

between the different functions of the use of this Psalm and has dealt with his material in a meticulous manner. Only because of his careful analysis and adeptness of treatment was he able to develop the relative scantiness and the apparent similarity of the contents of the material with any fullness at all.

Andrews University

SAKAE KUBO

Heimbeck, Raeburne S. *Theology and Meaning: A Critique of Metatheological Scepticism*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1969. 276 pp. \$7.50.

The problems of religious language in the philosophical milieu of logical positivism have been widely discussed in the literature. Heimbeck's book is a welcome and able attempt to invest the discussion with the precision that only a truly philosophical mind can provide. *Theology and Meaning* explores every side road and alley in its search for *all* the possible alternatives and their justifications with respect to the empirical nature, the "factuality," of God-talk.

This is not to suggest that the book merely *summarizes* positions. On the contrary, there are illuminating insights into the subtle presuppositions operating in religious-language philosophizing and a clear analysis of the tendency of some language philosophers to confuse the "criteria" for truth with the "evidence" for truth, the "checking-conditions" with the "checking-procedures" for verification/falsification. Failure to recognize *their* differences obscures the important difference between God statements such as "God raised Jesus from the dead" (what Heimbeck calls  $G_1$ -statements) and "God loves all human beings" ( $G_2$ -statements). He points out that "the controversies have centered around discussion of the more complex and tricky  $G_2$ -statements" (p. 174) which are very different in kind from the  $G_1$ -statements.  $G_1$ -statements can be shown to be empirical in nature;  $G_2$ -statements cannot. Nevertheless, Heimbeck demonstrates that  $G_1$ -statements are the ultimate warrant for believing the assertions of  $G_2$ -statements, thus giving to a non-empirical assertion (when looked at by itself) an empirical basis.

Heimbeck's attack on metatheological skepticism is convincing in many respects. He shows that God-talk is meaningful even in the restricted sense of "meaning" employed by the strict "verificationist" thinkers, and that religious language is cognitively significant.

I have only one objection to the book: its written style. Heimbeck writes at times with an economy and clarity that carries the reader with him from point to point. But at other times the reader is barraged with a tortuous, ponderous phraseology that uses the worst kind of jargon as its weapons, making the book tedious even for those engrossed in the issues. The following is one example: "There is a parallelism between the argument from criteria of application of summary designation to application of summary designation and the synthetic direction of the entailment-rule that backs it up, a parallelism which explains why and how the entailment-rule can serve to back up that type of argument. (The same point can be made, of course, for the argument from the denial of criteria of application to the rejection of the

summary designation and the synthetic direction of the incompatibility-rule that backs it up, . . .)" (p. 59).

If one can work through many pages of this kind of writing, he will profit from Heimbeck's really cogent discussion. It is just too bad that such fine theorizing is freighted with such poor writing.

Atlantic Union College  
South Lancaster, Mass.

JAMES J. LONDIS

Kaiser, Otto. *Isaiah 13-39: A Commentary*. Trans. by R. A. Wilson. The Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1974. 412 pp. \$12.50.

This commentary constitutes Kaiser's most recent exegetical work on the book of Isaiah; his commentary on Is 1-12 was published in English in 1972. The present volume covers a much more perplexing part of Isaiah and resembles its predecessor in the scope and character of its exegetical treatment.

The author holds with liberal scholarship that the formation of Is 13-19 continued for about five centuries from the time of Isaiah in the eighth century down to the first third of the second century B.C. The various redactors were not concerned to preserve Isaiah's words faithfully and without any alteration but reflect the faith and theology of circles of late pre-exilic to post-exilic times. Chaps. 13-23 have a highly checkered redactional history with only 25 verses (17:10-11; 20:1, 3-6; 22:1-14, 15-18) assigned to Isaiah of Jerusalem. The so-called "Apocalypse of Isaiah" (chaps 24-27) is believed to be composed in the period between the second half of the fourth century and the first third of the second century B.C. Chaps. 28-32 should not be treated as a separate "Assyrian Cycle" containing much material from Isaiah of Jerusalem, as is usually done. Basic Isaianic material is preserved in 28:7-12, 14-18; 29:9-10, 13-14, 15-16; 30:1-5, 6-7, 8, 9-17; and 31:1-3, but not without the touch of later redactors who put the text in its present form. Chap. 33 is a kind of compendium of eschatological conceptions associated with the fate of Jerusalem. Chaps. 34-35 are considered as a "Short Apocalypse" from the late exilic period and composed by the author of Is 40-55 as suggested by M. Pope in 1952. Finally, chaps. 36-39 form an appendix taken from the late post-exilic period.

This redaction-critical approach clearly has important consequences for the exposition of Is 13-39. There is much innovative and highly original argument which prompts renewed critical reflection concerning the composition of the book of Isaiah. Aside from 35 verses which have an Isaianic kernel in chaps. 28-31, there are only 25 verses of the 189 in chaps. 13-23 which are assigned to Isaiah himself. By comparison, other scholars assign much more to Isaiah of Jerusalem in the same section; e.g., J. Mauchline (1962) 101 verses, G. E. Wright (1964) 99 verses, G. Fohrer (1966) 39 verses, and F. L. Moriarty (1968) 100 verses. What one scholar regards as early (and genuine), another scholar considers as late (and secondary). Scholars opting for the gradual growth of the book of Isaiah differ so strongly in their conclusions that no scholarly consensus can be found. In this situation where no two scholars working independently can come to the same conclusion, the