

2. It is surprising that one of the themes is not evangelism, especially in light of Jesus' commission (Matt 28:19-20), which provides the impetus for much of the preaching that goes on in the Christian church.

But the book is also commendable on two fronts:

1. The real contribution of this volume is that it does not teach how to preach; rather, it deals with issues that highlight preaching and encourage excellence in preaching. In this way, it is a refreshing and welcomed reader.

2. Lischer's brief introduction before each essay, largely biographical in nature, is quite useful in setting the historical tone for each essay.

Despite the fine print which made reading laborious and the fact that it may have been better if some essays were not included, I heartily recommend this book for all who have a passion for preaching.

Kenneth D. Mulzac

Mounce, William D. *Pastoral Epistles*. Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 46. Nashville: Nelson, 2000. cxxxvi + 641 pp.

William D. Mounce is the preaching pastor at Cornerstone Fellowship Church in Spokane, Washington. Formerly, he was professor of New Testament at Conwell Theological Seminary and director of the Greek Language Program. He has written extensively on biblical Greek. His book *Basics of Biblical Greek: Grammar* (Zondervan, 1993) is a standard textbook.

This present commentary, the outcome of thirteen years of study, targets the pastor and all those involved in the life of the church. Mounce concentrates on exposition of the text, leaving the tangential issues to other sources. His translation is idiomatic, while word studies are limited only to those words found in the Pastoral Epistles (PE). He provides an excellent bibliography and notes for scholars and those interested in further studies.

The introduction (xli-cxxxvi) provides a thorough description of the usual isagogical questions. He defends Pauline authorship and reconstructs the PE within Paul's life history. The historical information in the PE should be fitted after Paul's first Roman imprisonment (lvi). The PE were written prior to the second century because more than 450 references to them appear in second century documents (lxv). The heresy addressed in the PE has Jewish, proto-Gnostic, Hellenistic, and other elements.

Mounce does not see the PE as postulating a church organization similar to the one expounded in Ignatius. For him the bishop/overseer and the elder hold the same office and are interchangeable. Further, the theology of Paul in other epistles is not much different from that of the PE. After all, none of the Pauline themes is given priority in all the letters of Paul (1c), not even a concept as large as "justification," which is found only in Romans (15 times) and Galatians (8 times). He sees no evidence of developed orthodoxy in the PE above what we find in other

Pauline epistles. The language of the PE is also Pauline. Mounce demonstrates that the unique words in the PE are related to the circumstances that Paul was facing at Ephesus, such as the theology of his opponents, the use of traditional material, personal influences, and the use of an amanuensis (c-cviii).

The exegesis is done in a well-organized manner. He analyzes each pericope by providing the historical background, structural analysis, contextual and lexicogrammatical studies, and a commentary on each verse. He spends much of his time on 1 Timothy (3-373), discussing the major issues in PE studies. Since many concepts in 1 Timothy and Titus are similar, Mounce has only 84 pages for the exegesis of Titus (compared with 371 for 1 Timothy and 140 for 2 Timothy). His use of ancient and modern secondary sources is commendable.

As expected, Mounce provides extensive discussion on those issues related to women in ministry in the PE. He divides the scholars into two groups according to how they interpret Paul's comments on women: the "complimentarians," who see Paul restricting women on issues of leadership in ministry; and the "egalitarians," who see no restrictions. As a complimentarian, Mounce claims that women cannot teach bishops, but can teach other men, women, and children (123). But this prohibition is only applicable in public places. He sees 1 Tim 2:13-15 as prohibiting women from doing two things: "teaching bishops" and "acting in authority." He considers "acting in authority" as the principle, and "teaching bishops" as the specific application (130). He pleads with the readers not to reject his commentary because of this stand on women in ministry.

While agreeing with him that 1 Tim 2:13-14 is a restriction to women in some aspects of ministry, I think that it is going beyond the evidence to see Paul giving a universal rule from this passage, on the following grounds:

1. The heresy context demands that the passage be seen as trying to solve a local problem, just as in 1 Corinthians.

2. The principle should be not "acting on authority" but submissiveness of women (wives) to men (husbands). Because of heresy, the Ephesian women had broken this principle.

3. "Teaching" and "acting in authority" are the local problems that resulted in the Ephesian women's breaking the principle. Therefore, the rule of Paul in this occasion, as in 1 Corinthians is one of the various ways of applying the principle. Different situations may demand different applications.

Although he has listed the Nag Hammadi Literature in his list of abbreviations, Mounce does not actually use these important modern resources in his research. I was especially disappointed that he did not point to the *Treatise on Resurrection* where he quoted other important documents that deal with resurrection (541). There is also very little attention to Gnosticism in general, though he admits that proto-Gnostic traits are present. Other issues, such as "myth" and "Jannes and Jambres," should have received greater attention. It would also have been valuable to have included a subject index among various indexes, and to have included Nag Hammadi literature in the index of literature.

This commentary, nonetheless, is a great resource not only for the pastor but for the trained scholar as well. It will remain a major resource for studies in the PE for years to come.

Julius Muchee

Naugle, David K. *Worldview: The History of a Concept*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002. xxii + 384 pp.

David K. Naugle, professor of philosophy at Dallas Baptist University, has provided an excellent book covering an area that seems to have been overlooked, for while there are many books dealing with worldviews from different disciplines, there are not many books covering the history of the concept. *Worldview* grew out of a Ph.D. dissertation that Naugle did at the University of Texas, Arlington. The book is lucid and engaging and covers thoroughly the historical development of the concept of worldview in the western world.

Thinking of Christianity in terms of a worldview has been a refreshing development in recent times. It seems self-evident that Christianity presents a theistic interpretation of the universe, thereby shaping our concept of the reality about us. While the term “worldview” only recently came into existence, the concept is much older and may be traceable in the writings of Saint Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, and the Reformers.

Naugle has divided his book into eleven chapters. The first chapter deals with a worldview shaped by Protestant Evangelicalism. In this chapter he focuses on the pioneering work of James Orr (1844-1913), Scottish theologian, apologist, minister, and theologian, who in a series of landmark lectures presented at United Presbyterian Theological College, Edinburgh, introduced the concept of a Christian worldview to the English-speaking world. Orr followed this up with some equally significant publications. Significant focus is also given in this first chapter to the work of Abraham Kuyper (1837-1920), founder of the Free University of Amsterdam. Kuyper was a Dutch theologian, journalist, politician, and educator who saw secular modernism and biblical faith as presenting a view of humanity and the universe locked in mortal combat. Secular modernism, he argued, was essentially undermining the foundations of the Christian faith. Other notable modern Christian voices are also reflected on in this chapter.

I wish that Naugle had devoted the first chapter to a treatment of worldview during the biblical era—the times of the OT and NT. Because this is the starting point for the shaping of a Bible-based worldview, a treatment dealing with the view of reality and the universe at the very inception of biblical religion would have laid a stronger foundation for tracing the historical development of the concept.

The second chapter deals with a worldview shaped by Roman Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy. The word “worldview” appears less frequently, with fewer books written on the topic in both Catholicism and Orthodoxy. The contribution