

## BOOK REVIEWS

*The Book Study Concordance of the Greek New Testament.* By Andreas Köstenberger and Raymond Bouchoc. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2003, viii + 1528 pp., \$59.00.

Release of a variety of uniquely helpful study tools in recent years has facilitated work on the Greek NT. To their number Andreas Köstenberger and Raymond Bouchoc have added this compilation of Greek concordances for each book of the NT. *The Book Study Concordance* does not replace conventional concordances, such as the *Konkordanz zum Novum Testamentum Graece* or *The Exhaustive Concordance to the Greek New Testament*, but rather plays a complementary role, filling a niche by offering a clearer view of each NT book's vocabulary.

Following a brief introduction, the authors present each NT book in canonical order. The format begins with basic statistics, including total word count, the number of words occurring at least ten times, and the number of words occurring once. Then, in descending order, words are listed, with a transliteration and English gloss, according to percentage of use in relation to the NT as a whole. Each percentage group also is displayed in descending order according to the number of occurrences, and each Greek term is preceded by two numbers, the first representing uses in the book itself, and the second the number of uses in the entire NT. For instance, *τάλαντον* is the first entry in Matthew under those words that account for 100% of the occurrences in the NT. The numbers "14/14" preceding the Greek term stand for, respectively, 14 uses in Matthew and 14 uses in the NT. Listed next is *ζιζάνιον*, which still accounts for 100% of uses in the NT, with 8 uses in Matthew and 8 in the NT. The listings continue under 100% down to the *hapax legomena*, and then move to lower percentages (e.g. 87%, 85%, 80%, etc.), down to 25%.

Next in the format comes the main concordance for the book under consideration. The lexical form of the Greek word, a transliteration of the word, the number of occurrences in the book and the NT (again in "#/#" format), and an English gloss are underlined and serve as the heading for the incidents of that term in the book. If a term appears in Mark's longer ending or the adulterous woman pericope of John 7:53–8:11, both the concordance listing and the count of total occurrences for the book (in the case of Mark or John), or the count for the entire NT, appear in brackets. The word as it appears in context is in bold type, and the context offered, while not as generous as *The Exhaustive Concordance to the Greek New Testament*, for instance, is adequate. Only the article, *καί*, and *ὁὐτος* are not listed in the concordance. Finally, each section of *The Book Study Concordance* ends with two frequency lists for the NT book, the first in alphabetical order and the second according to number of occurrences.

This tool has several strengths. First, it is computer generated, based on the 27th edition of the Nestle-Aland *Novum Testamentum Graece*. With computer generation comes greater precision, a higher degree of accuracy, an orientation to the most recent editions of the NT text, and thus a stronger foundation for statistical analysis. For example, William Lane, in his monumental commentary on Hebrews, follows the older work of Morgenthaler, noting there are 1,038 different words in the book and 169 that occur only in Hebrews. Yet, *The Book Study Concordance* presents the total vocabulary at 1,030 and there are 157 different words listed as accounting for 100% of occurrences

in the NT (counting multiple occurrences, there are 170). Both Ellingworth and Attridge depend on Spicq's two-volume commentary for their vocabulary data, but the latter inadvertently omitted several terms, and the list presented in Ellingworth's commentary (pp. 12–13) has errors, such as the inclusion of *Σαλμών* rather than *Σαλήμ*.

Some may wonder whether the advent of powerful Bible study software, such as that produced by the Gramcord Institute, to which this concordance owes a debt, has not made a hard-bound concordance like this one obsolete. Yet this is not the case, for what *The Book Study Concordance* offers is a clear, handy, immediate overview of the vocabulary of any given book of the NT. One can scan the incidents of several terms at once, with the turn of a page or two, or compare different terms that seem to be used an equivalent number of times or a vastly disparate number of times. Also, both cognate terms and other terms related semantically can be observed with ease. For instance, *εἰσάγω*, *εἴσεμι*, *εἰσερχομαι*, and *εἰσφέρω* all are listed, with their occurrences, on page 1265. Of course, this could be run with computer software, but the immediate access to the data is helpful.

There are, however, a number of minor adjustments that could make this good tool even better. The designation "total word count" may be confusing to some, for this refers not to the total number of words in the book but rather the total vocabulary for the book. Romans, for example, is given a "total word count" of 1060, but many commentators refer to the total number of words in a book when doing statistics, and, for Romans, that number is 7,111. The addition of a true "total word count" would be helpful. While crunching numbers, why not give percentages following the vocabulary count, number of words occurring at least 10 times, and number of words occurring once? For example, the percentage of vocabulary to total words for Romans is about 15% and the number of words occurring once is at about 8%. This compares to 17.4% and 8% for 2 Corinthians and 20% and 11% for Hebrews. For even greater clarity on use of vocabulary, these percentages could be run, omitting the 29 very high frequency words listed in the preface to the *Konkordanz zum Novum Testamentum Graece*. Also, beside each percentage heading under "Words whose occurrences in the book account for at least 25% of occurrences in the entire NT," the authors could provide the total number of terms occurring under that percentage. In addition, along with the number of occurrences in the book and the NT, a third number could be added depicting the number of terms occurring with this frequency in the book. Thus, one could see readily that there are 157 different vocabulary terms in Hebrews, accounting for 100% of the uses in the NT, and 131 *hapax legomena*. Finally, English glosses in the frequency lists would take little room and keep users from constantly turning back to the concordance for word meanings of very low frequency terms.

Those doing research, as well as pastors, teachers, and students, will benefit greatly from this helpful work. Though *The Book Study Concordance* is a niche tool, it fills the niche well, offering a unique perspective on the vocabulary of the Greek NT.

George H. Guthrie  
Union University, Jackson, TN

*A Concise Dictionary of New Testament Greek*. By Warren C. Trenchard. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003, xvii + 177 pp., \$43.00.

Warren Trenchard has set out to produce a Greek lexicon that is up to date and full of detailed lexical information, yet, in accordance with its title, remains concise and suc-

cinct. In this difficult endeavor he has succeeded wonderfully. Trenchard, Professor of New Testament and Early Christian Literature at La Sierra University, is known to many readers of this *Journal* as the author of the *Complete Vocabulary Guide to the Greek New Testament* (rev. ed.; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1998). As Trenchard states in the preface, his previous lexical work has been refined and reshaped, now coming to fruition in the *Concise Dictionary*.

The volume is indeed concise. Although it weighs in at under 200 pages and is compact in size, the type is nonetheless very readable and each Greek headword is demarcated with bold print. The *Concise Dictionary* is not an abridgement but contains every Greek (and foreign) word that occurs in the Greek NT. Trenchard acknowledges that other small Greek dictionaries are available, but that his is unique in providing additional features such as cognate key words, frequency data, and references for NT *hapax legomena*. He also identifies enclitics, postpositives, and non-Greek words.

The English glosses given by Trenchard consciously depend extensively on BDAG, though not exclusively. Trenchard offers a range of glosses for most Greek words, employing semicolons to separate the various semantic categories. Many entries also contain idiomatic expressions lifted from the NT.

To get a feel for this lexicon, it is helpful to compare a typical entry of the *Concise Dictionary* with BDAG.

*Concise Dictionary:*

**εὐχαριστέω** v. (χαίρω) aor. εὐχαρίστησα; aor. pass. εὐχαριστήθην. *to be thankful, feel obligated to thank; give, express, render, or return thanks, offer a prayer of thanksgiving, εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ thanks be to God.* (38)

BDAG:

**εὐχαριστέω** (s. χάρις) 1 aor. εὐχαρίστησα (νήχ- **Ro 1:21** [edd. exc. t.r.] s. W-S. §12, 5b; Mlt-H. 191f); 1 aor. pass. subj. 3 sg. εὐχαριστήῃ; ptc. εὐχαριστηθεῖς (Just.)

1. to show that one is under obligation, *be thankful, feel obligated to thank.* . . .
2. to express appreciation for benefits or blessings, *give thanks, express thanks, render/return thanks* . . .
3. *pray gener.* . . .

In BDAG, of course, one also finds detailed descriptions and references under each numbered semantic domain, in this instance covering one and a half columns. One can see that the glosses in both lexicons align and that both provide a listing of principal parts. According to his concise purpose and NT focus, Trenchard provides *only* those principal parts that appear in the NT. He also helpfully concludes the entry with the number of occurrences found. The regular inclusion of cognate words in parentheses is also an added bonus. One can see that the *Concise Dictionary* has a succinct and readable presentation, yet is not skimpy on information.

Lexicography is a tricky business, full of difficult decisions that the end user never sees. The most striking thing about Trenchard's offering is how clearly thought out it is on such complicated lexicographical matters as headword forms, crasis forms, and organization of glosses. In a lexicon this size one might expect a mere abbreviation of the larger standard lexicons, but just the opposite is the case. The *Concise Dictionary* is a well-planned, original volume, gleaming from the mistakes and successes of other Greek lexicons.

While the *Concise Dictionary* will be of use on the scholar's desk, Trenchard clearly has the student and pastor in mind. He includes helpful notes such as this entry for μέγρις: " = μέγρι before vowels," and under ἐνπ- one finds "s. ἐμπ-." Of course, both the

student and scholar will always do well to consult the wealth of information found in BDAG, even for the most mundane of words. Nonetheless, within the genre of a concise and portable dictionary, Trenchard has set a new standard.

Jonathan T. Pennington  
University of St. Andrews, Scotland

*The Challenge of Bible Translation: Communicating God's Word to the World.* Edited by Glen G. Scorgie, Mark L. Strauss, and Steven M. Voth. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2003, 428 pp., \$24.99.

This book is a collection of essays on Bible translation presented in honor of Ronald F. Youngblood, emeritus professor of OT at Bethel Seminary West, San Diego, California. I am pleased to write this review because I have admired Ron for his great intellect, academic accomplishments, and spiritual stature since the days we were fellow students at Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning.

The book is divided into three sections: (1) the theory of Bible translation; (2) the history of Bible translation; and (3) the practice of Bible translation. Each section contains six essays. The book contains a table of contents, a list of contributors, an extensive table of abbreviations, and a subject index, all of which make it user-friendly as a resource. However, it does not have an organized bibliography, but rather a list of resources at the end of each essay; and unfortunately it has endnotes for each essay rather than the more convenient footnotes.

The book clearly is a defense of the TNIV. Most contributors had something to do with that translation and have some association with the International Bible Society's Committee on Bible Translation. Moisés Silva's essay, "Are Translators Traitors? Some Personal Reflections," opens the first section with a discussion of the subtle difficulties inherent in any translation process. His examples of translation difficulties, often drawn from his own experience, illustrate the necessity for translators to be thoroughly conversant in the grammar and culture of both the source and target languages in which they work. He argues that word-for-word translations often fail to accurately convey the meaning intended by the original author, and that translators should concentrate on transferring *meaning* rather than *words* from one language to another, thus the need for dynamic (functional) equivalence to be a part of any translational theory.

In the second essay, "Bible Translation Philosophies with Special Reference to the New International Version," Kenneth L. Barker, formerly the executive secretary of the NIV Translation Center, surveys the spectrum of translation theories, placing the Formal Equivalence Theory at one extreme and the Functional (or Dynamic) Equivalence Theory at the other. After discussing the strengths and weaknesses of each theory, he concludes that the middle ground between the two extremes, where he places the NIV, is best for translating the Bible.

D. A. Carson's essay, "The Limits of Functional Equivalence in Bible Translation— and Other Limits, too," is the third chapter. Before discussing the limits of Functional Equivalence (FE) for Bible translation, Carson presents a number of its benefits, assuring the reader of its overall importance. Attempting to refute the arguments against the use of gender-inclusive language, Carson defends its use in the TNIV. He notes that FE's emphasis on "equivalence of response" invites abuse, and objects that the extension of FE into "far broader issues has been facilitated on the one hand by a variety of faddish theoretical constructs that do not stand up to rigorous scholarship . . . and on

the other hand by the epistemological relativism endemic of postmodernism" (p. 97). He warns that FE "must not be permitted to override the historical particularity of the Bible" (p. 99). He also warns that FE "must not be permitted to mask the development of and internal relations within salvation history" (p. 101). He argues against the trend in FE to value style above grammatical and exegetical accuracy. He also warns against the tendency to expect FE to accomplish more than it can, and of the need to be discerning in the use of marginal notes.

The essay in chapter 4 is "Current Issues in the Gender-Language Debate: A Response to Vern Poythress and Wayne Grudem" by Mark L. Strauss. After acknowledging several areas of agreement with his antagonists in this debate, Strauss attempts to refute their arguments against the use of gender-inclusive language (GIL) in Bible translation. He disagrees with their definition of GIL, belittles their objection that GIL resulted in the loss of subtle nuances of meaning, and disagrees with their comprehension of when contemporary users of modern English understand masculine nouns and pronouns to be either gender-specific or gender-inclusive. After accusing his antagonists of several linguistic errors, he concludes with a discussion of political and social correctness, giving the impression he thinks GIL will inevitably be accepted as normal in standard English. Strauss and his NIV colleagues evidently have not read Paul Mankowski's essay, "Jesus, Son of Humankind? The Necessary Failure of Inclusive-Language Translations" (*The Thomist*, 62 [July 3, 1998]). Mankowski demonstrated that gender-inclusive language is found only in literature influenced by the current social agenda, and not in the language and literature of language groups isolated from or indifferent to that agenda. Such people experience none of the gender confusion alleged by inclusivists. It appears that the TNIV, which emphasizes the importance of naturalness, has unnecessarily incorporated an unnatural element (GIL) under pressure from a cultural agenda.

Herbert M. Wolf's essay, "Translation as a Communal Task," constitutes chapter 5. Wolf discusses the value of translation as a team effort as opposed to that of a single scholar. A team can provide the benefit of diversity while working with common values and goals. The communal influence of traditions, such as the KJV, adds stability to a translation. Wolf also discusses the importance of literary studies, the placement of headings, and the role of theology in Bible translation.

In chapter 6, "English Bible Translation in Postmodern Perspective: Reflections of a Critical Theory of Holistic Translation," Charles H. Cosgrove discusses holistic translation from the perspective of canon, rhetorical form, and medium. In addition, with caution, he discusses three dimensions of holistic translation: translangualization, transgenrelization, and transmediatization. Finally, he discusses democratization of translation—making a translation for the whole people of God. The difficulty of this topic is summarized by his own words: "Much of what I assert and describe is too new for any of us to have settled opinions about. I know I don't" (p.159).

Dick France's essay "The Bible in English: an Overview" comprises chapter 7 and launches the second major division of the book. France provides an excellent but brief history of Bible translation, beginning with ancient translations and extending up to the present. His primary focus is on the English Bible. In addition, he discusses some issues associated with Bible translation, including textual criticism, translation theories, the public and private reading of Scripture, and gender-inclusive language.

In chapter 8, "A Translator's Perspective on Alister McGrath's History of the King James Version," Walter W. Wessel provides an excellent review of McGrath's book. McGrath included economic, political, cultural, and religious details lacking in most other histories. From the perspective of a translator, Wessel questions a few of McGrath's statements, but on the whole commends the book as an important contribution.

Kent A. Eaton's essay, "Translation Was Not Enough: The Ecumenical and Educational Efforts of James 'Diego' Thomson and the British and Foreign Bible Society," comprises chapter 9. Eaton argues that translation is ineffective unless accompanied by distribution and education, and uses the example of the colportage and educational ministry of James Thomson to illustrate his point. Eaton admires Thomson's ecumenical success in acquiring the cooperation of the Roman Catholic Church in his international activities. Unfortunately, Thomson's failure to follow up his activities resulted in short-lived projects.

In chapter 10, "The New International Version: How It Came to Be," John H. Stek provides an excellent, detailed, but somewhat terse history of the NIV from its inception in the mind of Howard Long to its completion and ongoing revision.

Ronald A. Veenker's essay, "That Fabulous Talking Snake," comprises chapter 11 and is troubling to someone like me who views the early chapters of Genesis as true history composed by Moses. Veenker refers to the Genesis account of the Fall as a "fable" (p. 265) consisting of an "etiological narrative" composed by "creationist narrators" (p. 266) and revised by a number of subsequent redactors (p. 265) whose purpose was "to address the problem of evil" (p. 266). He concludes that "the serpent does not talk because Satan manipulates him. The serpent *must* speak, or God will be guilty of acting unjustly by human standards" (p. 270, emphasis his). Finally, he explains, "Of course, the 'serpent as Satan' identification grew out of the work of Hellenistic exegetes and found its way into the church fathers. From there it was further elaborated by John Milton in our English tongue" (p. 270).

Chapter 12, David Noel Freedman and David Miano's essay "Slip of the Eye: Accidental Omission in the Masoretic Tradition," concludes the second section of the book. Freedman and Miano propose that accidental omission in the copying of ancient manuscripts was much more common than textual scholars are willing to admit. They support their proposal with a number of convincing examples from the Hebrew Old Testament that can better be explained as accidental omission than otherwise.

Bruce Waltke's "Agur's Apologia for Verbal, Plenary Inspiration: An Exegesis of Proverbs 30:1-6" comprises chapter 13 and introduces the third section of the book. Waltke convincingly demonstrates that this passage does indeed support the doctrine of the plenary verbal inspiration of Scripture.

Steven M. Voth's essay, "Justice and/or Righteousness: A Contextualized Analysis of *Šedeq* in the KJV (English) and RVR (Spanish)," comprises chapter 14. Voth notes that in the majority of cases where the Hebrew word *tsedek* is translated as "justice" in the Reina Valera Revisada (RVR) Spanish Bible, it is translated as "righteousness" in the KJV. After a contextual and historical study of the meaning of the word, Voth concludes the KJV translators were influenced by political and ecclesiastical pressure to avoid the use of "justice" where it may reflect on the reign of King James, preferring "righteousness" instead. Consequently, Voth proposes the word should be translated in English much more often as "justice."

In chapter 15, "Translating John's Gospel: Challenges and Opportunities," Andreas J. Köstenberger evaluated passages of the Gospel of John in the NIV, NASB, NKJV, ISV, NLT, HCSB, ESV, NRSV, and TNIV on the basis of five issues: (1) text; (2) background; (3) ideology; (4) exegesis; and (5) style. The chapter ends with a summary chart that rates the TNIV best among the eight competitors.

Douglas J. Moo's essay, "'Flesh' in Romans: A Challenge for the Translator" (chap. 16), discusses the problem of translating the Greek word *sarx* as "sinful nature" in the NIV and TNIV. After confessing he was previously critical of translating the word as "sinful nature," he states his further study of the word led him to accept the NIV/TNIV rendering as the best.

The essay of James D. Smith III, "Faith as Substance or Surety: Historical Perspectives on *Hypostasis* in Hebrews 1:1" (chap. 17), investigates the historical, philosophical, and psychological basis for translating the Greek word *hypostasis* objectively as "substance" in the KJV or subjectively as "being sure" in the NIV. His conclusion prefers the objective sense.

In chapter 18, "The use of Capital Letters in Translating Scripture into English," Larry Lee Walker surveys the use of initial capital letters in the KJV, NIV, and a number of other modern versions with respect to references to God, the Messiah, and various proper nouns and pronouns. Numerous charts comparing the capitalization practice of the various translations under a variety of conditions indicate the NIV is more complete and consistent than the others.

This book is of value to all who have an interest in the history, theory, and practice of Bible translation, particularly with a focus on the NIV and TNIV.

James D. Price  
Temple Baptist Seminary, Chattanooga, TN

*The Bible and the Historian: Breaking the Silence About God in Biblical Studies.* By Paul S. Minear. Nashville: Abingdon, 2002, 280 pp., \$30.00 paper.

Long-time Yale professor and one-time ecumenical visionary Paul Minear was born in 1906, so it would be remarkable if in 2002 (at the age of 96) he brought out a monograph with the ambitious-sounding agenda suggested by the title. In fact, this is not a freshly-minted book but an anthology of some twenty-one essays, the earliest of which appeared in 1947, with most dating to the sixties and seventies and five dating to the nineties. They have been reshaped by Minear at points to make them cohere, to jettison some of the original scholarly apparatus, and to reflect inclusive language. Two "major personal convictions" animate the resulting whole: "first, the massive debt owed by biblical interpreters to modern scholars since Ernesti; second, the potential contributions of the New Testament itself to all the disciplines that are devoted to recovering its multiple messages" (p. 19).

The book begins with a Foreword from J. Louis Martyn (pp. 11–16). He rightly notes that Minear's first "personal conviction," the contribution of biblical scholarship since the Enlightenment, is not the book's main thrust. Rather, Minear is concerned about "the degree to which a simple and single-minded devotion to scientific historiography can severely attenuate our ability to hear the strange word of scripture" (p. 13). Critical method in the "virtual canonization" it has enjoyed in many centers of higher learning "can blind our eyes to God's revelation and stop our ears to God's Word" (p. 13). It is gratifying to hear Martyn concede this and encouraging that Minear's book in some ways serves to advance this proposition.

