Schocken Books, 1971. xii + 164 pp. 28 Figures. 103 Plates. \$10.00.

Here we have another of the popular books on the results of archaeological work in Palestine of which the author has given us two before—*Digging Up*