The bulk of the book consists of four parts. Part 1 ("Divine Revelation and Historical Research") documents ways that the allegedly historical methods dominant in main-line Western academic centers have frequently failed to live up to their billing. Post-Enlightenment thinkers have interpreted biblical texts with little regard for the biblical writers' convictions regarding eschatology, cosmology, and ontology. The result has been a wresting of the NT's message. These methods, it turned out, were not only "historical" but were in their own ways as "dogmatic" as the ecclesial approaches they were engineered to supplant. Minear points, it could be said, to what T. W. Manson in the 1940s called "the failure of liberalism to interpret the Bible as the word of God."

Part 2 (“The Churches’ Memories of the Messiah”) studies different texts from Matthew, Luke, and John to arrive at insights concerning what the early church came to believe about Jesus. This is a balancing act, because while Minear wants to check critical historiography’s tendency to ignore or treat superficially the Gospels’ theological riches, at certain points he does little to question the stock critical agnosticism about the status of Gospel claims regarding history. So, for example, regarding the birth narratives: “Today, everyone admits that to some degree these narratives are the distillation of a community’s experience, an articulation of the multiple memories and hopes of that community” (p. 90; cf. p. 226 regarding the putative *Sitz im Leben* of John 16:2). That may not square very well with Luke’s Prologue (or in the case of John 16:2 the Johannine author’s claims to have been an eyewitness) and appears to be a fairly unvarnished restatement of classic form-critical method. Yet happily Minear arrives at many good theological insights, and in the end he argues that careful study of the birth narratives demands alteration of the methods typically applied to them. The result should be “historians who are able to enter more fully into the life of the distant past and give a better report on the inner structure of that life, who are able to assess the work of ancient writers more accurately by viewing that work within the writers’ own perspective” (p. 98).

Part 3 deals with “The Messiah’s Presence with the Churches.” These are studies centering outside the Gospels. They explore the confidence found in various epistles and Revelation that the Messiah, though crucified, continued to have a living presence with and in subsequent generations of believers. “Their life on earth thus received an ultimate anchorage that was intimate, powerful, and enduring” (p. 147). This section includes an incisive comparison between the world view of NT writers who speak of the “peace” of God and the God of peace, on the one hand, and modern thinkers in their bondage to relativism, sociological reductionism, and ecclesial pragmatism (p. 185). Riffs like these dot the book and redeem its few pedestrian pages.

Part 4 (“The Messiah’s Gifts, The Churches’ Gratitude”) explores the gifts imparted by the risen Lord, gifts that “do not often weigh heavily on the scales of the historian” (p. 200). These include the aid of the Spirit in intercession, the blessed weakness of the fellowship of Christ’s sufferings, the gift of Christ’s ineffably rich promises, and the gift of mission in Jesus’ name.

Overall Minear testifies to his personal conviction that there is more transcendent, as well as historical, truth in the NT writings than old-line liberal scholarship of the 20th century could admit. In that sense he confirms the presence of confessional conviction in mainline Protestant thought that is redolent of works in other domains of theological scholarship by writers like John H. Leith (*Crisis in the Church* [Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997]), Thomas Oden (*The Rebirth of Orthodoxy* [San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 2003]), and others. The gospel is making a comeback in unexpected ways and places (see Colleen Carroll, *The New Faithful: Why Young Adults Are Embracing Christian Orthodoxy* [Chicago: Loyola, 2002]). Minear, an old-line insider, has performed the valuable service of demonstrating how even scholarly exegesis of NT passages need not arrive at results inimical to historic Christian belief. This is a book that respects human intellect, yet seeks to give God an active role in exegetical labor. It frequently delivers on the promise of its subtitle to shatter “the silence about God” that has too often made academic exegesis into a mode of arrogant polemic rather than a source of truly critical understanding.

Robert W. Yarbrough  
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

*Daily Life in Biblical Times*. By Oded Borowski. *Archaeology and Biblical Studies* 5. Atlanta: SBL, 2003, xi + 148 pp., \$15.95 paper.

This book provides an overview of daily life in Israel during the Iron Age (1200–586 BC). The five major sections of the book are devoted to rural life, urban life, household and life cycles, art, and writing. These sections are brought together at the end of the book with a description of what might have been a typical day in the life of a rural family at the beginning of the seventh century BC. The text is enhanced by a handful of drawings, photos, and maps. Helpful annotated bibliographies appear at the end of each chapter, and indices are included for Scripture references, Hebrew words, and modern authorities. Borowski has written in a non-technical style for a popular audience, although the writing style lacks energy. Technical errors are few. The most glaring is the confusion of figure 2.1 with figure 2.2, which are reversed from what the accompanying text indicates.

While Borowski makes liberal use of biblical references throughout the book, he does not hesitate to express his opinion that the Bible stories may be simply imagined (p. 24) or that in general the Bible is of questionable reliability (p. 35). While this is undoubtedly an accurate reflection of Borowski's view, it is not likely to find a sympathetic hearing with a large segment of the book's potential audience—evangelicals with a more conservative view of biblical history. Since the expression of opinion on this matter does not contribute to the purpose of the book, those comments would have been better left unvoiced.

In several places the discussion is rather thin. For example, Borowski suggests under "Health and Sickness" (p. 74) that useful information can be gleaned from biblical and extra-biblical written sources, as well as from archaeological evidence such as skeletal remains, soil analysis, and coprolites. However, in the subsequent discussion the only non-biblical material cited is possible evidence of the medical procedure of trephination (piercing of the skull) from Lachish. Most students of the Bible will already be familiar with the biblical material presented in this section and would have been better served from deeper discussion of non-biblical written sources (both Egyptian and Mesopotamian), additional skeletal remains (e.g. care for broken bones, evidence of rheumatism, vitamin, or mineral deficiencies), and the other archaeological remains Borowski has mentioned but failed to utilize.

It is difficult not to compare this book with King and Stager's *Life in Biblical Israel* (Westminster John Knox, 2001), which covers essentially the same subject. Unfortunately, Borowski's book does not compare favorably. King and Stager's work is more thorough (e.g. Borowski does not even mention the critical development of cisterns in his discussion of Israelite water systems), is much better illustrated (both in quantity and quality), has more engaging text, and is more aesthetically appealing.

Kris J. Udd

Michigan Theological Seminary, Plymouth, MI

*Life in Biblical Israel*. By Philip J. King and Lawrence E. Stager. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001, xxiv + 440 pp., \$39.95.

As veteran field archaeologists, both King and Stager are well qualified to co-author this volume—a part of the publisher's Library of Ancient Israel series edited by Douglas A. Knight. The book is voluminously illustrated with a variety of masterful visuals, many

of which were generated from Stager's excavations at Carthage and Ashkelon. Three useful indices (Biblical Passages and Ancient Sources, Modern Authors, and Subjects) contribute to posturing the work as a study resource. An 18-page bibliography in tandem with the careful documentation throughout testify to the extensive research underlying the project. Two end maps—one of the ancient Near East showing major sites mentioned and one of Palestine showing major sites mentioned—are included.

Two observations regarding the mechanics of the book are appropriate. First, the placement of a few illustrations is a bit curious. Early in chapter 4 (Patrimonial Kingdom), the "Royal City" is addressed, and in connection with that, a picture of a palmette capital from Ramat Rahel is shown (p. 207). Two more pictures of a palmette capital from Khirbet al-Mudabybi' appear somewhat later in the chapter (p. 237) in the section where "Siege Engines and Battering Rams" are the particular focus of discussion. A single picture of the Mudaybi' capital—instead of two pictures taken from different angles—would be more effective if it were included in the discussion of "The Royal City" instead of "Warfare, Armies, and Weapons." Second, with the effective inclusion of the extensive cultural Hebrew terminology throughout the book, an index of Hebrew terms would be beneficial. These two circumstances do not, however, impede one's reading of the work.

The initial line of the introduction clearly states what the co-authors set out to achieve in this volume: "The task undertaken in the present book is to recreate the lifeways and mental attitudes of the ancient Israelites, from the courtyards of the commoner to the courts of kings" (p. 1). The authors immediately clarify "lifeways" by identifying eighteen "cultural categories" (Family, Gender, Marriage, Child-rearing, Sex, Age, Death, Building, Social, Food, Dress, Work, Leisure, Learning, Religious, Order, Power, Ways) they intend to address; they also include page references where the reader will find relevant discussion. The book's organization is not, however, based on these categories. Rather, after chapter 1, "The Importance of Everyday Life", the contents are organized into five additional chapters that address sociological and political categories: (2) The Israelite House and Household; (3) The Means of Existence; (4) Patrimonial Kingdom; (5) Culture and the Expressive Life; and (6) Religious Institutions. Given the vast array of cultural materials the archaeological enterprise has made available, the "recreation of ancient lifeways" seems the more achievable of the two goals. Indeed, the reader encounters an engaging presentation of the lifeways of ancient Israel.

Relative paucity, however, of patriarchal- or Israelite-generated written materials recovered from Bronze Age and Iron Age Palestinian sites makes more challenging a "recreation of attitudes"—particularly those of the "commoner of the courtyard" (p. 1). Where written texts are available, the authors have made good use of them, but more for illuminating "lifeways" than for defining "mental attitudes." The biblical text, of course, has been extensively integrated by the authors. But it is precisely here that the "mental attitudes" of the co-authors present something of an enigma. On the one hand, the book presents a delightful study in the culturally contextualized vocabulary of ancient Israel's lifeways and includes text references in most cases. On the other hand, the reader is left pondering the authors' "mental attitudes" toward the OT text. Early in the book, the documentary hypothesis is embraced as the framework for reading the OT (pp. 2–3), and the authors declare, "Both the Deuteronomistic Historian and the Chronicler were interested in reinterpreting and reshaping older and contemporary sources in order to create a new past relevant to their present times and comprehensible to new generations" (p. 3). At best, this seems to assert more about the "mental attitudes" of the Deuteronomist and Chronicler than about grassroots mental attitudes. Yet elsewhere, occasionally the reader encounters assertions that various OT individuals "spoke," followed by a quotation of a text that presents the individual's recorded words (e.g. Abra-

ham, p. 40; Jesse, p. 93; Mephibosheth, p. 186; Naomi, p. 280). In light of King's and Stager's acceptance of the documentary hypothesis, one might expect such discourse would be presented as "reported words."

Related is the question of how one is to read and use the OT text. Is it to be read and used predominantly as "historical chronicle," as "literary, theological text," or as a combination of both? (See J. H. Sailhamer, "Text vs. Event," *Introduction to Old Testament Theology: A Canonical Approach* [Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1995], pp. 36–85, and the recent D. M. Howard and M. A. Grisanti, eds., *Giving the Sense: Understanding and Using Old Testament Historical Texts* [Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2003].) While not mutually exclusive, these varying approaches hinge, in some measure, on one's sensitivity to the genre of text being read/used, and therefore necessitate a more nuanced approach to and use of texts. King and Stager seem to lean more toward the "historical chronicle" model as they extract from the text vocabulary, isolated references, and snippets of events in order to create a cultural collage of biblical Israel.

Aside from the elusiveness of ancient Israelite "mental attitudes" and the somewhat enigmatic mental attitude of the co-authors regarding their stance toward and use of the biblical texts, readers—lay and scholastic—will be engaged and informed by *Life in Biblical Israel*.

John I. Lawlor  
Grand Rapids Theological Seminary, Grand Rapids, MI

*Nelson's Old Testament Survey*. By Charles Dyer and Eugene Merrill. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2001, 861 pp., \$34.99.

It is hardly conceivable that an OT survey could still be published that would contribute in a manner beyond what is already available, but Dyer and Merrill have indeed accomplished this with *Nelson's Old Testament Survey*. This survey is unique in that it could easily be utilized as a survey or as a one-volume commentary on the OT. It serves as a ready resource enabling one to have quick access to standard introductory information for the 39 books of the OT as well as providing succinct interpretation for each chapter, and often each paragraph, of these books. As a result, it would be beneficial for use as a course textbook or simply as an addition to one's library.

The volume covers, for each book, the essential components of a survey: authorship, unity, date, addressees, and purpose. Each of these components is covered thoroughly as Dyer and Merrill crystallize pertinent issues making them comprehensible to the reader. For example, they take an issue such as the documentary hypothesis (discussed in the chapter on Genesis) and explain it clearly in a couple of paragraphs. By addressing these essential components, the authors are able to bring the reader into the necessary issues for studying the books of the OT. For some of the books, such as the prophets, background information is also provided. The purpose for this discussion in the context of the prophetic books is to demonstrate how these books fit into the history of Israel.

One component that is not addressed in the introductory material for each book is overall theme. The chapter titles have a thematic twist to them, which could easily be developed or highlighted, but nowhere is a focused thematic statement made about each book. This in no way detracts from the benefits of the book, but its inclusion would be helpful for readers, especially students, to have an overall theme for each book.

The authors also provide two additional components for each book—outlines and theological emphases. The outlines provide the framework for discussing the contents of each biblical book in its respective chapter. These outlines are helpful and clearly related to the content, but may become overly alliterated for some, especially in the Psalms. The theological themes succinctly present major theological truths found in each book, with the exception of the prophets. (Second Kings and 2 Chronicles do not include theological themes because of their relation to the first books.) The reader will find these themes are insightful in understanding the larger literary purposes for the book under discussion. However, I always found myself wanting more discussion in this section. The authors are no doubt limited by the designated length of the volume, but in a survey the theological themes are an invaluable asset to understanding a book. It could be that they chose to focus on their analysis of each book chapter by chapter or paragraph by paragraph, which is beneficial, rather than the broader issues of thematic development, but the absence of the latter is disappointing to me personally.

The bibliography is located at the end of the book. Bibliography is provided under headings for the individual books with an additional heading for the broader issues of prophetic literature. This is an excellent bibliography, which points the reader to high quality resources if one were interested in further study. Along with the additional section for prophetic literature, it would be helpful to include additional bibliography for the Pentateuch, historical books, and poetic literature. Similar to the prophetic literature, each of these has unique resources, which would be helpful to highlight for those who want to further their research.

Each chapter in the book is devoted to a separate book of the OT. After the essential components of a survey are provided, the authors then thoroughly overview the contents of the books, often paragraph by paragraph. This is a strength of the book, giving it the “feel” of being a one-volume commentary. As noted earlier, this feature requires a large amount of space, but it also makes the book very utilitarian. Not only will one find it a quick resource for survey material, but also a brief interpretation of many of the broader issues found in each biblical book.

The book also has an additional chapter that introduces the prophetic literature. Additional chapters introducing the Pentateuch, historical books, and poetic books (partially covered in “characteristics,” pp. 406–7) would be advantageous to the reader. The unique nature of each of these sections would make further explanation beneficial. It would also aid in understanding some of the larger issues of the OT. In fact, a general introduction to the OT is needed. The book abruptly begins with the book of Genesis with no introduction to the 39 books under survey. A general introduction, which would help the reader see the larger picture, is glaringly absent in this survey.

Throughout the book, highlighted boxes underscore personal application. These bring a needed spiritual emphasis to what could otherwise be information overload. The truths are poignant and penetratingly insightful.

One final comment is that I believe a map is necessary in a survey, but it is lacking in this volume. Geography and the location of cities and countries are important factors in the story of the OT. To introduce readers to this fascinating area is not only important, but would also strengthen this volume. If this book were adopted as a course textbook, an atlas would be an important companion volume.

Overall, I find the book to be a good survey of the OT. The writing style is comfortable and clear for the reader. It is obvious that two scholars who know how to communicate both standard information and technical material have written this book. They communicate well, staying focused on the content that matters. They do not get wordy, but rather stay on task, providing the reader what is needed to understand a given passage. As a result, this book would not only be a good textbook for an OT survey course,

but would also be a good addition to the shelf of any family who wants a good resource for OT studies.

David Lee Talley  
Biola University/Talbot School of Theology, La Mirada, CA  
Grace Evangelical Free Church of La Mirada, La Mirada, CA

*Jerusalem in Bible and Archaeology: The First Temple Period.* Edited by Andrew G. Vaughn and Ann E. Killebrew. SBL Symposia Series 18. Atlanta: SBL, 2003. 510 pp., \$49.95 paper.

The city of Jerusalem has always held a special place in the hearts and minds of Bible readers. Partly this is because all manner of biblical themes—from inspiration to creation to redemption to eschatology—find a home here. But partly as well it is because of the allure of the city itself. No other place has been as extensively explored as has Jerusalem, either by the penetrating tools of the archaeologist or by those of the literary critic, and the age-old struggles that have bloodied the city itself sometimes seem no more intense than struggles over theological and academic positions *about* the city. Jerusalem has developed into a archaeological and historical “hot spot” over the past couple of decades, in a sense representing the much older struggle between the “assured results” of archaeology and the “equally assured results” of biblical studies, and has become an ensign both for those who insist that these disciplines maintain their distance from each other and those who bewail the fact that they do.

As a breath of fresh air, this integrative volume provides a series of twenty essays, most of which originated as papers presented in the “Consultation on Jerusalem in Bible and Archaeology” at the Annual Meetings of the Society of Biblical Literature from 1998 to 2001. It bears witness that it is possible to hold productive conversations on a topic as pivotal and emotional as Jerusalem in spite of a decided lack of scholarly consensus about the place and the ideas it represents. It also offers a great chance for non-specialists to be brought up to date on some of the issues in the current debate.

Vaughn and Killebrew have organized the essays of this volume into three categories. The first includes six essays relating to the tenth century BC, the period of the United Monarchy. Because this is the most contentious section of the collection, it will be good to summarize the salient points made by each contributor.

The lead essay by Jane Cahill, “Jerusalem at the Time of the United Monarchy: The Archaeological Evidence,” sets the stage for those that follow. Cahill, who has been assigned the responsibility of publishing the results of the late Yigal Shiloh’s excavations in the City of David (1978–1985), not only provides an up-to-date summary of Shiloh’s data but also includes previously unpublished pottery plates and photos of his work. In addition, Cahill reviews previous archaeological work in the city, offering a necessary interpretive context for Shiloh’s excavations. Cahill concludes that Jerusalem of the United Monarchy was a fortified city serviced by at least two water systems and inhabited by a socially stratified population that built at least two new residential quarters—in short, a city in many ways consistent with the biblical picture of the United Monarchy. Her plea that “theories based on negative evidence should never be preferred to theories based on positive (i.e. archaeological) evidence” (p. 73) should be well-heeded.

Israel Finkelstein’s contribution (“The Rise of Jerusalem and Judah: The Missing Link”) and that of David Ussishkin (“Solomon’s Jerusalem: The Text and the Facts on the Ground”) provide a very different interpretation of tenth-century BC Jerusalem.

These two scholars, working with a low archaeological chronology and an extremely cautious or even minimalistic understanding of archaeological process and data, argue tenth-century BC Jerusalem was a relatively small, unwalled village and (re)acquired the aspects of an important fortified city only in the ninth and eighth centuries BC. For Finkelstein, this move to a city worthy of statehood began with the rise of the Omride dynasty in the north and was completed with the fall of the northern kingdom and incorporation of Judah under the umbrella of Assyrian domination.

By casting his archaeological net a bit wider and drawing as well on sociological theory, Gunnar Lehmann ("The United Monarchy in the Countryside: Jerusalem, Judah and the Shephelah during the Tenth Century BCE") offers a kind of middle-ground interpretation. Combining data from archaeological surveys in the Judean hill country and Shephelah that suggest these areas were relatively sparsely settled in the tenth century BC with tribal theory that offers an understanding of village unity centered on only a very few clans (e.g. Calebites and Ephratites), Lehmann concludes that while Jerusalem was impressively fortified in the tenth century BC, its ruler extended hegemony only locally through a series of kinship-based chiefdoms (a model which, by the way, resonates with the description of David's rise to power in 1 Samuel).

But what then of the "Zion Tradition?" The next two essays are by biblical historians: J. J. M. Roberts' "Solomon's Jerusalem and the Zion Tradition" and Richard Elliott Friedman's "Solomon and the Great Histories." Both trace the origins of the importance of Jerusalem and its ruling dynasty in the Iron Age back to at least the time of Solomon. Linking literary themes in the biblical accounts of Solomon and Hezekiah with verifiable historical and political connections between the tenth and late eighth centuries BC, Roberts and Friedman offer biblically-based scenarios that support a Jerusalem that, while not a major world capital, was at least a city to be reckoned with on the local scene.

The book's second section includes eight essays relating to the late eighth to early sixth centuries BC (the last half of the Judean monarchy). It is here, where the ground is more firm and the issues less tendentious, that we find some essays by evangelicals. Is this somehow significant, or perhaps just another reminder that evangelicals also need to continue to constructively enjoy the world of wider scholarship even when the issues are slushy and contentious?

In any case, here we find two archaeological articles. Hillel Geva ("Western Jerusalem at the End of the First Temple Period in Light of the Excavations in the Jewish Quarter") offers a maximalist view of the Jerusalem in the eighth and seventh centuries BC. Ronny Reich and Eli Shukron ("The Urban Development of Jerusalem in the Late Eighth Century BCE") describe a thin band of settlement, well-fortified, on the eastern slope of the City of David that predated the larger rise of settlement on Jerusalem's western hill.

Essays by James Hoffmeier ("Egypt's Role in the Events of 701 BC in Jerusalem," with a rejoinder), K. Lawson Younger Jr. ("Assyrian Involvement in the Southern Levant at the End of the Eighth Century BCE") and J. J. M. Roberts ("Egypt, Assyria, Isaiah and the Ashdod Affair: An Alternative Proposal") examine ways in which Judah was swept up by the forceful tide of Egyptian and Assyrian foreign policy during the politically uncertain days of Hezekiah. Younger, in particular, makes a salient point in correctly calling scholars to account who take the biblical text to task for being too "theological," while at the same time accepting the essential historicity of similarly "theological" Assyrian annals and royal inscriptions (p. 262). The last two essays in this section, "Jerusalem in Conflict: The Evidence for the Seventh-Century BCE Religious Struggle over Jerusalem" by Lynn Tatum and "The City YHWH Has Chosen: The Chronicler's Promotion of Jerusalem in Light of Recent Archaeology" by Gary Knoppers, focus on the end of the First Temple period. Tatum sees the collapse of Judah to have been primarily caused by internal, rather than external military, forces (which common

sense might suggest anyway), while Knoppers views the Chronicler's renewal of the image of Jerusalem as a kind of revivalistic response to multiple threats of the Persian period after Solomon.

The third, concluding section provides six synthetic essays purportedly aimed at working toward an archaeological and textual consensus of Jerusalem of the First Temple period, although some (e.g. Killebrew, Schniedewind, and Vaughn) exhibit more of an even hand than others (most noticeably Steiner). These essays include "Biblical Jerusalem: An Archaeological Assessment" (Ann Killebrew); "The Evidence from Kenyon's Excavations in Jerusalem: A Response Essay" (Margreet Steiner); "Jerusalem in Bible and Archaeology: When Did Jerusalem Become a Subject of Polemic?" (Yairah Amit); "Jerusalem, the Late Judaean Monarchy and the Composition of Biblical Texts" (William Schniedewind); "Archaeology, Ideology and the Search for David and Solomon" (Neil Asher Silberman); and "Is Biblical Archaeology Theologically Useful Today? Yes, A Programmatic Proposal" (Andrew Vaughn).

Silberman calls a spade a spade by noting how a lack of agreement between archaeologists and biblical scholars is often motivated by political and ideological concerns—concerns that readily see the speck in one's opponent's eye but rarely acknowledge the log in one's own. This is especially apparent in the debates about the tenth century BC. Evangelicals, of course, are not immune, and should heed Silberman's warning: when the stakes of a debate are high, with modern religious and/or political ramifications, those who enter the debate should be honest, bold, and prepared to accept the consequences of the process.

Finally, Vaughn's essay calls for the recovery of data (archaeological and otherwise) to make positive statements that illuminate the background and setting of the (biblical) narratives—and hence provide a set of parameters into which the range of biblical and archaeological interpretations should fall—without passing judgment on the historical veracity of specific events described in that narrative *per se*. Hence, he suggests there is vast room for collaboration among scholars who otherwise hold irreconcilable views on the nature of the biblical events themselves (pp. 416–17), and that such collaboration on context should tend to hone in on those interpretations that are more probable while eliminating those that are less so. This "dividing the data between A and B" and agreeing to disagree on "A" while working together on "B" will not satisfy those wanting to nail down every loose flap of an issue, but it at least can serve as a starting point for joint efforts in the larger world of scholarship. Given the pitfalls of other approaches, perhaps it is worth a try.

The volume concludes with a bibliography of over 800 entries.

Paul H. Wright  
Jerusalem University College, Jerusalem, Israel

*Beginning Biblical Hebrew*. By Mark D. Futato. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2003, vii + 351 pp., \$35.00.

Writing from his prison cell in 1535, Tyndale requests "the use of my Hebrew Bible, Hebrew Grammar, and Hebrew Lexicon, that I may employ my time with that study" (quoted in F.W. Danker, *Multipurpose Tools for Bible Study* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003], p. 177). If we are guilty of anything today, it is having an excess of Hebrew tools that are poorly used or rarely required, even in the best of times. To a growing selection of grammars, Futato now adds *Beginning Biblical Hebrew* (BBH).

The introduction to *BBH* is clear, stipulating the “Goal,” “Objectives,” and “Method” of the grammar (p. ix). Under “Goal,” Futato claims his grammar “provides students with a thorough introduction to Biblical Hebrew in an easy-to-learn format” (p. ix), which for him includes morphology and syntax—“forms” and “uses” (p. ix). As for “Method,” Futato presents the grammar in “bite-sized chunks,” addressing what is “essential for reading the Hebrew Bible” (p. ix). What emerges in *BBH* is Futato’s emphasis on reading (see #4, p. x), accomplished by drilling pronunciation, mastery of forms, and vocabulary memorization of 400 words. The vocabulary is keyed to Raymond B. Dillard’s *Hebrew Vocabulary Cards*.

There are forty lessons (pp. 1–252), each comprised of three sections: *grammar*, *vocabulary*, and *practice*. Following the lessons (123 pp.), *BBH* concludes with “Paradigms” (pp. 254–81), listing of “Vocabulary” (pp. 282–90), and “Answers to Practice Drills” (pp. 291–351). In terms of quantity, over half of the lesson material is comprised of “practice” portions (129 of 252 pages). In addition, each “practice” has a unit dedicated to reviewing previous material. Two chapters are dedicated to the noun and three to the pronoun, but the verb and key particles (e.g. הוּוּ), crucial to the drama of reading, receive the most emphasis in Futato’s scheme. Not until the Qal is fully covered in both strong and weak forms (chaps. 6–27) are the other stems addressed (chaps. 28–40)—what Futato distractingly calls “patterns” (p. 30; cf. p. 253). Citing *IBHS* stem statistics (§21.2.3e), Futato wisely emphasizes the four primary stems that comprise 96% of Hebrew verbs, pedagogically helpful for the student (see pp. 30, 175, 194, 225, 237, 238, 243).

On the whole, the chapters are brilliantly brief with only essential information that typically does not exceed three pages. *BBH*’s minimal discussion allows coverage of a surprising amount of grammatical topics. An exception to this brevity is chapter 9 that addresses “Independent Prepositions,” “Inseparable Prepositions,” “The Preposition ׀,” “Form of Vav Conjunction,” and “Use of Vav Conjunction” (pp. 49–52). Discussions are numerically outlined with colored titles and more technical points set off with boxes (e.g. “diphthong,” p. 70, “Mappiq,” p. 96, “Defective Spelling,” p. 129).

*BBH* has several distinctives. Futato has managed to wed brevity with unusual clarity. While some would define clarity through detail, *BBH* has recaptured the simplicity of Weingreen’s approach (even returning to לִשְׁׁ) with the visual appeal desired by a “Power Point” generation. Though Futato is writing a “beginning” Hebrew grammar in an “easy-to-learn format” (p. ix), he achieves both “crisp” and well-informed grammatical discussion of such issues as “Conjugations” (pp. 30–33); “Direct Object” (pp. 36–37); “Vowels” (pp. 42–44); “Relative Pronoun (ׁ)” (pp. 103–104); “Have Not (ׁ)” (pp. 142–43); and “Vav-Relative” (pp. 162–64), to name a few. With the size of a standard atlas, *BBH* combines broad margins, clear layout, appealing fonts, “fill-in” exercises, and superb binding for a “tight” grammar.

Moreover, Futato’s lively exercises reflect an engaging pedagogy evident in his wide variety methods that include explanation of forms, circling or underlining specific morphemes, pronouncing and writing words, reading sentences out loud, parsing, and translation of alternating Hebrew-English texts—a format often used for acquisition of modern languages. Because many of the exercises are reminiscent of drills teachers use in the classroom, *BBH* takes on an inductive and student-friendly character. For this reason, *BBH* is less demanding of the teacher’s role than many Hebrew grammars—to say nothing of a 50-page “answer key” at one’s disposal!

In addition, *BBH* is available as a fully integrated module with *BibleWorks 6*. Futato’s grammar (and a tutorial) joins other language tools in the software databases as a separate add-on, increasing its potential use and redefining the utility of Bible software.

For me, *BBH* also raises several criticisms. First, while reading seems to be Futato’s passion, in the end *BBH* is not distinctly reading or exegetically focused. Requiring 400

vocabulary words, for example, hardly equips the student for either reading or exegetical work (see “Objectives,” p. ix). As an indication, consider the vocabulary lists in the major Hebrew grammars: Weingreen (416), Ross (478), Pratico and Van Pelt (491), Kelly (518), Seow (522), and Lambdin (738). Moreover, the omission of the Masoretic accents in a Biblical Hebrew grammar is unfortunate. Though Futato often refers to reading the “Hebrew Bible” (pp. x, 242, 248, etc.), not one of the 76 *BHS* passages (large or small) includes the basic accents. Why not teach students some sensitivity to the most ancient (liturgical) reading tradition? So, too, coloring the propretonic syllable blue is a poor substitute for the Hebrew accent (p. 15).

Second, while students typically balk at learning Hebrew transliteration, is complete removal the answer? Whether *BBH* employs it or not, making a column available alongside the alphabet (pp. 2–3) would seem appropriate—now that some standardization exists (*SBL Handbook of Style*, pp. 26–27)—but *BBH* insists on its own style throughout (e.g. *chatef-segol*, 45; *qamets-chaturf*, p. 220).

Third, the parsing format of *BBH* is unbalanced to the point of being counterproductive. Students are limited to parsing only abstract forms; surely it is a disservice to never require parsing “in context.”

Finally, the paradigms could be improved. While the listing includes all seven stems, regular and irregular, the “charts” section would be more effective for students with the inclusion of a side-by-side comparison of all regular stems for quick reference. But the purpose becomes clearer with Futato’s explanation: “These paradigms includes [*sic*] all of the paradigms a student would do well to commit to memory by the end of first-year Hebrew” (p. 253). Thus, reference is not their purpose. Mentioned several times, Futato’s assumption of full paradigm “mastery” (p. 253) seems a bit out of place given his goal of *BBH* as “easy-to-learn” in “bite-sized chunks” (p. ix). A brief index would also help the student access many fine grammatical discussions, especially since the Table of Contents is so general (p. vii).

*BBH* is a fine elementary grammar, competently written with creative layout. A more reading-based program hobbled by grammatical detail might find *BBH* the best choice. The grammar has minimized some shortcomings, but created others. While *BBH* extends Weingreen’s style, it has not replaced it; Futato’s exercises are more creative, but not as enduring. *BBH*’s approach does not supplant present grammars. Texts such as Kelly, Seow, and Ross are more holistic but are also more labor-intensive for the teacher.

Andrew J. Schmutzer  
Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, IL

*Deuteronomy*. By Richard D. Nelson. OTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002, xv + 424 pp., \$44.95.

This commentary serves to update the discussion of Deuteronomy for the OTL series, in which Gerhard von Rad published *Deuteronomy* in 1966. Westminster John Knox hopes to have a complete update for this OT commentary series within the next two years. Some of the older volumes, including von Rad’s, will be continued. This updated series will also include non-commentary works as did the former OTL.

Richard D. Nelson is the W. J. A. Power Professor of Biblical Hebrew and Old Testament Interpretation at the Perkins School of Theology, SMU. His works have centered primarily on Deuteronomistic History with studies concerning redaction (JSOT Press, 1981), 1 and 2 Kings (John Knox, 1987), Joshua (Westminster John Knox, 1997), the

historical books (Abingdon, 1998), and also concerning the OT priesthood (Westminster John Knox, 2004).

For each chapter Nelson gives his translation (with detailed, helpful notes), usually a discussion of the literary structures and redactional considerations, and then comments. His commentary includes a brief restating of the content of the chapter, observations on the text, and of the historical and social setting. His discussion reflects solid work in the scholarly literature, especially the most recent critical scholarship.

Nelson locates the setting for the stages of composition for most of the book ca. 670–620 BC. It was motivated by a grouping of scribes, priests, sages, and aristocrats, and served as the basis of Josiah's reform (pp. 6–9). Toward this end, Nelson cites parallels with Assyrian treaties for the period but elaborates only briefly on the document as treaty between God and Israel (e.g. p. 168). His primary use of the observations regarding treaty elements in Deuteronomy is as a means of dating the content of the book to the Neo-Assyrian era (cf. pp. 6, 326, 331). He does not discuss the structure of Deuteronomy in treaty terms. Nor does he take up the issue of whether 2nd millennium BC Mesopotamian and Hittite documents (cf. ANET, pp. 161b, 178b, 201a, 205c, 206; but also cf. Sefire, ANET, p. 660b; see also Hallo and Younger, *The Context of Scripture*, Vol. 2 [Brill, 2000], pp. 95, 98, 351, 413; but also 215) more characteristically evidence a blessings section, nor the absence of blessings in the treaties of Esarhaddon. This lapse is unusual given his thorough work in other discussions.

Nelson interacts with the OT content, but particularly within those books identified as Deuteronomic History. Some topics receive extra treatment and are quite helpful—cultic centralization (chap. 12, pp. 142–61), issues of clean and unclean (pp. 174–82), debt and slavery (chap. 15, pp. 187–200), king and law (pp. 222–25), and taking a foe's wife after battle (pp. 258–60). Some important topics receive less treatment, e.g. all of Deuteronomy 5 receives about the same discussion as the debt and slavery section, perhaps because the commandments are covered in detail in others' works. This same process might explain why the discussion of Yahweh's circumcising of the heart (30:6) only mentions Jeremiah 31:31–34 briefly in a footnote (p. 349).

Nelson does not interact within the larger NT context; seven NT texts are cited in the work. Given the very good material on the theology of Deuteronomy (pp. 9–12), one could wish for more synthesis of its message.

This work is a worthy addition to the new OTL and a fitting companion to von Rad's work. Experts will probably desire more discussion of the compositional history, or the setting of Deuteronomy's message in the larger theology of the Bible. But Nelson's work provides a fine starting point for the study of current critical thinking.

Chip McDaniel  
Columbia, SC

*Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther.* By Leslie C. Allen and Timothy S. Laniak. New International Biblical Commentary 9. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2003, 290 pp., \$14.95 paper.

A recent volume in Hendrickson's NIBC series contains commentaries by Leslie Allen (on *Ezra* and *Nehemiah*) and Timothy Laniak (on *Esther*). The volume continues the familiar format of providing a general introduction to the biblical book followed by comments on each subdivision of the book. The comments on each subdivision include a brief summary, a verse-by-verse exposition based on the NIV, and "Additional Notes" of a more technical nature. The volume concludes with bibliography and indexes (subject and Scripture).

Leslie Allen's introduction to Ezra-Nehemiah begins by addressing the book's function as historical literature—that is, “as history-related *literature*” (p. 3). He proceeds to discuss “The Structure and Content of Ezra-Nehemiah” (pp. 4–7) in which he shows how the individual parts add up to a structural whole. Specifically, the three parts of the book (Ezra 1–6, Ezra 7–10, Nehemiah 1–13) correspond to the three missions. He then briefly explains “The Historical Order of Ezra and Nehemiah” (pp. 7–8) and “The Editing of Ezra-Nehemiah” (pp. 8–10). In the latter, he maintains the book's precedence and independence with regard to Chronicles. Finally, he discusses “The Separatism of Ezra-Nehemiah” (pp. 10–12) and “English Versions of the Bible” (p. 12). By “separatism” he means the book's strict religious attitude toward pagan society. Following the introduction, Allen provides a succinct commentary of 70 pages on Ezra and 80 pages on Nehemiah.

Allen's comments are both lucid and learned. His approach is literary, historical, philological, text-critical, and theological. The only approach that seems to be lacking is the archaeological—this omission is evident in a glance at the bibliography (pp. 271–74). There are numerous instances where archaeological data (such as coins, seals, jar handles, bullae, ostraca, and the finds from Wadi ed-Daliyeh, Elephantine, Tel Dor, Lachish, etc.) could have been used to elucidate the biblical material. One might do well to supplement the commentary with Ephraim Stern's *Archaeology of the Land of the Bible, vol. 2: The Assyrian, Babylonian, and Persian Periods, 732–332 BCE* (New York: Doubleday, 2001, especially pp. 351–582). Allen's references to relevant ancient Near Eastern texts are frequent in additional notes (e.g. pp. 17, 18, 40, 53), although his citations utilize *ANET* rather than the more recent work edited by W. W. Hallo and K. L. Younger, *Context of Scripture*, 3 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 1997, 2000, 2002). He also often integrates NT ideas with careful insight (e.g. pp. 3, 12, 20, 36, 48, 82, 165).

Timothy Laniak, who recently published a monograph on Esther (*Shame and Honor in the Book of Esther*, SBLDS 165, Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), provides a 23-page introduction with a 77-page commentary to follow. In his introduction, he begins with a discussion of the literary elements that contribute to the story of Esther: point of view, setting, plot, themes, characterization, intertextuality, and genre. Regarding themes, he shows how reversals and banquets punctuate a chiasmic arrangement of the story (p. 171). Regarding intertextuality, he explores connections with the stories of Joseph, Moses, and King Saul (pp. 172–74; cf. pp. 184–85). As for genre, he suggests Esther is “a festival etiology (that is, an explanation of the origin of Purim) that follows the conflict story pattern” (p. 174).

Next in his introduction he discusses “The Stories of Esther” (pp. 174–76), which concerns matters of textual development. He concludes that there are three stages:

The AT [Alpha Text] reflects the first stage of the story, told without any association with Purim. The MT [Masoretic Text] represents the next stage, with the story written as a basis for festival observance. The LXX [Septuagint] and additions represent a third stage, adding a religious color to the whole narrative. This way of retelling the story—by making explicit its theological character—has continued to the present day, as we will see in the commentary that follows (p. 176).

Laniak then proceeds to examine “The Story of Esther and History” (pp. 176–82) in which he concludes, after an informed and sensitive discussion, that its message “depends on having historical referents in time and space” (p. 178), and he demonstrates that the story “deserves merit as a historical source” (p. 182).

Finally, Laniak discusses the morality, theology, and message of the story of Esther. He shows how the many instances of coincidence and peripety (unexpected reversals) are “evidence” for divine presence in Esther (p. 184). He suggests, “It is not so much

the *presence* of God but the *hiddenness* of God in human events that the story articulates. To be hidden is to be present yet unseen" (p. 185). The message of Esther, Laniak concludes, is essentially one of hope to Jews in the Diaspora: "Jews did not need to be in Zion to have hope . . . the book of Esther invites its readers to find hope anywhere, any time, and through anyone" (p. 187).

Throughout the commentary, Laniak's remarks are fresh and well-crafted. Both of the authors in this volume have offered students of the Bible a rich and readable reference for understanding Ezra-Nehemiah and Esther.

Kenneth C. Way  
Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, OH

*Zephaniah: A Commentary.* By Marvin A. Sweeney. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003, xvii + 227 pp., \$47.00.

This commentary represents the results of Sweeney's extensive study and publications on the reign of Josiah, the twelve minor prophets, and the composition of Zephaniah. It is therefore a rich resource for study of this prophetic book.

The commentary shares the format of others in the Hermeneia series. After an outline and bibliography, the commentary proper begins with a forty-one page introduction that covers all the key issues pertaining to Zephaniah. After comments on the MT, Sweeney proceeds to issues of genre and structure, Zephaniah's place in the book of the twelve, and the sociohistorical setting. However, this volume is unique in that half of the introduction is devoted to investigating the origins, manuscripts, textual features, and sociohistorical setting of each of the text traditions for Zephaniah. Thus, Sweeney discusses in detail the LXX version, the scrolls from Murabba'at, Nahal Hever, and Qumran, the Targum, the Peshitta, the Vulgate and other Old Latin versions, and references in the NT and Rabbinic tradition. Such a wealth of information is unusual for a typical commentary. Sweeney devotes attention to these other texts because he believes the variant wordings in the versions represent a different reading and interpretation from the text of the MT tradition.

Sweeney places the historical setting of the book of Zephaniah firmly in the reign of Josiah, affirming the accuracy of the superscription in 1:1. The whole of the book is the very words of the historical Zephaniah except 1:1 and 3 and some minor glosses. What some scholars have seen as exilic glosses in 1:2-3, 17-28; 2:14-15, etc., Sweeney believes can be understood in light of Zephaniah's times. Sweeney shows throughout the commentary that Zephaniah was composed to support Josiah's reform, probably in the early years, before the discovery of the "book of the Torah." After 1:1 the book has two major sections, the announcement of the day of YHWH in 1:2-18, and the parenetic address to seek YHWH and avoid punishment on the day of YHWH in 2:1-3:20. Zephaniah 2:1-3 comprises the rhetorical center of the book.

Like other volumes in the Hermeneia series, Sweeney's commentary is characterized by a fresh translation and extensive notes on the text. Each section's form and setting are explored and then a verse-by-verse commentary follows with extensive comments on grammar, vocabulary, the versions' renderings, and parallel words and expressions elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible. The comments are detailed and exhaustive, exploring every angle and possibility of meaning before arriving at a judicious decision.

One example will provide an indication of the value of this commentary. Zephaniah 1:9a refers to "all who leap over the threshold," an opaque expression that has elicited several different interpretations. Sweeney first discusses the various problems with

the phrase that already surface in the LXX and other early translations. The prevailing interpretation of the phrase, following the LXX and Targum Jonathan, takes the reference to be to pagan religious practices of not stepping on the threshold of the temple, with 1 Samuel 5:5 as a proof text. Sweeney undertakes a thorough investigation of the occurrences of the words "threshold" and "leap" in the Hebrew Bible. He concludes from this study, and from the immediate context, that the phrase refers to priests who serve at the temple and are the only ones who can enter it ("stepping over the threshold"). The priests then parallel the officials and sons of the kings of verse 8 who are the targets of Yahweh's punishment. Five pages are devoted to this discussion! Almost every verse of Zephaniah receives this same kind of detailed consideration.

From the perspective of a seminary professor who teaches exegesis to preachers and leaders in the church, this commentary has one glaring weakness. There is absolutely no attempt to deal with the "So what?" question. What meaning does the text have for the contemporary church and Christian? Other volumes in the Hermeneia series have at least taken a stab (though often unsatisfactorily) at this question by including an "Aim" section at the end of the exegesis of each subdivision in the biblical text. Sweeney has nothing of this nature. The reader is left with massive detail but no suggestions as to what to do with the text now that it is understood in its context. The nature of the Bible itself requires some effort in this direction.

Despite this weakness Sweeney's commentary is the premier resource for the study of the book of Zephaniah. Scholars and ministers interested in the prophets should have this volume.

Gary H. Hall  
Lincoln Christian Seminary, Lincoln, IL

*The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research.* By R. Timothy McLay. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003, xiv + 207 pp., \$30.00.

To what extent did the Septuagint influence NT theology? R. Timothy McLay explores this and other questions in his book, *The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research*. In the introduction he delineates the pertinent terminology associated with his study, such as "Septuagint," "Old Greek" (OG), "Masoretic Text" (MT), "Hebrew Bible," and "Greek Hebrew Scriptures." He then proceeds toward his main goal of examining the impact of the LXX on the NT, while looking at the use of Scripture in the NT generally, translation technique, and the origin and development of the LXX along the way.

McLay offers this volume because of the dearth of literature that provides a framework for understanding the influence of the LXX on the development of the NT. He also gives a target audience: "There are many scholars and students who might profit from a text devoted to *The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research*. Thus, this volume will attempt to address the needs of both of these audiences without neglecting either" (p. 4). In my view, a study that emphasizes LXX influence on the NT writings is most welcome. The subject has certainly been neglected, especially in light of the high percentage of agreement between OT citations in the NT and the Greek Hebrew Scriptures. Likewise, I would applaud McLay's interest in writing not only to fellow biblical scholars, but also to seminarians.

Theological students, however, might become confused at various points in the discussion because of a need for greater clarity. Students with limited background in LXX studies may find it difficult to follow certain sections of the book, although referencing

the works listed in the bibliography would be helpful in this regard. Some of the discussions become quite involved and depend on an understanding of technical terms, so that readers with limited knowledge and exposure would benefit from further explanation. An example is on p. 129 where McLay argues against a unified *kaige*-Theodotion recension. Not only is this subject fairly advanced for the average theological student, it is exacerbated by a proclivity for lengthy sentences that can make reading with comprehension more difficult.

Another place where McLay could have added further explanation is in his definition and use of OG. He rightly says that OG is the “original translation” or “oldest recoverable form” of the Greek text of a particular book, and he mentions the critical editions being published in the Göttingen *Septuaginta* series. He proceeds to give the “OG” text for a passage in Amos (cited in Acts 15) without adding any further discussion, apparently assuming the text found in the Göttingen series (?). A more adequate explanation designed to help the reader ascertain the Greek text would be welcome, especially one that includes some discussion of differences from book to book (cf. Moisés Silva, *Biblical Words and Their Meaning* [2d ed.; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994] 68–71).

Equally technical and potentially confusing for students are the seven steps for “Analyzing a Citation” on pp. 133–34. Certainly if one were to read these steps carefully and follow them rigorously, they might produce some helpful results. The point here is that the method could perhaps be presented more simply and with greater clarity for seminarians and others possessing a limited background in LXX study.

McLay’s statement about textual pluriformity in the first century, however, is in my view the most likely scenario and is a helpful insight to students and scholars alike. It makes sense based on the evidence we have that a number of variant readings existed in both the Hebrew Bible and the LXX at that time. He adds to this position, however, the stance that the OT *canon* likewise was in a fluid state at the time the NT was written. This is significantly more debatable as many scholars interpret the available data, including the data from the DSS and Josephus, as suggesting that a canon in some sense similar to the one we have today already existed before Jamnia (AD 90).

The sections of the book devoted to translation technique and first-century exegetical methods are very informative. McLay’s inclusion of linguistics, especially his argument that syntagmatic considerations should be examined alongside paradigmatic concerns, is particularly helpful. He provides an example on p. 87, where he compares OG Dan 11:27 with the MT and finds that a two-word Hebrew construction is rendered by just one word in Greek (כּוֹב יִדְבָּר = ψευδολογήσους). This consideration of how a Hebrew syntagm can be rendered in Greek might help to explain other LXX constructions, such as πᾶς οἰκέτης for עֶבֶד עֲבָדִים in Gen 9:25 (cf. Brad F. Mellon, “Distinguishing Greek and Hebrew Words in the Semantic Field ‘Servant’” [Ph.D. diss., Westminster Theological Seminary, 1996] 39).

McLay suggests that the NT writers were affected at certain points not only linguistically but also *theologically* by Greek texts that differed from the Hebrew, at least as we know it today. When a Greek reading differs from the Hebrew, we can look to the possibility of a different *Vorlage*, such as is evidenced by the Dead Sea Scrolls’ support of LXX readings that differ from the MT. Alongside the search for a different parent Hebrew text, however, it is well known that we need also to consider the hermeneutical concerns and exegetical methods of the translators. McLay is careful to set his study within the context of these debates and discussions.

Besides the citation from Amos in Acts 15, our author offers several other passages where he finds LXX influence in the NT. Upon further study, however, some of his examples prove to be questionable. For example, he devotes several pages to what he considers to be the influence of the Greek Jonah on Matthew’s theology. McLay finds this influence in the repetition of κοιλία (“belly”) in Jonah 2:1, 3 in collocation with κήτος (“fish, sea monster”) and ᾗδης (“Hades”). He contends that the Greek “provides an iden-

tification of the belly of the fish, *which the Hebrew lacked* . . . an explicit identification between the belly of the fish and Hades. This identification is employed in Matthew's Gospel" (italics mine; pp.160–61).

A close reading of the Hebrew, however, shows that it too makes the same identification, albeit using two different words for "belly," עמים and בטן (along with שאול in v. 3, which McLay affirms is "usually" rendered by ᾠδης). Further, Hatch and Redpath (p. 773) indicate that κοιλία renders both עמים and בטן several times in the LXX. Thus the evidence does not lend support to McLay's claim that the Greek exerts an influence on Matthew's theology, because the same connection between the fish's belly and Sheol (Hades) is found in the Hebrew Bible.

McLay also suggests that Heb 1:6 drew upon the theology of the Greek text of OG Deut 32:43, which is considerably longer than the Hebrew in the MT. He argues against viewing the Hebrews text as a conflation with Ps 96 (97):7 despite the similarity of wording. Our author instead introduces 4QDeut and a passage from the pseudepigraphic *Odes of Solomon*. He suggests the probability that Hebrews either cites a source like that found in *Odes Sol.* 2:43 verbatim or that the author may have modified a text like OG Deut 32:43. McLay concludes that if the OG is the earliest witness we have to an "original" reading, then 4QDeut, the MT, and *Odes Sol.* 2:43/Heb 1:6 "represent three separate and distinct ways that the text was transmitted and they all would have been read as Scripture" (p. 114).

In my view a better approach to this citation is that of Gleason L. Archer and G. C. Chirichigno (*Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament: A Complete Survey* [Chicago: Moody, 1983] 48–51). First, they suggest the MT reading likely is shorter by virtue of homoeoteleuton. Second, although there is a minor difference between the wording of Ps 96:7 and Heb 1:6, "essentially it is the same thing. The inserted material of Deut 32:43 is not needed to serve as a basis for the quote in Heb 1:6 because it is there [in the psalm]."

Some of the other examples McLay gives to demonstrate LXX influence upon the NT are in my view valid and helpful. By way of illustration, he contends that the word "mind" in the Greek of Isa 40:13 exerted an influence on Paul's theology in 1 Cor 2:16. The Hebrew has "spirit," but McLay rightly observes that the apostle's context is a discussion that revolves around the *mind*. At the end of the quotation Paul affirms, "We have the mind of Christ."

In conclusion, it would appear that McLay seeks to challenge the bias for the MT over the LXX evident among NT interpreters. One of the benefits of McLay's study is to suggest that the Greek OT could have served as a *source* for NT theology, at least in certain places, together with the Hebrew. Caution is necessary, however, because as we have seen the Greek and Hebrew texts may not always be as different as he contends. Overall, *The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research*, although confusing and difficult to follow at certain points, represents a significant contribution to LXX and NT study. Students and scholars alike should read and use it critically.

Brad F. Mellon  
Bethel Seminary of the East, Dresher, PA

*Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity.* By Larry Hurtado. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003, xxii + 746 pp., \$55.00.

Since 1979 Larry Hurtado, Professor of New Testament Language, Literature, and Theology at the University of Edinburgh, has been publishing studies of the rapid rise of high Christology in early Christianity among believers staunchly committed to

Jewish monotheism. This detailed volume represents the crowning climax of his labors thus far. Taking each NT corpus in turn, and including studies of significant early Christian trajectories of the second century, Hurtado's work thoroughly refutes the evolutionary hypotheses of Wilhelm Bousset in *Kyrios Christos* (German original, 1913) and many who have followed him, alleging that the high Christology of the NT emerged only gradually and in largely Hellenistic circles that warped the original message of Jesus, a simple Galilean rabbi. While eschewing an explicitly apologetic motive in his writing, Hurtado repeatedly stresses that the rapid rise of belief in Jesus' divinity within Jewish monotheism is unparalleled in the history of religion. Although beyond his explicit claims, the logical implications of his volume are that the early Christian portraits of Jesus were, in fact, substantially accurate.

A short review can merely highlight some of the most significant historical and exegetical findings. With respect to Jewish backgrounds and against the claims of scholars like Hayman and Barker, first-century Judaism was staunchly monotheistic. Exalted claims could be made for angels and patriarchs, but *worship* was reserved for God alone. Yet it is precisely worship that we see the first Christians consistently directing to Jesus.

Hurtado begins his review of NT material with Paul—because of the first-hand nature of his undisputed epistles and the pre-Pauline creedal information that probably takes us back to the church's beliefs at the time of Paul's conversion, only a few years after the death of Jesus himself. Central to Paul's own Christology are Jesus' divine sonship, regal Messiahship, and cosmic Lordship, set in the larger contexts of pre-existence and redemptive death. First Corinthians 8:4–6 provides a classic illustration of how Paul can attribute the identical divine actions in creation to Jesus as to Yahweh, all the while insisting there is only one God and one Lord. If this is not yet explicit trinitarian thought, it is at the very least "binitarian." Regularly, Paul addresses prayers to God and Jesus (or "through Jesus"), baptism is performed "in Jesus' name," and Jesus plays the role in the celebration of the Lord's Supper that the gods did in pagan cults. Yet two of the most obviously pre-Pauline confessions or hymns, Phil 2:6–11 and 1 Cor 15:3–6, embrace this lofty Christology at still earlier dates.

Paul's writings offer windows into early Judean Christianity as well, not hesitating to raise issues on which Paul disagreed with more Torah-centric Christians. Striking in its omission, however, is any debate over his high Christology, which surely would have appeared (in either Acts or Paul) had this been a first-generation disagreement. On the other hand, Saul's intense persecution of early Jewish Christianity was doubtless fueled by his perception that its reverence for Jesus crossed a boundary of that which was appropriate for God alone. The sermons in the early chapters of Acts also disclose lofty titles for Jesus that do not become prominent in the rest of the NT and thus seem to reflect authentic tradition—the leader or author (*archēgos*) of life, the righteous one (*dikaios*), and the servant (*pais*).

The hypothetical Q document has, of course, become a storm center in recent research. Hurtado proves a particularly expert navigator here. While recognizing the probability of the early existence of such a document, the countless hypotheses surrounding its composition and excavation quickly turn speculative. Here Hurtado interacts extensively with the influential work of Kloppenborg. Particularly dubious is the common claim that the Q community had no knowledge of Christ's redemptive death, since Q contains no passion narrative. One would not expect it in a mere collection of Jesus' sayings, nor is there any reason to think Q would be all that its supporters knew about Jesus. Nevertheless, most of the major Christological emphases of the other NT writings are found, at least *in nuce*, in the Q material anyway.

With regard to the canonical Gospels, the very fact that such documents were created, centering on the life and ministry of Jesus, reflects an advanced stage of de-

votion to him. All four Gospels agree on the most central honorific titles for him. Adopting a *via media* within Son-of-man research, Hurtado concludes that “the semantic force of the expression was almost certainly to posit Jesus . . . as somehow a figure of particular significance” (p. 304). Individual evangelists’ distinctives only heighten the adoration of this significant man. Mark’s messianic secret motif does not reject the title “Christ” but substantially redefines it. Matthew’s Jesus teaches with unparalleled authority and commissions his followers to make his message a universal one. Luke’s “Savior” corresponds to roles for deity in Judaism and Hellenism alike.

Against Dunn (and many far more liberal), then, John’s writings are scarcely the first time, chronologically, that one encounters divine Christology. The Fourth Gospel simply makes explicit what was often more implicit in the Synoptics. Perhaps the most notable feature of the former—Christ’s pre-existence—has been anticipated already in Matthew’s and Luke’s presentations of the virginal conception. At the same time, the development of this theme, particularly in the *logos* Christology, the oneness of Father and Son, and the “I am” statements reflect a “breathtaking devotional move” (p. 372). But it all remains within a *Jewish monotheistic* framework. Thus the Johannine motif of Jesus as the glory of God probably alludes to the Isaianic theme of God not giving his glory to another. John presents Jesus as God and still affirms there is only one God, yet without equating the Son and the Father! Yet John goes further, in his treatment of the Spirit, particularly in chapters 14–16, so that more explicitly post-NT trinitarian formulations are natural outgrowths of this material.

Early non-canonical “Jesus books” demonstrate how differently the pictures of Jesus could be painted. Here for the first time we move beyond the bounds of what can still be subsumed under mutations of Judaism. The Gospel of Peter displays a sharper anti-Judaism than anything found in NT documents. The Infancy Gospels disclose a desire simply to revel in the miraculous. The Gospel of Thomas reflects the first truly dissonant presentation of Jesus himself. Its superficial resemblance to Q masks the fact that it is truly an esoteric compilation designed to impart secret truths to one group of uniquely elect “Christians.” What matters for Thomas are the Revealer’s teachings, not Christ’s person or faith in him. Yet this is a later, second-century development, not the true heterodox roots of Christianity. Other “revelation dialogues” prove even later and more heterodox.

The remaining late first- and second-century tributaries can be divided into the “proto-orthodox” and “radically diverse.” Among the former appear the remaining NT books and the Apostolic Fathers; most prominent among the latter are Valentinianism and Marcionism. Among many items distinguishing the two is the central role played by devotion to the person of Jesus, at least the human Jesus of Nazareth, in the former. However, a careful study of the chronology of these documents subverts the notion of Walter Bauer that “heresy” preceded “orthodoxy.” Also, in no instance did the radical innovations of second-century dissidents ever commend themselves to more than a small minority of professing Christians.

Proto-orthodox devotion to Jesus, on the other hand, maintained strong ties with the Hebrew Scriptures, finding the fulfillment of them in Jesus via a variety of largely Jewish exegetical methods. The fourfold Gospel collection marked off the acceptable boundaries of both unity and diversity in Christological thought. The book of Revelation represents an apex of worshipping Jesus exactly as one worships God within a fully Jewish framework, over against the demands for imperial worship. Second-century literature fleshes out the trend, begun in the Apocalypse, of believers being willing to be martyred for their devotion to Christ.

In addition to the specific historical argument defended throughout the book, Hurtado has provided virtually a full-blown NT Christology. At times, this more tangential material proves so detailed that one loses the central thread, but never for too long. So

many exegetical decisions must be made that no interpreter will likely agree with all of them. Are the errorists behind the Johannine epistles really more akin to mystics than to docetists? Should a deutero-Pauline provenance be so quickly conceded for Colossians, Ephesians, and the Pastorals? Does "Christ" really lack a titular sense in most of its Pauline usages? However, these and comparable criticisms pale in comparison with the vast array of valuable material Hurtado has compiled. This volume provides a treatment of its topic that dissenting positions will have to refute if they are to maintain any credibility.

Craig L. Blomberg  
Denver Seminary, Denver, CO

*Christianity in the Making*, vol. 1: *Jesus Remembered*. By James D. G. Dunn. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003, xvii + 1019 pp., \$55.00.

In *Jesus Remembered*, James Dunn argues that the quest for the historical Jesus was often guided by the assumption that the Jesus of history was considerably different than the Jesus portrayed in the Gospels. Dunn denies the validity of this assumption. He insists that the only realistic objective for any quest for the historical Jesus is the "Jesus remembered," that is, the impact Jesus made on the lives of his earliest followers. According to Dunn, finding a Jesus significantly different than the "Jesus remembered" is inevitably the result of importing ideological agendas into the research.

The problem with previous research, says Dunn, is that scholars have not really taken oral tradition seriously. Dunn argues that the NT motifs of "witnessing" and "remembering" imply that the earliest church took care to remember and pass on the Jesus tradition. Rather than the memorization model that Riesenfeld and Gerhardsson proposed, however, Dunn relies on studies demonstrating that in oral tradition the peripheral elements may vary widely, but the core traditions tend to be remarkably consistent from story to story. Dunn provides examples from the NT to demonstrate that this model of oral tradition was at work in the formation of the Gospels.

Dunn proposes that the impact Jesus made on his earliest followers can be seen in the core elements that (1) remain constant from story to story; (2) are characteristic of the Jesus tradition; and (3) are relatively distinctive of the Jesus tradition. With this understanding, Dunn analyzes parallel Gospel accounts separating the core elements of the stories from the peripheral elements which varied with each telling.

The result is a Jesus who was remembered as a teacher, exorcist, healer, and prophet. Jesus preached both the present and future aspects of the kingdom of God and was remembered for bringing the good news of the kingdom to the poor and outcast of society. He called people to repentance and taught that they should love God, love their neighbor, and forgive their enemies. While Jesus was heard as speaking from God and insisting on faith in God, he was not remembered as requiring faith in himself. The question of whether Jesus was Messiah was raised even before he was executed as a claimant to the throne of David. It is unclear, however, whether Jesus thought his death would bring the faithful into the kingdom or even whether he would bring in the kingdom at all. The data regarding the resurrection consists of the reports of the empty tomb and sightings or visions of Jesus. In other words, the data consists of interpretations made by the disciples. Dunn argues that since the conclusion that Jesus rose from the dead is a further interpretation of interpreted data it is problematic to speak of the resurrection as historical. The resurrection, therefore, is not so much a historical fact as it is a foundational fact or meta-fact (p. 878).

Any work as ground-breaking and thorough as *Jesus Remembered* is bound to raise questions. For example, Dunn contends that although scholars like Bultmann gave lip service to oral tradition, the model they proposed was essentially a literary paradigm which envisioned redactors pouring over written texts. Dunn states flatly that the literary model was wrong and asks how *oral* tradition could work on or from previous retellings of a story. Oral transmission, he insists, is performed, not edited. One might think this would commit Dunn to an independent view of Gospel origins but such is not the case. In fact, Dunn makes a point of affirming aspects of the literary model, including the priority of Mark and the existence of Q. It is not entirely clear, however, how these two models can successfully co-exist.

When Matthew and Mark record similar stories, for example, was Matthew independently drawing on oral tradition as Dunn's model would suggest, or was he just editing a story in his Markan source as the literary model suggests? Maybe Matthew was just re-telling the story he had read in Mark, but if so, it is not clear how that differs substantially from the literary model. Future editions of *Jesus Remembered* would be enhanced with more thorough explanations of how these two models co-exist in actual practice.

Second, Dunn mentions Wright's thesis about Jesus' triumphal entry symbolizing the embodiment of Yahweh's return. While Dunn says that his own study does not necessarily exclude Wright's understanding, Dunn's conclusions about Jesus' self-understanding fall short of Wright's proposal, not to mention falling short of the Jesus presented in the NT. Unfortunately, Dunn seems to be more skeptical than the evidence warrants. For example, in his discussion of a passage in which Jesus heals a paralyzed man and announces that the man's sins are forgiven (Mark 2, Matthew 9, Luke 5), Dunn argues that the passive form of the verb ( $\alpha\varphi\epsilon\iota\nu\tau\alpha\iota$ ) shows that Jesus was not usurping a prerogative that belonged only to God, but was simply announcing forgiveness the way a modern priest would declare a penitent sinner forgiven. According to Dunn, the subsequent protest by the religious leadership occurred simply because Jesus exceeded his authority by pronouncing forgiveness outside of the Temple cult.

In all three accounts, however, Jesus says this healing was done "that you may know that the Son of man has authority on earth to forgive sins." All three accounts say Jesus' enemies responded by charging him with blasphemy. The reason for the charge is apparently that they thought Jesus was usurping the authority of God since in two of the three accounts they ask, "Who can forgive sins but God alone?" Since these sayings seem to belong to the "core tradition," it would appear that by Dunn's own method the Jesus remembered is claiming much more for himself that Dunn allows.

Finally, while Dunn's method demonstrates what historians have good evidence to believe about Jesus, this reader was left with the impression that material not part of the "core" was often assumed to be storytellers' elaboration. As Dunn himself insists, however, the earliest church storytellers, evangelists, prophets, and teachers probably had access to a large number of Jesus traditions, only some of which overlapped. Just because some elements of the story are not part of the core, therefore, does not necessarily mean they are unhistorical. If Dunn's thesis is accepted, an avenue of future research might be to examine how other criteria, such as multiple independent attestation, might be used to authenticate non-core elements (while Dunn's method may look like multiple independent attestation, the differences are significant).

Regardless of the questions raised by Dunn's book, *Jesus Remembered* deserves to take its place along with other "new classics" in the field of historical Jesus studies like the works of John Meier and N. T. Wright. Dunn not only proposes a new method for studying Jesus, he provides an extensive introduction to the entire field of Jesus' studies including sources and methods, hermeneutics and faith, historical, social, and religious background as well as a thorough history of the quest. Dunn demonstrates encyclopedic

knowledge of his subject and continually interacts with the major thinkers and theories in the field. The book is well-indexed, well-written, and provides fascinating possibilities for further research.

Dennis Ingolfsland  
Crown College, St. Bonifacius, MN

*The Brother of Jesus: The Dramatic Story and Significance of the First Archaeological Link to Jesus and His Family.* By Hershel Shanks and Ben Witherington III. New York: HarperCollins, 2003, 240 pp., \$24.95.

In the fall of 2002, who could have missed the news that splashed across news magazines, the internet, and even network television? "The Burial Box of James Discovered!" Biblical scholars, archaeologists, and much of the general public were excited about the prospect. Those who attended the SBL and ETS meetings in Toronto in late November thronged to see it on display at the Royal Ontario Museum. Many also attended the special meeting where panelists Hershel Shanks, André Lemaire, and Eric Meyers opined about the box. I was there with at least a thousand others as Shanks gave general remarks, Lemaire talked about names and populations, and Meyers railed against the entire enterprise of even discussing a non-provenanced artifact. The whole thing hit the fan when Oded Golan, the antiquities dealer who owns the ossuary, came to the microphone and publicly declared that he had not manipulated the ossuary in any way and did not know its original provenance.

One of the true delights of reading this book by Shanks and Witherington is getting the behind-the-scenes events that went on from the point of Lemaire's chance discovery of the ossuary in Golan's collection in spring 2002 to its showing in Toronto and the emotional SBL session. This is the first half of the book, which Shanks relays. The second half, penned by Witherington, explains the biblical and post-biblical information regarding the historical person whose bones may have eventually ended up in this box: "James, the son of Joseph, the brother of Jesus."

In line with the wide expression of interest in this "bone box," both Shanks and Witherington write for a general audience, patiently explaining the many technical terms in archaeology and history for the uninitiated, much of which would be well-known to biblical scholars and the readers of this *Journal*. At the popular level, then, at the very least, this book succeeds in its goal to inform an information-hungry general audience about this much-publicized discovery.

Shanks begins his half of the book by recounting in dramatic fashion the emotional roller coaster he experienced on November 1, 2002, the day he received the news that the James ossuary had cracked into five pieces during shipment from Israel and that one of the cracks went right through the much-vaunted and debated inscription. From there, he moves to where the story truly begins, with André Lemaire, the specialist in Semitic inscriptions, who stumbled upon the Israeli antiquities collector, dubbed "Joe" early in the book (Oded Golan), who invited him to his apartment to look at some of the inscribed ossuaries he had in his collection. However, it was a photographed inscription of an ossuary "Joe" had in storage at which Lemaire's "eyes popped" (p. 11), the box now at the center of the archaeological storm, which wound up in Toronto six months later.

Shanks is blunt in recounting that Lemaire's practice of looking at the unprovenanced materials held by private collectors in Israel is not countenanced by the AIA (Archaeological Institute of America) or by the ASOR (American Schools of Oriental Research). However, he is not shy to defend Lemaire's practices because some types of

archaeological artifacts, such as coins, bullae (document seals), and also ossuaries are rarely found in professional digs but are plentiful on the market. Joe's James ossuary is considered unprovenanced because, even though he openly stipulates that he bought it from a dealer who told him it came from Silwan, an Arab village east of Jerusalem, the exact site is unknown and professional archaeologists did not and cannot oversee its removal from that site.

Shanks helpfully supplies the results of various specialists who examined the James ossuary before the discovery was made public and those after, both those who are positive and negative about it. Kyle McCarter, a leading inscription specialist, believes the inscription to be ancient, even if "the brother of Jesus" phrase was added somewhat later than the original first half. Joseph Fitzmyer believes the unusual, and generally unknown, spelling of "brother" on the inscription makes it nearly impossible for a modern forger to have written it. The ossuary itself was found by the Geological Survey of Israel to have come from the Jerusalem area during the first or second centuries AD. The patina (ink) contains no signs that a modern instrument was used nor that any modern adhesive was used.

Shanks vilifies one early critic of the inscription's authenticity, Rochelle Altman, as working outside the realm of her expertise. He also reveals the quizzical reactions of Eric Meyers to the ossuary, who on November 8, 2002 said it was probably authentic but days later at the SBL event railed against the ossuary, its owner, and its unprovenanced situation.

Shanks also rehearses much of the information conveyed by Lemaire at the SBL event. This is statistical evidence regarding the likelihood of the names James, Joseph, and Jesus appearing together on anything from the period before AD 70. This likelihood of .02% against an estimated population of Israel in that period results in an estimated 20 people named James who could have "had a father named Joseph and a brother named Jesus" (p. 58). This, then, together with Shanks's view that the box and the inscription are authentic, leads to the possibility that the box at one time contained the bones of James, the brother of Christ, known leader of the Jerusalem church from its earliest days until his illegal execution in AD 62, as recorded by Josephus.

This conclusion leads into Witherington's documentation of what is known about this James. He begins with the Gospels, dispelling the notion, still commonly held, that Jesus had no brothers or sisters, due to Mary's perpetual virginity and moving on to conclude that James was not a believer until Christ appeared to him personally (like Paul). Next, he considers evidence from Galatians, Acts, and James that demonstrate James to be the recognized leader and teacher in the Jerusalem church and a mediator on the issue of Jewish/Gentile relationships in the church. Finally, Witherington considers in detail Josephus's matter-of-fact recounting of James's death as well as the somewhat legendary accounts of James in early Christian literature. By far the most significant in terms of the newly found ossuary is the Hegesippus account of James's death which appears in Eusebius, that James was buried south of the Temple Mount in Jerusalem and that a well-known inscribed stone was still at this site in Hegesippus's day. Could he be referring to the ossuary?

At this point, the reader is left pondering the mystery, and rightly so. All the evidence, at least that Shanks and Witherington have at their disposal, is laid on the table in this book for the reader to discern. There is no possibility of providing incontrovertible proof that the ossuary indeed once held the bones of James, the brother of Jesus. The best is to demonstrate within reasonable probability that the ossuary and its inscription are authentic for the NT period. That is what this volume provides, and from this vantage point it is an informative source on the issue.

However, sceptics loom over this book's positivist spin on the ossuary. The mightiest spectre now is the published finding of the Israeli Antiquities Authority (IAA) that in

spring 2003 declared the James ossuary to be a hoax. This declaration was based on using an oxygen isotope test, which revealed modern water and soap in the patina. In an October 2003 *Christianity Today* article (pp. 42–45) entitled “Bones of Contention: Why I Still Think the James Bone Box Inscription is Likely to be Authentic,” Witherington challenges these results, contending that the IAA study committee included no NT scholars, the oxygen isotope test is unproven on ossuaries, and that the IAA had a dominant political agenda in discrediting the ossuary.

Obviously, the debate on the James ossuary is far from over. In any case, this volume by Shanks and Witherington will remain, at least for a while, a necessary first read on this issue.

William R. Baker  
Cincinnati Bible Seminary, Cincinnati, OH

*The Gospel of Matthew and its Readers: A Historical Introduction to the First Gospel.* By Howard Clarke. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2003, xxiv + 297 pp., \$22.95 paper.

“This is, yes, another commentary on St. Matthew’s gospel” (p. x), though it is a very unique and interesting kind. Rather than providing a standard, verse-by-verse explanation of the text, Clarke provides, as his subtitle suggests, “a historical introduction to the first Gospel.” By this he means that he furnishes often fascinating details of the influences of Matthew’s Gospel on various aspects of the Church as well as Western civilization—from the tradition of celebrating Christmas on the 25th of December to the differing renditions of the calling of Matthew in Renaissance art. Indeed, in his preface (pp. x–xii), he acknowledges dependence on the KJV, recognizing its weaknesses as a translation but choosing it because of its influence on English writers (p. xii). His work is a “collage of secondary readings that testify to the constant vitality of Matthew, historically and culturally, in the lives of the Bible’s readers” (p. xii). The author is a Classicist and a Catholic, yet neither effects an undue imbalance of his treatment of historical material. It is intended for “the general reader” and “endeavors to give in one volume, devoted to one gospel, some substance—if only superficially—to that hoariest of platitudes: that the Bible, ‘The Greatest Book Ever Written,’ has been the most influential book in Western civilization” (p. xii).

Clarke’s introduction (pp. xiii–xxiv) illustrates the influence of Matthew upon such minutiae as popular phrases: “wolves in sheep’s clothing,” “signs of the times,” and “the blind leading the blind” (p. xxi). The remainder of the book is broadly arranged by chapters in Matthew’s Gospel: chapter 1 (“The Infancy Narrative,” pp. 1–25), chapter 2 (“The Ministry Begins,” pp. 26–60), chapter 3 (“The Sermon on the Mount,” pp. 61–94), chapter 4 (“Miracles,” pp. 95–105), chapter 5 (“Disciples,” pp. 106–35), chapter 6 (“Jesus and the Pharisees,” pp. 136–58), chapter 7 (“Jerusalem,” pp. 159–201), chapter 8 (“Passion, Death, and Resurrection,” pp. 202–53). The volume concludes with (end) Notes (pp. 205–77) and an Index (pp. 279–97) including authors, topics, titles, etc.

This is not so much a reference work as a history book with the first Gospel as its primary subject. One looking for an exegesis of the Magi paying homage to Jesus (2:11), for example, best look elsewhere. Yet if one were interested in the fact that the Orthodox Church prohibits kneeling on Sunday and Easter as a sign that “our fall has been corrected through the resurrection of Christ on the third day” (p. 21), Clarke’s volume is the place to go. A casual perusal of the index illustrates the point. Under “L,” the reader will certainly find an entry for the eminent Matthean scholar Ulrich Luz, yet also one for Abraham Lincoln, who in his “Second Inaugural Address” (March 4, 1865) reflected

on the strife that was then dividing America despite both sides reading the same Bible and invoking the aid of the same God (p. 90).

The author addresses many interesting facts that relate to Matthew's Gospel and illustrates the influence of particular texts in Matthew upon hymns, councils, creeds, art, films, architecture, literature, politics, etc. Clarke addresses, for example, Tolstoy's reflections on the importance of the Sermon on the Mount (p. 65), marginal comments in the Geneva Bible, and the origins of the English word "church" (Matt 18:17; p. 155), while elsewhere recounting Hume's (1748) chidings of miracles that "violate the unalterable laws of nature" (p. 97). When addressing Jesus' calming of the storm (8:23–27), the author describes the "Kinneret boat," a small fishing vessel recovered from the Sea of Galilee in 1986. He makes mention of the infamous James Ossuary (p. 221) and shows that the state motto of Ohio ("with God all things are possible") comes from Matt 19:26b and highlights the legal disputes over it (p. 163). Clarke shows how Sen. Robert Byrd (1964) used Matthew (25:1–13) to oppose the Civil Rights bill (p. 165) and recalls the tradition that Mary herself had as a child woven the veil of the temple that was torn (27:51; *Protoevangelium of James* 10:2; p. 238).

Amidst the occasional dryness of narrating historical detail, the author offers some entertaining wit, parenthetically referring to John the Baptist as the "Big Dipper" (p. 26), and when introducing "The Incarnation" (p. 9) furnishes the reader with a quote from Joyce Clyde Hall: "When you care enough / to send the very best." Casting the demons into pigs reminds him of "deviled ham" (p. 102), and he recalls Mark Twain's complaint about the cost of a boat ride across the Sea of Galilee: "Do you wonder now that Jesus walked?" (p. 132).

At first, I wondered if this was indeed another commentary, which the author clearly affirms. Yet Clarke, Professor Emeritus of Classics at the University of California at Santa Barbara, is better regarded for his wealth of historical knowledge—ecclesiastical and secular—than for his exegesis. Indeed, readers of this *Journal* will find his critical judgments at times disturbing and often marked by unsound exegesis and dated approaches to the first Gospel. Yet this is certainly not Clarke's contribution, and comparison with commentaries even of a more historical orientation (e.g. *ACCS*) would do injustice to both. A noticeable weakness in this volume, though, is that references to the Matthean text under discussion are often difficult to find, which makes it a rather cumbersome reference work. Yet one interested broadly in the influence of the book of Matthew upon the history of Western civilization will find Clarke's extensively researched, clearly written, and massively informative work greatly enhances one's appreciation for the first Gospel. It would also have been interesting, though clearly beyond Clarke's intent, to explore Matthew's influences upon non-Western cultures and ecclesiastical traditions. Nonetheless, this book is wrought with interesting tidbits of information and nuggets for preaching, and it reflects an admirable breadth of knowledge and research. It is a worthy, affordable resource for a patient reader with interests in history, culture, and Matthew's Gospel.

Daniel M. Gurtner  
St. Mary's College, University of St. Andrews, Scotland

*The Mutilation of Mark's Gospel.* By N. Clayton Croy. Nashville: Abingdon, 2003, 230 pp., \$20.00 paper.

Did Mark originally end at 16:8, or not? And what about the awkward beginning of Mark's Gospel? Clayton Croy posits that "through some mishap, the Second Gospel lost its original beginning and ending not too many years after its composition" (p. 12).

Croy organizes his work around three independent yet interlocking proposals related to this thesis, giving separate treatments of the ending of Mark, the beginning of Mark, and the original or early format for Mark's Gospel. After explaining his thesis in the introduction, the ending of Mark is considered in chapters 2 through 5, the beginning of Mark in chapter 6, and the writing format in chapter 7, with a final summary chapter of conclusions and implications.

The first thesis is that the end of Mark was lost, with Mark 16:8 representing the point of the loss, not Mark's intended ending of the Gospel. Croy gives a history of the opinions about Mark's ending, emphasizing especially the past two centuries. In the 1800s, Mark 16:8 became accepted as the end of the Gospel from a text-critical standpoint, with Mark 16:9–20 rejected as a later addition. However, Mark 16:8 was generally considered to be "truncated" due to the loss of the original ending. While a shift was emerging earlier, the arrival of modern literary methods of interpretation caused a rapid shift over the past three decades toward a consensus view that now sees Mark 16:8 as the intended ending of the Gospel. Croy holds that this shift was not warranted by the evidence but rather was largely the result of literary criticism's desire to interpret the existing text as a literary whole. In weighing the support for this thesis, Croy sees the loss of Mark's original ending as "very probable" and as "probable" that the lost ending included material about the forgiveness of the disciples and their reintegration into fellowship with Jesus (p. 165). The inclusion of a commissioning of the disciples by Jesus is rated as "possible" (p. 165).

Croy's second thesis is that the beginning of Mark has been lost as well, with Mark 1:1 being a later scribal addition that identifies the beginning of the text. In evaluating the textual evidence, the numerous variants in the verse indicate that the verse "lacked a stable form when it first began to circulate" (p. 117). Based upon the textual data, grammatical and stylistic difficulties, and the plethora of interpretations about the connection between the first verse and the following verses, Croy proposes that Mark 1:1 is not original but rather is a later second-century addition that marked the beginning of the extant text after the original beginning was lost. This loss of the beginning is rated as "probable," with the contents likely including information about John the Baptist (p. 165). The inclusion of information about the birth or parentage of Jesus is seen as "possible," although Croy nuances this conclusion as marginal at best (p. 166).

The third thesis is that the codex form was the reason for the "mutilation" of Mark's Gospel, with Mark either written originally in a codex form or moved to it very early in the copy process (the loss occurred prior to Matthew or Luke's use of Mark). The codex form explains how both the beginning and the ending of the Gospel were affected simultaneously as the outside folio was lost (or folios if more than one quire was involved). Croy bases his viewpoint on the following: other works from antiquity are known to have lost sections of text; no extant NT manuscripts from before the 5th century were written on scrolls, but rather all were on codices; the codex form is known to have been in use in Rome in the first century based upon a reference in Martial; and the codex form would best explain the problems at both the beginning and ending of Mark. Croy considers Mark's use of the codex form as "probable" (p. 166).

How well are the theses supported? Croy has at least shown that Mark's original ending possibly was lost, although the arguments about the beginning of Mark were less convincing. The chapter on an original/early codex format for Mark is thought provoking since this possibility cannot be easily dismissed and is more probable than most NT scholars have been willing to admit.

On the other hand, the constant negative attitude toward narrative criticism is distracting. Scholars who hold to Mark 16:8 as the original ending of the Gospel are not all basing their conclusions on a narrative approach to the Gospel. Since this is likely the first of our Gospels, Mark did not have the benefit of seeing the other Gospels' resur-

rection appearances as a model for how to end his Gospel, so he can hardly be faulted for not including such appearances. While the 16:8 ending is minimally awkward, the manuscripts that end at 16:8 bear witness that at least some scribes felt comfortable enough with the ending so as to copy it without adding a more appropriate ending. While a truncated ending is “possible,” the “probable” rating is debatable.

Croy’s argument on Mark 1:1 is not convincing. The textual witnesses almost all include the bulk of the verse, the major variant affects only the end of the verse, and no textual witnesses omit the entire verse. This would suggest that the verse was there from the beginning of any tradition that we can trace. The suggestion of an early second-century lectionary provenance for ἀρχή is a stretch of the historical information about the origin of the use of lectionary equipment in manuscripts. And with no “alternative” beginnings created in a like manner as at the end of the book, the conjecture of a lost beginning is dubious at best.

Of course, if the beginning of Mark is not truncated, then the need for a single quire codex is diminished and actually less likely. Nevertheless, the possible loss of the Gospel’s ending would be better explained by the codex form than by a scroll format; for the loss of the innermost leaf of the scroll would be highly unlikely while the loss of the last page of a codex would be plausible.

Bill Warren  
New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, New Orleans, LA

*Slave of All: The Paradox of Authority and Servanthood in the Gospel of Mark.* By Narry F. Santos. JSNTSup 237. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003, xii + 337 pp., \$130.00.

Paradox in Mark’s Gospel is a topic that is both there and not there. It is “there” in the sense that paradox is an obvious and important rhetorical feature in Mark. It is “not there” in the sense that scholarship on Mark’s Gospel has neglected to examine the nature and effect of paradox. This oversight now stands corrected by an extensive, literary study of the subject, written by Narry F. Santos, who serves on the pastoral staff of Greenhills Christian Fellowship and on the faculty of the International School of Theology-Asia in Manila, Philippines. The work is an update and revision of Santos’s doctoral dissertation, written under the supervision of David Lowery at Dallas Theological Seminary.

In chapter 1, Santos defines paradox as an apparently self-contradictory rhetorical statement or concept that deviates from accepted opinion (pp. 2–3, 14). Although it contains two opposing assertions, a paradox has the potential to convey unified truth. According to Santos, Mark used this rhetorical device in connection with the themes of authority and servanthood in order to jolt and challenge his readers to depart from the accepted opinion that servanthood is incompatible with authority (p. 3). The chapter on methodology (chap. 2) is wide ranging, covering the ways in which reader-response criticism, narrative criticism, and rhetorical criticism help to make sense of the use of paradox in Mark’s Gospel. The chapters that explore the paradoxical relationship between authority and servanthood throughout Mark (chaps. 3–5) are also extensive, hardly leaving one stone upon another. Santos examines every passage in Mark to determine what it contributes to the themes of authority and servanthood and the relationship between them. A final chapter summarizes the results of the study and relates these conclusions to three current issues in Markan scholarship: the role of the disciples, the messianic secret, and the profile of Mark’s community (chap. 6). On the whole, Santos’s book is more of a detailed exploration of a topic than a tightly reasoned argument, seeking

to prove a thesis. Since the comprehensive character of the book makes it difficult to summarize, I will only attempt to isolate some of the more important contributions of Santos's study.

Santos makes a distinction between *verbal* paradox, the kind that occurs in statement form, and *dramatic* paradox, the kind that occurs through an author's use of events and characters in a narrative (pp. 33–35). The central section of Mark's Gospel (8:22–10:52) contains the key instances of verbal paradox, statements that explicitly juxtapose authority and servanthood (p. 58). An example of verbal paradox appears in each of Jesus' discipleship discourses within the central section. Whoever saves his life will lose it, and whoever loses his life will save it (8:35). Anyone who wants to be first must be last and the servant of all (9:35). Whoever wants to become great must be a servant, and whoever wants to be first must be a slave of all (10:43–44). Santos negotiates these paradoxes by transforming them into another rhetorical figure, that of metaphor, and in this way he unpacks their meaning and significance in the narrative (pp. 37–39, 164–65). This approach follows Jesus' own method, since he used metaphors and illustrations in his discipleship discourses in order to interpret and explain his paradoxical teaching. Therefore, Santos treats the paradox in Mark 8:35 as indicating that the desire to claim and cling to worldly authority (saving one's life) is not profitable, because it leads to the loss of one's soul to eternal ruin (losing one's life; p. 167). The paradox in Mark 9:35 means that true greatness and authority in the sight of Jesus (being first) demands welcoming those in society who are commonly viewed as insignificant or strangers (being last) and caring for these people, even in ways that seem insignificant to others (being the servant of all; pp. 185–86). The paradox of Mark 10:43–44 is transformed by the example of Jesus in 10:45, who stands as the ultimate expression of both true greatness and self-sacrifice (pp. 207–9).

The sections before and after Mark's central section (1:1–8:21; 11:1–16:8) contain dramatic instances of the authority/servanthood paradox, with the former chapters highlighting especially Jesus' authority and the latter chapters stressing especially his servanthood. According to Santos, an understanding of Mark's narrative—his use of characterization and his emphasis on conflict in the plot—clarifies the effect of dramatic paradox within the story (p. 41). Mark's narrative presents individuals and groups who have (or do not have) authority and who serve (or do not serve) others. Mark's characterization of these people functions as a plea to his readers to emulate the ways of those who serve and to shun the attitudes and actions of those who do not (p. 46). Santos identifies four sets of characters in Mark: (1) those who have authority and serve (i.e. Jesus, John the baptizer, Joseph of Arimathea); (2) those who claim to have authority but do not serve (i.e. the religious leaders, the rich man); (3) those who have no authority but serve (i.e. Peter's mother-in-law, the poor widow, Simon of Cyrene); (4) those who have authority but struggle to serve (i.e. the disciples). Such categories remind readers that they must serve, whether they have authority or not (p. 60).

Mark's plot depends on conflict, between Jesus and the religious leaders and between Jesus and his disciples. According to Santos, these conflicts are rhetorical, in that they warn readers about the dire consequences of failing to recognize the paradoxical relationship between authority and servanthood within the ministry of Jesus (pp. 48, 271–72). The religious leaders reject Jesus' authority and also miss the necessity of service. They oppose Jesus because they want to cling to their own authority and they want to be served. They will receive a greater condemnation and judgment from God himself (pp. 9–10, 47–48). The disciples accept Jesus' authority but struggle with the concept of servanthood. They value the importance of authority but find it hard to accept the high demands and inconvenience of service. Therefore, they misunderstand Jesus and his teaching on discipleship, even to the point of abandoning him at his time of great need (pp. 10, 48).

Sometimes doctoral dissertations within biblical studies pursue topics only tangentially related to the biblical text, or they defend speculative conjectures unlikely to stand the test of time. Santos has avoided such pitfalls by carefully analyzing a significant rhetorical device, as well as crucial literary motifs, in Mark's Gospel. His work has the added benefit of being relevant to the present-day church, which stands in need of leaders who know how to sacrifice and serve.

Joel F. Williams  
Columbia International University, Columbia, SC

*Psalm 118 in the Gospel of John: An Intertextual Study of the New Exodus Pattern in the Theology of John.* By Andrew C. Brunson. WUNT 2/158. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003, xiii + 451 pp., €69.00.

For those exploring the use of the OT in the NT there are typically two extremes that cause scholars much consternation. On the one hand, scholars must steer clear of what Sandmel famously called "parallelomania," which in intertextual studies would translate into "finding the Old Testament passage you are studying in every crevasse of the New Testament." On the other hand, scholars who want to explore the use of the OT in the NT are only able to get a partial picture, if in the process of trying to avoid parallelomania they set up such strict limitations that they only explore those NT passages where formula quotations appear. Andrew Brunson's recently published doctoral dissertation, written under the supervision of I. Howard Marshall at the University of Aberdeen, is an attempt at exploring the use of Psalm 118 in the Gospel of John, while at the same time steering clear of these two extremes.

Brunson, in chapter 1, presents a threefold methodology to guide his way. First, he adopts definitions and tests for "citations" and "allusions" along the lines proposed by Stanley Porter (p. 13). Second, he adopts the view that Jewish intertestamental literature serves as a mediating backdrop through which the NT use of the OT should be read (p. 17). Third, he adopts C. H. Dodd's perspective that when an OT verse was quoted by a NT author, that verse often served as a pointer to its larger context (p. 19).

In chapter 2 Brunson explores Psalm 118 in its Jewish setting. The author argues that the psalm was originally a royal processional psalm sung during the autumn festival in the temple, in which the king's vice-regency was celebrated in light of Yahweh's ultimate kingship. The Israelite king was portrayed as one surrounded by his enemies but then finally saved by the power of Yahweh. After the exile, the psalm still retained a royal feel to it. However, the focus moved from celebrating a kingship that *was* to anticipating a kingship that *was to come*. At this point Brunson adopts the view of N. T. Wright and others who hold that post-exilic and intertestamental Jews believed that they were still in exile because their sin had not been atoned. Evidence of this was that they were still slaves in the land God gave to them (Neh 9:36) and that God's presence had not returned. Thus, the author presents the view that Psalm 118, for post-exilic and intertestamental Jews, came to hold special eschatological significance as it was sung as part of the Hallel during the various Jewish festivals. It caused them to look forward to a New Exodus when Yahweh and his vice-regent would return, defeat their enemies, and physically reign among God's people. Thus, Psalm 118 came to have eschatological significance by the time of the first century AD.

Chapter 3 examines the use of Psalm 118 in the Synoptic Gospels and contrasts their use with the Gospel of John. One notable conclusion that Brunson draws is that while the Synoptics tend to appropriate Psalm 118 to point to Jesus as the Davidic king, John

tends to appropriate Psalm 118 in a way that de-emphasizes Jesus as Davidic king and emphasizes a divine Christology. Chapter 4 explores broad themes found in John's Gospel as a precursor to looking at specific passages. Here Brunson surveys the New Exodus theme as well as the replacement theme.

Chapters 5 through 7 explore the influence of Psalm 118 in the Johannine entrance narrative (John 12:12–19), which for Brunson appears to be the strongest allusion. After establishing strong verbal parallels between Psalm 118 and John 12:12–19, Brunson takes on several conventional assumptions of the entrance narrative as he reads it through the lens of Psalm 118. I will mention one. He disagrees with the interpretation of Carson and others who argue that Jesus rode a donkey rather than a war horse because he came not as a war lord but as a peaceful king. Brunson argues that Jesus was intentionally actualizing the enthronement procession of Psalm 118, which contained references to the defeat of the king's enemies, in order to present himself intentionally as a war lord, having initially conquered death in the raising of Lazarus and ready to conquer death once and for all in his own death and resurrection. Drawing from the view that the Israelites saw themselves as still in exile, Brunson argues that Jesus saw himself as a war lord coming to inaugurate the New Exodus in his death-resurrection act. Incidentally, John is the only Gospel that mentions the raising of Lazarus as part of the entrance narrative, a reality that Brunson leans on to argue his point. If Brunson is correct, then this raises interesting questions concerning how one should understand the humble king of Zechariah 9:9, which is also an antecedent text for John's entrance narrative.

Not only does Brunson take on conventional assumptions but he also covers some new ground as well. All Johannine scholars admit that the coming-sent theme is significant to the Fourth Gospel. A variety of OT backgrounds have been suggested. Brunson proposes that Ps 118:26 is the primary backdrop for the coming-sent theme in John. His argument is primarily literary. After tracing the various appearances of the coming-sent theme from John's prologue forward, he argues that the coming-sent language culminates in the words of the crowd crying forth the words of Ps 118:26 in the entrance narrative at John 12:13, "Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord."

Chapters 8 through 10 examine other possible allusions to Psalm 118 in John's Gospel: John 8:56; 10:7–10; 10:24–25; and 11:41–42. This portion of the study, while helpful, does not engage with the same kind of depth as Brunson's examination of the entrance narrative. Chapter 11 serves as the conclusion to the book. Here Brunson restates his view that John's story of Jesus is a story of convergence. An eschatological hymn that looks forward to Yahweh's coming kingship and the reality that Israel was still in exile awaiting the New Exodus because of its sinfulness, both converge to explain the mission and ministry of Jesus.

What is particularly helpful about Brunson's work is his methodology. He establishes a methodology that keeps him from wavering from one extreme to the other, and as a result he produces a very balanced and helpful study, one that will contribute favorably to Johannine scholarship.

C. Scott Shidemantle  
Geneva College, Beaver Falls, PA

*Magic and Paganism in Early Christianity: The World of the Acts of the Apostles.* By Hans-Josef Klauck. Translated by Brian McNeil. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003, xii + 136 pp., \$15.00 paper.

This short study originated in a lecture that was presented throughout South Africa in 1994 and was subsequently published as an English article that same year (*Neot* 21

[1994] 93–108). The author then published a full German monograph, entitled *Magie und Heidentum in der Apostelgeschichte des Lukas* (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1996). The English translation under review represents a thorough revision of the German volume and incorporates secondary literature up to 1999. The updated bibliography in this Fortress edition also includes some materials through 2002 (unlike the English edition published by T. & T. Clark in 2000).

Klauck's first chapter establishes the missionary program of the book of Acts, which is summarized in the prologue and is founded upon the Pentecost event. The body of the volume surveys Luke's descriptions of Gentile religiosity as found in the dramatic episodes, speeches, and narrative commentaries of Acts. Klauck examines Philip's encounters with Simon and the Ethiopian chamberlain, the death of Herod Agrippa I, Paul's encounter with Bar-Jesus, the Lystra episode of misidentification, the soothsaying slave-girl from Philippi, Paul's Athenian discourse, the seven sons of Sceva, the burning of magical collections and the riot of the silversmiths in Ephesus, and the shipwreck at Malta. Along the way, Klauck discusses oriental cults, astrology, oracles, exorcism, magical papyri, and devotional souvenirs. Klauck's survey portrays Luke as a largely irenic author more interested in "brilliant parodies" and "subtle irony" than in "any heavily aggressive polemic" (p. 119). Nevertheless, texts such as Acts 26:17–18 must temper Klauck's optimistic claim that Luke could not have had a "very negative view" of the Gentile pagans under consideration (and the human race in general).

According to Klauck, Luke aims "to form and stabilize the identity of the Christian readers" (p. 121) by warning them of an "all-devouring syncretism." Such an eclecticism was a continuing threat within established churches but also an obstacle to the Christian mission. Luke carefully distances the miracles of his Christian protagonists from the magic of the surrounding pagan milieu, since a certain ambiguity could accompany miraculous phenomena apart from interpretation (p. 18). The Christian missionaries recognized the necessary demarcation between the divine and human spheres—the miraculous power was not their own. Furthermore, they refused to profit from the miraculous. They consistently deflected honor and wealth, and they shunned self-aggrandizement. Perhaps most importantly, the early Christian missionaries subordinated miracles to the kerygma. "The miracle arouses astonishment, but ultimately it is the message, the gospel, the word of God . . . that is decisive" (p. 53).

This insight allows Klauck to re-investigate the case of Simon Magus. While many interpreters have spoken of the hypocritical intentions of Simon's pretended belief, Klauck concludes that his faith was sincere. However, it was also superficial and precarious, since it was not adequately founded upon the Christian kerygma. This concern for preserving the integrity of the Christian message also helps Klauck explain Paul's opposition to the Philippian soothsaying slave-girl. She proclaimed Paul's preaching as "a way of salvation," but her anarthrous statement revealed a dangerous ambiguity. Klauck's investigation of the importance of "boundaries" allows him to conclude that those who burned their magical books in Acts 19 had already been members of the Ephesian church. Since "remnants of popular religiosity" could also threaten the Christian community from within, Luke called for resolute opposition as well as caution in dealing with lapsed members.

Klauck's main interest lies in the "narrative world" of the book of Acts. However, he intermittently allows us to ascertain his view of the actual historicity of events. Klauck's redactional analysis allows for Lukan creation of materials, distortion of events, and revision of accounts in the interests of a theological or pastoral agenda. In Klauck's view, Luke gives legendary "visual form" to early Christian beliefs, fills in the lacunae of his sources with "traditional motifs," and blames Jews for troubles they did not cause. On the other hand, Klauck affirms the reliability of various events (pp. 24, 32, 36), and he notes the "striking confirmation" that the Pauline correspondence gives to Acts (pp. 71, 74, 93–94). Klauck contrasts his own perspective with the "severe"

criticism of G. Lüdemann (p. 45). Yet he clearly does not stand within the more apologetically conservative tradition of a W. M. Ramsay, F. F. Bruce, or C. J. Hemer.

Depending on one's expectations, the brevity and accessibility of Klauck's volume are commendable, but they also result in definite weaknesses. For example, there is little documentation or in-depth scholarship available in the sparse footnotes. Accordingly, the volume does not contain a modern author index. One can easily lose sight of the contemporary scholarship that undoubtedly informs the study, but even this can have a certain advantage. Klauck, like a master mechanic, provides the reader with a swift and smooth ride without drawing attention to the engine's workings that lie hidden under the hood. On the other hand, scholars will also want to consult detailed and documented studies that thoroughly display all of the engineering design.

Klauck's work can be compared with an earlier brief study which covered much of the same terrain: Susan R. Garrett's *The Demise of the Devil: Magic and the Demonic in Luke's Writings* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989). Garrett's volume was a revision of her Yale doctoral dissertation, and her substantial endnotes are worthy of careful perusal. Although Klauck purposely avoids definitional questions concerning "magic" (p. 2), Garrett commences with a review of modern scholarship. Conversely, Garrett does not analyze Greco-Roman religiosity beyond the realm of magic.

Since Garrett's work is now dated, one should also examine Andy M. Reimer's *Miracle and Magic: A Study in the Acts of the Apostles and the Life of Apollonius of Tyana* (JSNTSup 235; London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002). Reimer seeks to move beyond the relative definitions of "miracle" and "magic" provided by contemporary perspectives arising from a sociology of knowledge (one person's "magic" is his opponent's "miracle," and vice versa). In social anthropological terms, Reimer's analysis is more "etic" (an outsider's perspective and description) than the studies of Garrett and Klauck, since it seeks to anchor itself beyond the "symbolic universe" of Luke-Acts.

In conclusion, Klauck's work is an accessible and fascinatingly insightful introduction to the Greco-Roman religious context of Acts. The worth of the volume does not lie merely in historical interest; theologians and missiologists interested in the tension between inculturation and evangelization will also benefit. Christians today often face a similar dialectic as that found in Acts, as they seek to make cultural contact while simultaneously offering cultural critique. How does one engage culture in a meaningful and understandable manner without being absorbed by its thought patterns, an absorption that can lead to "a fundamental distortion and falsification of the message" (p. 61)?

Paul A. Hartog

Faith Baptist Theological Seminary, Ankeny, IA

*Paul: A Jew on the Margins.* By Calvin J. Roetzel. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2003, xii + 116 pp., \$14.95 paper.

In *Paul, A Jew on the Margins* Calvin Roetzel brings together four previously published essays, along with two new contributions, in an effort to highlight the significance of Paul's status as one who lived on the cultural, religious, and political margins of first-century society. In Roetzel's view, this marginality was both theologically formative and intellectually generative in that it provided the impetus and perspective of much of Paul's theologizing throughout his letters. Far from a barren, unfruitful wasteland, Paul's marginality proved to be the creative matrix which produced his most enduring and distinctive theological formulations. Nor was this position on the perimeter one that Paul scorned; rather, "Paul actively embraced the margin and made it an instrument pregnant with possibility" (p. 3).

Chapter 1 begins by situating Paul on the margins of Pharisaism. Roetzel is keen to depict Paul as a Jew whose unique blend of pharisaism and apocalypticism left him at odds with other groups in both Judaism and the primitive Jesus movement. Paul did not, however, repudiate his ancestral faith but radically revised it in light of his newly found conviction regarding Jesus as the Messiah. In chapter 2, "Paul as Mother," Roetzel addresses Paul's conversion and struggles to find an adequate rubric that will account for the diverse terminology and rich symbolism used to describe this event in Paul's letters. Drawing on the work of medievalist Caroline Walker Bynum, Roetzel argues that the idea of gender inversion may be the most productive conversion symbolism in Paul's letters. Noting Paul's use of maternal imagery in 1 Thess 2:7; Gal 4:19; and 1 Cor 3:2, Roetzel suggests that this symbolism depicts Paul's voluntary renunciation of a position of status, yet without implying any repudiation of his ancestral faith. Roetzel is quite determined to present Paul as one who "was born a Jew, lived as a Jew, and died as a Jew" (p. 18), and it is clear that his advocacy of conversion as gender inversion is driven by this larger concern. I found the argument of this chapter both innovative and tendentious. While I am sympathetic to the viewpoint that Paul never rejected his native Judaism, there are certainly more obvious ways of interpreting Paul's maternal imagery, and one would expect to see a more liberal and theologically intentional use of this language if Roetzel is correct. In any event, Roetzel's thesis would probably require a monograph-length treatment for an adequate presentation.

Chapters 3 through 6 focus on Paul the theologizer, each taking a prominent feature of Paul's intellectual landscape and probing its depth, dimension, and position on the ideological boundary of first-century Judaism. Paul's application and radical reinterpretation of the apocalyptic myth (chap. 3) reveals the fertile and imaginative intellectual life of the apostle and demonstrates "his understanding of the margin as a location of radical possibility" (p. 19). Paul's theology of dying and rising with Christ, especially as articulated in 2 Corinthians in terms of strength in weakness (chap. 4) was forged in response to the claims of Paul's rivals. Their attempts to marginalize Paul, far from discrediting the apostle, "inspired a radical embrace of the human condition invaded by the divine in the human and dying Christ" (p. 49). In coming to terms with the universal application of Christ's mission (chap. 5), Paul was forced to renegotiate Israel's special status, while not excluding Gentile "sinners." In chapter 6 Roetzel examines Paul's "grammar of election" in order to emphasize its contextually contingent application, as opposed to a "stable, static, unchangeable foundational element" (p. 87) of Paul's theology.

Each of these essays is stimulating and can be read independently of the others. The author incorporates insights from leading anthropologists, historians, theologians, and social critics, creating in this way numerous thought-provoking discussions. Roetzel's argumentation is always careful, and his writing is well crafted.

A consistent theme throughout these pages, particularly emphasized in the final chapter, is the very ad hoc and evolutionary nature of Paul's theology. At points Roetzel seems to imply that Paul's thoughts on a subject were probably not fully formed until the quill was lifted from the parchment. Is it really likely, however, that Paul "had simply not thought through the implications of his proclamation" regarding the "inclusion of Gentiles as Gentiles in the family of God" (pp. 5–6) before he wrote 1 Thessalonians? Hardly. Equally puzzling is Roetzel's claim that Paul's vision of an "inclusive *ekklesia*," one that incorporated both Jews and Gentiles, failed miserably soon after the apostle's death, and that would have left him "heartbroken" had he lived to see it (p. 87). It is true, of course, that Paul longed for his kinsmen to embrace Jesus as the Messiah and that he was deeply grieved at his people's rejection of their redeemer (Rom 9:1–2). Yet Paul fully understood that a "partial hardening" of Israel was part of God's plan and was intended to allow for the incorporation of the Gentiles (Rom 11:25–32). Paul's primary vision was that membership in God's family be equally accessible to all—Jew and

Gentile—by faith, regardless of ethnic identity. In this regard, Paul’s mission was anything but a failure.

Moyer Hubbard  
Talbot School of Theology, La Mirada, CA

*Where to Live: The Hermeneutical Significance of Paul’s Citations from Scripture in Galatians 3:1–14.* By Andrew H. Wakefield. Academia Biblica 14. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003, ix + 227 pp., \$39.95 paper.

Wakefield’s goal is defining a “matrix” for viewing this section of Galatians. In this dissertation written under Richard Hays, the method used is labeled “intertextuality,” as in Hays’s own work *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989). Wakefield defines the method by the assertion that “texts have meaning only in relationship with other texts,” and these relationships always exist, whether or not an author has deliberately cited or alluded to another text (p. 99). This leads him to conclude that “a text is not a static, independent entity with inherent meaning, but rather is a dynamic process” (p. 101). He acknowledges that “true intertextuality almost inevitably incorporates a reader-response approach to the text” (p. 103), and he supports this approach, which he calls “the prevailing trend in hermeneutical theory which rejects the traditional effort to locate the meaning of the text in the intentions of its author,” since whatever these intentions are “the reader must perceive meaning” (p. 104).

His goal in applying intertextuality to Galatians 3 is to find “some sort of matrix, some intertext to which the ungrammaticalities point and in light of which the text takes on new and deeper significance” (p. 123). In seeking this significance, he questions what is presupposed by Paul’s citation of Scripture. He examines the assumption that, for citations within an argument, such citations are “both applicable and authoritative” (p. 147). He argues not that the source of the citation presupposes this but that the mere usage of citation does. Yet it does not mean that “either the author or the audience shares this assumption,” which allows for dissonance surrounding the usage of such citations, or “in other words, for ungrammaticality,” which obligates us to find a significance that “resolves the dissonance” (p. 148). Wakefield uses the assumption of dissonance to question whether, for instance, the citations of both Lev 18:5 and Hab 2:4 can be applicable and authoritative. He answers that such citations can function not only as proofs, but also as premise and as conclusion.

Where does this emphasis on other functions for citation (than as proofs) lead? One sees the answer in Wakefield’s use of punctuation in Gal 3:11 to claim that the citation there does not function deductively but rather extends an argument. His translation of the verse is “because no one is justified before God by the law, it is clear that the ‘righteous will live by faith.’” He says the point of the argument rests on the function of the citation. Rather than an argument over how one is justified, based on scriptural proof, the verse “moves from an agreement on how one is justified to an argument about how one who is justified should live” (p. 167). The focus becomes how one completes what was begun through faith. He argues against the assumption that Hab 2:4 and Lev 18:5 “describe different means of salvation,” because of two factors: (1) the validity of claims from E. P. Sanders about covenantal nomism with regard to Israel and the law; and (2) the idea that ζάω in the context of Galatians 3 refers not to gaining life but to living it. As to Sanders’s work, Wakefield accepts the view that a Jew “gets in” through the covenant and that observance of the law merely allows him to “stay in.” If one argues that Paul here in Galatians 3 contrasts “a misunderstanding of how one gains life with

a true understanding, the problem remains that he apparently cites a verse in support of or to illustrate a position that neither he nor his opponents hold, that they agree is false, according to Gal 2:15–20” (p. 169). If the citation of Hab 2:4 extends the agreed-upon point (“not a proof, but a conclusion”) that the law cannot justify, then after examination of the contexts where forms of ζάω are found, a “soteriological understanding of ζήσεται is untenable” (p. 173). He argues that a non-soteriological reading of the citations resolves the dissonance between the presupposition of applicability and authority and the apparent contradiction between Hab 2:4 and Lev 18:5. For Wakefield, Galatians 3 is not about finding righteousness but about “where to live,” defined as “life in the new age.”

Wakefield ends by discussing how the “matrix” of “where to live” affects one’s view of other elements in Galatians. These elements include the curse, the Spirit, and the law. He says that what is “wrong with the law” is its place in the old age. “If Paul’s discussion is focused on where to live,” then Paul is not rejecting the law as a means to gain life, but rather he refers to law as “a system that is apocalyptically severed from the new age in Christ.” We can live there, but not also live in Christ. As for its effect on the view of the Spirit, Wakefield claims “to live in the Spirit, in the new age, is to leave both sin and law behind.” In short, Wakefield uses intertextuality, i.e. the interplay between texts Paul cites, to argue that Paul is not seeking soteriological proof through his citations; rather, Paul advocates “where to live,” that is, in the new eschatological age where only the Spirit, not the law, functions.

With regard to the book’s strengths and weaknesses, Wakefield offers helpful surveys of recent treatments concerning Paul’s view of the law (chap. 2) and his use of Scripture (chap. 3). He outlines the work of scholars other than Hays who employ intertextuality to evaluate textual echoes (chap. 4). He argues persuasively for certain interpretations of individual verses in Galatians 3.

Yet “dissonance,” to borrow his word, exists between his method and the assumption behind it. When he claims that Paul does not reject the law as a means to gain life, he is not suggesting that the author’s intention defines the meaning (see note 2 on p. 190). His use of “Paul” means “something like the implied author, rather than as a claim about the intentions of the historical figure.” There is a consistency here, in that he stated earlier that intertextual relationships always exist, regardless of an author’s intent in citations, and “a text is not a static, independent entity with inherent meaning, but rather is a dynamic process” (p. 101). He acknowledges that intertextuality usually incorporates a reader-response approach to the text. However, if he intends to pursue a reader-initiated view of the meaning of the citations, then his second and third chapters should be composed entirely differently. He is not really after how Paul viewed the law; he pursues how other scholars think Paul viewed the relationship between law and justification. Similarly, in light of his method, he would not be concerned with the function Paul assigns to the citations in Galatians 3, but with the function readers can assign that reduces the tension inherent in Paul’s letter.

To summarize the objection that those who hold to authorial intent will have when reading Wakefield, one might say the following. If what Paul meant in using the citations does not determine the significance of these citations in relation to the meaning of Galatians 3, then the question of whether Paul intends a soteriological defense in using texts like Lev 18:5 and Hab 2:4 in the argument about justification is moot. The reader can assert, and should offer interpretations of verses that support such an assertion, that Paul’s argument in Galatians 3 is focused on “where to live,” in the new age under the Spirit. Certainly Paul does argue for such a life in the Spirit. However, is that what Paul is after in Gal 3:1–14? Using Wakefield’s intertextual assumptions, the answer is irrelevant, for the reader determines meaning. His monograph seems based on the assumption that he seeks Paul’s intent (that of the historical figure, not an implied author), yet his methods, and some direct statements, dictate otherwise. Many of the

books he references are helpful in exploring the issues within Galatians 3, and his grasp of the arguments within Galatians is astute. However, the method he employs carries assumptions that undermine the rather well-formulated conclusions he reaches.

Bryan McIntosh  
Boyce College, Louisville, KY

*Understanding the Book of Hebrews: The Story Behind the Sermon.* By Kenneth Schenck. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2003, vii + 144 pp., \$19.95 paper.

Schenck uses the principles of narrative criticism to explain the implicit “story” behind Hebrews in order to facilitate a deeper understand of the message of Hebrews. He shows clearly how these principles are applicable to literature such as Hebrews, which he rightly calls a “sermon.”

The first chapter gives a clear summary of Schenck’s approach. The plot of this story, as of all stories, consists of events, characters, and settings. The events of the plot of Hebrews fall into three periods: the “Prologue,” “Act I: Days of Anticipation,” and “Act II: The Consummation of the Ages.” The prologue describes humanity under the power of sin, which marred God’s intention for humans to live in glory as his regents on earth. In Act I, God made the first covenant through the angels and Moses, the sacrifices of which foreshadowed the death and enthronement of Christ. During this age the people to whom God’s word came could respond in trust or in disobedience. Act II began with Christ’s sacrificial death and the celebration of his exaltation to God’s right hand. He fulfilled the foreshadowings of the old covenant and provided the redemption that brings faithful human beings into the glory of the eternal world. During this act those who received God’s word had the same choices as those under the first act. Act II will end when Christ returns to bring final salvation and God “speaks” again in judgment, shaking the created world so that only the heavenly world remains.

The main characters that carry this story forward are God and Christ. Angels, Moses, and others serve as “foils” for Christ. The devil functions as the antagonist. A number of OT characters in the first act, Jesus, and the earlier leaders of the church to which Hebrews was addressed are examples of faithfulness. The recipients of Hebrews are themselves characters in the story, for they are invited to follow these examples of faith and shun those of disbelief as they take advantage of the salvation Christ has provided.

The setting of this story is divided between the heavenly world and the earthly, created world. Act I and the first covenant pertain primarily to the earthly, created world. In Act II the heavenly and earthly worlds overlap. After God removes the earthly, created world at the end of Act II, only the heavenly, unshakeable world will remain. Each chapter fleshes out a different aspect of this story.

Schenck writes clearly and presents a coherent understanding of Hebrews. There are a number of sound exegetical insights, such as his explanation of faith. Unfortunately, however, the usefulness of this book is seriously marred by two interrelated flaws. First, Schenck exaggerates and gives undue significance to the distinction between the heavenly and the earthly worlds. Second, he argues that Hebrews does not affirm the pre-existence, and thus the eternity, of the Son of God. We can see how these two errors are intertwined when we observe Schenck’s view on what made Christ’s sacrifice effective. He believes that Christ’s sacrifice was effective because it was offered in the heavenly world. However, Hebrews teaches that it was effective because the one who offered himself is the eternal Son of God (1:4–14; 5:5–6; 7:1–25).

Schenck argues that Heb 1:4–14 refers to the exaltation of the Son, not to his pre-existence. He holds that the one who is priest after Melchizedek’s order (7:1–28) has an

unending priesthood but not eternal existence. The description of the Son in Heb 1:1–3 should, according to Schenck, not be taken literally, because it reflects the terminology of wisdom speculations, which did not literally describe a pre-existent or eternal being. In each instance the exegesis is question begging.

In regard to Heb 1:1–3, Schenck falls into the “no-more-than” fallacy. That is, because certain language was “no more than” a literary figure when used outside Scripture, it can be “no more than” a literary figure when traces of it are applied to Christ. This approach totally misses the point of the new referent. Heb 1:4–14 may celebrate the exaltation or the enthronement of the Son of God. Such exaltation, however, in no way negates the clear designation of the Son as God and affirmation of his creatorship and eternal sovereignty over creation. The Son’s status as a priest according to the Melchizedekian type clearly means that his priesthood was not based on Aaronic descent. He was “without father, without mother, without genealogy” (7:3), he “does not belong to their ancestry” (7:6), and he comes from “another tribe” (7:13). However, it also means that his priesthood is based on his being the eternal Son of God. “Having neither beginning of days nor end of life” (7:3), “he lives” (7:8) and is successful because of “the power of an indestructible life” (7:15). His perpetual priesthood is empowered by his eternal being.

The contrast in Hebrews is not between the realm of the “spirit” and the realm of “flesh.” It is between God’s eternity (“the power of an indestructible life”) and “fleshly,” human weakness (7:15). Indeed, Schenck’s attempt to associate “spirit” with the heavenly world causes considerable strain in his interpretation of “the eternal spirit” in 9:14 as Christ’s (human) spirit. Also, the angels who are spirits are associated with the first earthly covenant (1:14). The heavenly world may be distinct from the created world that we see, but it, too, was made by God (11:10).

Christ’s heavenly high priesthood in Hebrews is a priesthood of intercession from the right hand of God. He now exercises this heavenly priesthood because of his effective sacrifice (7:23–25; 10:11–14). There is no place in Hebrews that clearly affirms that this sacrifice was “offered in heaven.” Its offering gained Christ access to God’s presence as our high priest.

It is not some speculation about an offering in the heavenly world but the deity of the Son of God that stands behind his saving work. Unfortunately, Schenck’s Jesus is neither true to the teaching of Hebrews nor adequate to procure our salvation.

Gareth Lee Cockerill  
Wesley Biblical Seminary, Jackson, MS

*1 Peter, Jude and 2 Peter.* By Donald P. Senior and Daniel J. Harrington. SacPag 15. Collegeville: Liturgical, 2003, xv + 315 pp., \$39.95.

I remember reading somewhere many years ago that the post-Vatican II Catholic acceptance of the historical-critical method was some measure of justification for it. I remain nonplussed by the logic. More importantly, as this commentary demonstrates anew, the results have done little to commend a headlong dive into the historical-critical pool. Ironically and typically, the critical approach as modeled in this work is not very self-critical. This is the first volume in this new series that I have read. I very much hoped it would be a positive contribution to scholarship and the church, only to be sorely disappointed.

Sacra Pagina is a fairly new series of commentaries on the NT written exclusively by Catholic scholars. The goal of the series “is to provide sound critical analysis without any loss of sensitivity to religious meaning” for “biblical professionals, graduate students, theologians, clergy, and religious educators” (p. ix). The authors of this volume

are both well known and respected scholars, both past presidents of the Catholic Biblical Association.

Following discussion of typical introductory matters and a very limited general bibliography, the commentary proper involves the author's English translation of a portion of text, notes on select words or phrases within the text, interpretation of the text, and suggestions for further study (taken from the earlier bibliography). There is limited interaction with secondary sources, and there are no footnotes.

Senior rejects Petrine authorship for 1 Peter, concluding instead that the unified (not a composite document), circular letter (not a baptismal homily) is the result of a Petrine disciple or group in Rome sometime during the last quarter of the first century. Two of his points against Petrine authorship are arguments from silence. One point finds suspicious the more frequent use of the LXX tradition rather than Hebrew. Yet this is typical of the NT authors. A fourth objection notes the "established leadership" (i.e. elders in 5:1–5), possibly indicative of a later period. The fifth point, the quality of the Greek, is worth considering but by no means conclusive, especially in light of Karen Jobes's recent study of the quality of Greek in 1 Peter ("The Syntax of 1 Peter: Just How Good Is the Greek?" *BBR* 13 [2003]: 159–74). In light of the weak case against Petrine authorship, it is striking to read later that "[t]he author's own statement of his purpose in writing the letter should be taken at face value" (p. 12).

Senior rejects the social reconstruction of Elliott (i.e. "alien" was the legal and literal social status of the recipients), understanding the internal descriptions of the recipients as metaphors and symbols of Israel applied to Christians. In fact, pace Achtemeier, Israel as the church is regarded as the "controlling metaphor" within the letter (pp. 12, 14). Senior does rightly reject the idea of official Roman anti-Christian persecution behind the suffering portrayed in the epistle, and he understands instead (in keeping with the majority of recent work on 1 Peter) that the recipients are facing local social pressures significant enough to bring about religious compromise on the one hand, or economic loss on the other hand, possibly resulting in suffering. Senior also provides a rather unhelpful, one-dimensional outline of the letter.

There are various problems that detract from Senior's work. For example, Mark is not referred to as a leader among the brethren in Acts 15:22 as Senior states (p. 5). Second, the outline declares that the body of the letter is composed of 1:3–5:11 (p. 11). Yet earlier on the same page he says it is 1:13–5:11. Complicating the matter further, he later identifies the body as 2:11–4:11 (p. 22). Two other examples occur on page 26 when discussing the phrase "for obedience" (εἰς ὑπακοήν). Senior says "the preposition could be used in a *causative* sense and, coupled with the next phrase 'sprinkling of blood,' mean that sanctification is also effected *through* the obedience and shed blood 'of Jesus Christ'" (italics mine). I think I understand his point, but it is a confusing way to put it. Finally, two sentences later he says, "the word 'obedience' stands on its own and means 'obedience.'"

With respect to the intriguing passage in 3:18–22, Senior agrees with the view that the proclamation to the spirits in prison of v. 19 is not a descent into the underworld between Christ's death and resurrection, but a post-resurrection (i.e. ascension) proclamation of victory likely connected to Enochic traditions and ultimately rooted in Genesis 6–7.

Harrington, who also serves as the editor of the series, regards both 2 Peter and Jude as pseudonymous. The latter, a homily in letter form, is a highly polemical attack against Christian intruders written sometime between AD 80 and 100. As for the intruders, they were at least similar to a "group of radical Paulinists" (p. 182). Harrington concedes "it remains difficult to prove this definitively." I am afraid the diagnosis is more severe than he allows for.

2 Peter is regarded as a "vigorous denunciation" of false teachers written as a "testament" by a Hellenized Jewish Christian in Rome. Given that Harrington understands

that the author of 2 Peter has borrowed (and edited) from Jude, then 2 Peter must follow Jude in the late first or early second century. He rejects the notion of “early Catholicism” for both writings, preferring instead to speak of “elements” or “roots” of early Catholicism in the NT.

In a day when theology and tradition are once again afforded a legitimate place at the table of biblical interpretation, I had hoped for edifying and provocative perspectives from a commentary supposedly “shaped by the context of the Catholic tradition” (p. ix). More than anything else I sense the critical Protestant tradition behind and throughout this work. This volume does have flashes of insight and helpful information, but in general I cannot recommend it with conviction for a frequent resource.

B. Paul Wolfe  
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Ft. Worth, TX

*1, 2 Peter; Jude.* By Thomas R. Schreiner. NAC. Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 2003, 512 pp., \$29.99.

Schreiner, Professor of New Testament and Associate Dean for Scripture and Interpretation at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, is also preaching pastor at Trinity Baptist Church in Louisville. This commentary reflects his ministry in both the academy and the church. In his preface he states that he wrote the commentary “primarily for pastors and laypersons who are interested in serious study of the Scripture.” He goes on to say that he hopes the commentary will have interest to scholars, “but I have tried to keep it short enough so that busy pastors will have time to read it.”

The commentary, volume 37 in Broadman and Holman’s New American Commentary series, reflects the best of what that series is designed to be. In their preface the editors explain that their goal for this series is that the scholars who write the commentaries “communicate the findings of their research in a manner that will build up the whole body of Christ.” In order to accomplish that goal the main body of the commentaries consists of “theological exegesis while providing practical, applicable exposition,” and the footnotes contain “discussions relating to contemporary scholarship and technical points of grammar and syntax.” This commentary sets a standard in these areas for all others writing in this series. The discussions in the body of the commentary are lucid, thorough, and focused on the important theological and exegetical issues in the text.

The introductions to 1, 2 Peter and Jude digest the relevant critical and historical information and present the reader with important theories and approaches pertinent to the interpretation of the books. Schreiner believes that 1 Peter was written by the apostle Peter from Rome to Christians, who were predominantly Gentiles, in Asia Minor in AD 62–63. Since the recipients were from five provinces, they were from a broad background (1:1–2). He rejects Elliott’s sociological reading of 1 Peter; the recipients were first spiritual or theological aliens, not political (pp. 21–48). In the introduction to 2 Peter (pp. 253–82) Schreiner discusses evidence that the letter is pseudepigraphal, interacting with and responding to David G. Meade (*Pseudonymity and Canon* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986]), Lewis R. Donelson’s work on the Pastoral Epistles (*Pseudepigraphy and Ethical Argument in the Pastoral Epistles* [HUT 22; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1986]), and Kurt Aland (“The Problem of Anonymity and Pseudonymity in Christian Literature of the First Two Centuries,” *JTS* 12 [1961] 39–49). He also examines the testament theory of Richard Bauckham (*Jude, 2 Peter* [WBC; Waco: Word, 1983]). He finds none of these theories compelling, but instead he concludes, on the basis of an array of internal and

external evidence, that the most persuasive theory is that 2 Peter is authentic. Interestingly, in light of his traditional views, he also argues in the introduction to Jude that 2 Peter was familiar with Jude and the most probable literary relationship between the two is that 2 Peter used Jude (pp. 415–19). He dates 2 Peter shortly before Peter's death, and he hesitates to attach a name or a full-fledged theology to the opponents addressed in 2 Peter. Schreiner concludes that Jude was written in the 60s by Jude, the brother of James and Jesus, to either Jews or a mixed audience of Jews and Gentiles in an unknown destination. The opponents addressed in Jude were libertine, charismatic intruders in Christian congregations, who were deceiving and dividing the true believers (pp. 403–26).

Since the commentary series “concentrates on theological exegesis” and since Schreiner states in his preface that one distinctive of his commentary is its “theological slant,” which he describes further as his conviction that the canonical unity of the Scriptures yields a coherent message, the reader expects to find consistency of theology in the commentary. For the most part the commentary does not disappoint in this regard. One clear example is the theology of perseverance and assurance that Schreiner has developed elsewhere (Schreiner and Ardel B. Caneday, *The Race Set Before Us: A Biblical Theology of Perseverance and Assurance* [Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2001]), which is fleshed out in this commentary. Especially helpful is the discussion on “obedience” (1:2, 14, 22) in 1 Peter; less helpful, but a clear application of his theology, is the discussion of 2 Pet 2:20–22 (pp. 360–65). In the latter context he explains the theological tension as “phenomenological language.” Also worth mentioning is his discussion of 1 Pet 3:18–22, which he interprets as Christ proclaiming victory over demonic spirits. Although I question whether the dative *pneumati*, “spirit,” in 3:18 is instrumental, differing from the parallel *sarki* or “flesh,” which is a dative of reference or sphere (he argues for a similar distinction in 4:6), his summary and overall treatment of the section is consistent with the context and an excellent entrée into the main issues in the passage. (It is noteworthy that Schreiner suggests that Peter varies his seemingly parallel grammatical constructions in the same context [3:18; 4:6], but he is not open to variance in word meaning in the same context, even where it might relieve tensions he grapples with, i.e. “elder” in 1 Pet 5:5.)

Another issue that raised questions in my mind was Schreiner's interpretation of the application of the OT (esp. in 1 Pet 2:9–10) to the recipients of 1 Peter. On page 46 he states that the recipients had become “part of Israel by believing in Jesus Christ and were God's holy nation and special people (2:9–10).” Later he writes that “the church does not replace Israel, but it does fulfill the promises made to Israel; and all those, Jews and Gentiles, who belong to the true Israel are now part of the new people of God” (p. 115). One could wish that he had developed his thoughts further here so that the reader could evaluate the hermeneutical and theological basis for his statements or that he had interacted more with other interpretations. (See my proposal “The Israelite Imagery of 1 Peter 2,” in *Dispensationalism, Israel and the Church* [ed. Craig A. Blaising and Darrell L. Bock; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992] 156–87.)

The commentary has three helpful indices: a selected subject index, a person index, and a selected Scripture index. The bibliography is helpful, and Schreiner interacts with unpublished works, dissertations, monographs, and scholarly studies. His breadth of research, his attention to detail in the Scripture text, and the helpful details in the footnote discussions suggest that Schreiner's desire for the commentary be of interest to scholars will be realized.

However, the greatest value of this commentary is its contribution to the church and its pastors. The succinct and pointed summary of the issues in the body of the commentary will delight busy pastors and students who are trying to discover the heart of what is being said in the letters addressed in this commentary. In fact, in my own work

in 1 Peter, I find myself going first to this commentary to grasp the basic meaning and issues in the text. I am confident many others will find themselves doing the same.

W. Edward Glenny  
Northwestern College, St. Paul, MN

*The Significance of Parallels Between 2 Peter and Other Early Christian Literature.* By Michael J. Gilmour. Academia Biblica 10. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002, xi + 176 pp., \$29.95 paper.

Any reader of this journal will be aware of the uncertainties surrounding the question of the authorship of 2 Peter. In the presence of strong skepticism regarding the book's provenance, is there another method by which we might be able to locate this letter within the fabric of early Christian history? Gilmour discussed this question in his doctoral dissertation written under the supervision of Frederik Wisse at McGill University. Without making any pronouncements concerning the letter's authenticity, Gilmour explores the way that parallels from other ancient texts might help place the document within history. The method is intriguing and does present the possibility of a constructive approach that, in the end, could help bring this letter out of the exegetical backwaters. The book opens with hope, but Gilmour is careful to underscore that his primary purpose is to examine the merits of this method of historical inquiry in relation to 2 Peter. As he puts the query, "is the simple observation that texts of unknown historical location . . . resemble other texts of known location a reliable tool for placing documents in history?" (p. 4).

In order to answer the question, Gilmour first examines various past attempts at historical reconstruction. Some studies try to place the letter within "a general historical framework," such as Reicke's reconstruction of the political context in which the letter was born or the quest to locate the epistle's geographical context from Egypt to Rome. Others attempts are placed within the category of "developmental models" which include the Hegelian-based theory of F. C. Bauer, Käseman's "early catholicism," and Robinson and Koester's examination of early Christian "trajectories." Gilmour is skeptical that either approach can be fruitful since, on the one hand, "there is insufficient evidence to determine a specific geographical setting for the provenance and destination of this letter" (p. 23) and, on the other, developmental models fail to take into account "the idiosyncrasies of authorship" (p. 43). In other words, "writers and their creations do not always follow predictable patterns" (p. 45).

Having demonstrated the necessity of an alternative approach, Gilmour lays the groundwork for examining the literary parallels with 2 Peter by discussing the criteria that should be used to determine if some text is truly a source used by the author. The taxonomy that he develops goes well beyond that of Richard Hays (summarized in Appendix 8) as he distinguishes between parallels that are the result of direct dependence, common authorship, the use of a common source, and deliberate imitation and parallels that had their origins in a common school or shared milieu. The author summarizes this work in a series of appendices (3–7). With these considerable foundations laid, Gilmour proceeds to the heart of the matter in his discussion of the parallels between 2 Peter and other early Christian literature in chapter 4. Here, however, are where the surprises begin. While 2 Peter is dependent upon Jude, Gilmour's conclusions about the epistle's indebtedness to other literature are negative on the whole. Despite the reference to 1 Peter in 2 Peter 3:1, "little connects these two documents other than the name of Peter" (p. 93). Although the transfiguration is recounted in 1:16–18, the parallels with

the canonical Gospels “are too general to prove literary dependence” (p. 98), although he does admit the plausibility of the influence of Matthew upon the author (p. 100). Paul’s epistles are similarly examined in light of the author’s knowledge of a Pauline corpus (3:15–16), but here again Gilmour finds that there are no demonstrable parallels between 2 Peter and Paul (p. 105). In searching for a *terminus ad quem* for 2 Peter, Gilmour likewise comes to the conclusion that the Apocalypse of Peter has not been demonstrated to be dependent on 2 Peter (p. 115), and the apostolic fathers also appear to be devoid of parallels with the epistle. The relationships between 2 Peter and early Christian literature “are not as obvious as sometimes argued” (p. 121). In a final attempt to locate the text, Gilmour examines the relationship between 2 Peter and the Pastoral Epistles as he jettisons the quest to find parallels and opts rather to locate the book within “a broad, religious milieu” (p. 121). Despite the skepticism demonstrated in the previous chapter, in the final chapter he discovers that 2 Peter shares “the common language, style and themes in the Pastorals” (p. 134).

The strength of Gilmour’s study for anyone researching 2 Peter is his careful work in bringing together the various interpretive strategies which have been employed to locate the letter within the flow of early Christian history. His encyclopedic presentation and careful examination of alleged parallels is a strength that will both aid and caution anyone attempting to ferret out this book’s associations. His negative assessment of the parallels, however, leaves the reader at another interpretive dead-end alley. The final thrust to locate the letter within the same matrix as the Pastorals is somewhat disjointed from the careful work which began the study. The quest for precision in defining parallels gives way to imprecise talk of 2 Peter sharing “various characteristics with the Pastoral Epistles” (p. 134). The foundational work was not laid for this final trajectory, which is juxtaposed against the previous methodology. Why such skepticism previously and easy acceptance at the end? However, the final chapter could become the beginning of a new quest to locate the epistle in Christian history and within the matrix of thought of the wider Mediterranean world.

The question of intertextuality occupies much literary discussion in our era, and some interaction with those debates would have been helpful as this wider topic is germane to Gilmour’s ends. Moreover, the study is carried out with no reference to the wider field of linguistics, especially pragmatics, which discusses the relationship between texts and their contexts. Neither does the study stop to ask the questions about how ancient authors viewed borrowing, this despite the fact that a sharp distinction was made between “imitation” of other authors (*mimēsis*, *imitatio*) and “theft” (*klopē*, *furtum*). Further work remains to define what constitutes an intertextual echo and to understand why and how such echoes occur in the process of the communication of meaning.

Gene L. Green  
Wheaton College, Wheaton, IL

*Jewish Law in Gentile Churches: Halakhah and the Beginning of Christian Public Ethics.* By Markus Bockmuehl. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2003, xvi + 314 pp., \$29.99 paper.

Sooner or later any student of the NT must address the issue of how the Jewish and Gentile sectors of the early church related to each other. One topic that continually confronts scholars is whether or not each branch held to the same ethical code. Markus Bockmuehl of Cambridge University addresses this issue in his book *Jewish Law*. He

invites us to examine a somewhat neglected subject of the dependence (if any) of Gentile Christianity on the Jewish understanding of the Torah. He proposes that the Gentile Christian ethic is indeed related to Jewish *halakhah*, and this understanding became the basis for the early Church apologists' discussion of a "public ethic." *Jewish Law* opens with a preface that offers a summary of each of the nine chapters. The book includes 60 pages of bibliography entries and literature indices.

Part 1 consists of the first four chapters and seeks to demonstrate that the early church did not reject Jewish *halakhah* as reasoned from the Torah. Bockmuehl offers four points for consideration. First, he argues in a general sense that Jesus' teaching did not contravene the Jewish law. He keeps before the reader the point that the moral and ethical heritage of the Jewish tradition is preserved by the Jewish NT writers who write for Gentiles.

Second, Bockmuehl looks at the exception clauses in Matthew's reference to divorce (5:32, 19:9) and argues that such is in keeping with Jewish understanding. That is, it was well accepted in Jewish thinking that sexual union outside of marriage made divorce imperative and thus Jesus' teaching on marriage is consistent with Jewish *halakhah*. Third, Bockmuehl examines the much-debated logion in Matthew, "Let the dead bury the dead" (8:22). Our author suggests Jesus, when extending this call of discipleship, may have had in mind the Nazirite vow of "not touching a dead body." If this theory is true, then Jesus' demand is not unheard of at this time and thus should not be taken to mean a rejection of or even an attack aimed at the Jewish law.

Fourth, Bockmuehl examines the situation in Antioch (Galatians 2) and the motive of James the Just to "intervene" in the state of affairs of Jewish Christians and their table fellowship with Gentile Christians. Our author points out that James does not intervene in order to attack the Gentile mission or impose more restrictions on Gentile behavior than did the apostolic council (Acts 15). Rather, James, who perceives that the city of Antioch is part of the Promised Land, seeks to insure that Jewish Christians remain in position to benefit from Jesus' mission to restore Israel. Overall, then, Part 1 is an attempt to demonstrate that (1) by his actions and teachings Jesus continues the principles of the Torah; and (2) James' involvement in the Antiochian state of affairs was not an attempt to overturn the Gentile mission.

Part 2 (chaps. 5 to 7) is an examination of the concept of "natural law." Bockmuehl's position is that the ethics of Gentile Christians are continuous with the ethics of Jewish Christians. He supports this thesis by arguing that within Second Temple Judaism (from the OT to Josephus) there is an implied expression of God's will both in creation and in the Torah. Furthermore, this expression points to a "universal ethic," thus suggesting that there are laws and ethics in the Torah that are applicable to the Gentile world, whether in terms of custom or innate law. Bockmuehl's point is that there appears to be no natural law separate from God.

Next, our author examines the NT and comes away with the same conclusion that there is no clear teaching that supports a natural law separate from God. To be sure, there are some things customary in society that Christians are to follow: Jesus teaches to pay taxes (Matt 22:21) and Paul urges obedience to the authorities (Romans 13). However, in light of the coming of the new age they also reject some societal paradigms: Jesus rejects accepted family ties (Matt 12:48–50) and Paul downplays the practice of patronage (2 Corinthians 10–13). To close part 2 Bockmuehl underlines the point that second-century (CE) rabbis believed the three prohibitions concerning fornication, bloodshed, and idolatry were ethically applicable to Gentiles who adopted Judaism. In other words Bockmuehl opines that the Noahide commandments (pre-Sinaitic law, Gen 2:16–17) teach that "resident aliens" were expected to follow a minimum moral code, even if the Jewish people held to all of the Torah. This rabbinic position is reminiscent of the letter

in Acts 15 (though Bockmuehl is hard pressed regarding the issue of bloodshed). The point to be made is that the Jewish and Gentile wings of the church have a common ethical ground.

The final two chapters (part 3) analyze the early church apologists' attempt to present a Christian "public ethic." Bockmuehl develops his position in light of the separation of the church from Judaism and the resultant need to defend and present its faith and ethic to the pagan world. He focuses on two apologists, Aristides of Athens and the *Epistle of Diognetus*, both tentatively dated around 150 CE. The former, while mainly echoing the philosophical arguments of other apologists, seeks to widen the discussion of a public ethic for Christians. He emphasizes the theme that the gods of polytheism promote inferior ethics, even in light of the high standards of some pagans. Hence, the superior God (found in both Judaism and Christianity) promotes superior ethics. *Diognetus*, though harsher toward Judaism than Aristides, casts the ethical net wider by employing Stoic and Platonic ideas. As the divine spirit sustains the cosmos, so the historical church sustains the world. Moreover, the main contribution of *Diognetus* is the "principle of Diaspora" or dual citizenship. The edict to "be in the world but not of it" is the basis of living out one's ethic in the name of Christ. As Luke (Acts 17) and 1 Peter (3:15–16) hint at, the best way to show the advantage (and even superiority) of Christianity is both to live out and to articulate "publicly" the ethics of the Messiah of Israel. The concept of "constructive engagement," which may have been implied in the NT, is now made explicit in the first part of the second century CE. Christians are called to love those of the world, the same world they are commanded to resist.

This call to live differently is quite congruent to that of the Jewish mindset, a mindset continued by Jewish Christians, appropriated by Gentile Christians, and ultimately presented to the Gentile world. Thus Bockmuehl concludes that while the new covenant reformulated the requirements of salvation, its moral and ethical intentions remain basically the same (as consistent with the example and teachings of Christ). The Gentile churches both receive Jewish *halakhah* and incorporate it in their Christian ethics.

In conclusion, a reading of Bockmuehl will prove greatly beneficial. He has articulated well the issues and difficulties of examining the important points of the relationship between the ethics in the Jewish and Gentile sectors of the early church. He has done a good job of isolating a common denominator in the ethical realm of both segments and cogently argues that we must always be aware that reinterpretation of Jewish thinking does not automatically imply rejection of that tradition. He is well aware that more study must be done in this area before a hypothesis approaches the status of probable cause, but his articulation of the problem should benefit those grappling with the issue of what is the relationship between Israel and the Church.

For improvement I suggest sharper definitions of terms such as "natural law," "positive law," "universal ethics," and "common sense." Also, the use of phrases such as "makes rather heavy weather of the contrast" (p. 140), "fairly slim pickings" (p. 192), and "no-one nowadays" (p. 232) seem somewhat informal for this formal context. More importantly, the issue that Jesus did not contravene the Law cannot be so easily assumed. There was no direct discussion of Jesus' command, "Do not swear" (Matt 5:33–37) and the suggestion twice (pp. 8, 10) that Christ was ill at ease around or even avoided Gentile company seems to undercut the thesis that the Gentile church should accept the Jewish thinking on ethics. However, any study that undertakes such an important and complex topic as this one is subject to criticism and these suggestions should in no way discourage one from reading this book. This work is clearly a positive addition to the discussion of the topic at hand.

Rich Menninger  
Ottawa University, Ottawa, KS

*Zondervan Bible Study Library: Scholar's Edition 5.0*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2003, \$349.99, CD-ROM.

The release of the scholar's edition of *Zondervan Bible Study Library* marks another milestone in the progress of software publication in biblical studies. Personally, I am amazed at how fast this progress has been since my review of the two early programs in DOS, *Lbase 5.0* (Silver Mountain Software) and *BibleWord* (Hermeneutika) in SBL's "Offline" column (*RSN* VI/1 [1991] 28–29). H. van Dyke Parunak's recent article "Windows Software for Bible Study" (*JETS* 43/3 [2003] 465–95) provides an excellent review of six packages, a witness to this amazing development. Unfortunately the current program was not among those he reviewed, apparently appearing too late to be included.

In both quantity and quality, the program is packed with resources for Bible study. It claims to be the only completely NIV-based reference system. Besides NIV, eight other Bible translations are included, among them NASB (Updated), NLT, and NRSV. The only apocryphal books contained in the library are in the KJV. Texts in the original languages include the Hebrew OT (BHS) and the Greek NT (UBS4), and both are morphologically tagged. The LXX is not available.

What clearly makes this package valuable is the number of its reference works. The accompanying brochure lists over 100 titles, inadvertently omitting the *Analytical Lexicon to the Hebrew OT* seen in the program. Besides a few older works such as Calvin's *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, many titles come from Zondervan's recent publications. The collection consists of (among others) the *NIV Study Bible*, *NIV Thematic Reference Bible*, *Zondervan NIV Nave's Topical Bible*, *Zondervan Quick Reference Series*, as well as various introductions to the OT and NT.

Perhaps the most significant works belong to the categories of dictionaries and encyclopedias, biblical languages, and commentaries. It is here that I find the program's greatest value, a value that may not be easily matched by its competitors, which often require their better resources to be "unlocked" at extra cost. Among the dictionaries the user will find the *New International Dictionary of the Christian Church*, *New International Dictionary of Biblical Archaeology*, *New International Bible Dictionary*, and *Dictionary of Cults, Sects, Religions and the Occult*. The encyclopedias include the *New International Encyclopedia of Bible Words*, *New International Encyclopedia of Bible Difficulties*, and the *Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible* (5 volumes).

Works on Hebrew and Greek include several analytical lexicons. Material for Hebrew in the package is limited, but Greek tools are quite numerous: *New Testament Greek Morpheme Lexicon*, *Basics of Biblical Greek Grammar*, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, *Morphology of Biblical Greek*, *Biblical Greek Exegesis*, and *New Linguistic and Exegetical Key to the Greek New Testament*. As for commentaries, there are older works by Godet, Lightfoot, Westcott, Hort, and Eadie, as well as the more recent *New International Bible Commentary* and *Zondervan NIV Bible Commentary*. The last title is an abridgment of the respected 12-volume *Expositor's Bible Commentary*.

The program's screen (interface) follows a control panel layout in four small windows (panes), with the upper left window for Bible translations. On top of each of the four panes are the titles of the selected books. The interface is similar to that of BibleWorks but different from the flexible desktop layout of BibleWindows and Logos Bible Software. Preference of one layout over the other is ultimately a matter of personal taste. The online Help manual is sufficiently clear and detailed. Zondervan provides on its website an "Interactive Demonstration" showing visually its useful functions.

The speed and spontaneity of the link feature is a strength of this program. Many books are linked to scroll together by default. For example, when users move to Genesis 6 in the NIV translation, they will notice that other Bible translations, the Hebrew Bible, the Hebrew-English lexicons, Hebrew morphology and translation tables, and

the commentaries all have scrolled to the section related to this passage. Even the *New International Encyclopedia of Bible Difficulties* is now at the location of explaining the meaning of “the sons of God.”

The Hebrew and Greek analytical tools offer instant helps. Right clicking on a Hebrew or Greek word on the original texts reveals its morphological and translation information. One of these tools, *NIV to BHS/UBS4 Translation*, presents all the words of the NIV alongside their corresponding Hebrew or Greek words, noting “not in Hebrew (or Greek)” if a word in NIV does not directly correspond to an original word. The speed of this instant linking becomes most evident when the user reviews the different verses resulting from a search.

The program’s search ability, a major reason for using a Bible program, is impressive. Besides the standard search functions English Bible programs commonly feature, the program assists less advanced users to do complicated searches through its Search Assistant dialog box. Instead of entering the search parameters as most programs require, the user can compose with ease by simply filling in one or more of the five blank spaces, each being introduced with an explanation, e.g. “Include ALL of these words” (“AND” equivalent), “Do NOT include ANY of these words” (“NOT” equivalent).

By default the program will search only the book in the active window. To search all books, the user must check “Open All Books” in the “Advance” section of the search dialog box. After the search, the user can simply move the cursor across each title of the books. Books containing matches will have the searched word or phrase indicated on it. For example, a search on “everlasting covenant” shows that besides all Bibles (including BHS, but not UBS4) and commentaries, several dictionaries also reported matches for the phrase, including the 10 matches in the *Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible*.

For those possessing only a working knowledge of the biblical languages, the linking of NIV to the original Hebrew and Greek in a search is a useful feature. This cross-language search allows the user to find a word in one language and see instantly its equivalent in the other. Searching “covenant” in NIV shows 271 matches with the word highlighted. Switching to BHS will reveal the same OT passages, with the word ברית highlighted. Scrolling the list in NIV to the NT section and then turning to UBS4, the user will see the same NT passages with διαθήκη highlighted. In cases where NIV uses the same word to translate different Hebrew or Greek words, it will be quickly noticeable in the corresponding lists. A search with the word “love” in NIV will show in BHS (e.g. Deuteronomy) not only חסד but also אהב, and in UBS4 (e.g. Matthew) not only ἀγαπάω but also φιλέω. Because of the difference in word order between English and Hebrew or Greek, cross-language searches are accurate only with single word searches.

Direct searches on the Hebrew text in this program, however, is problematic and at times confusing. Simply highlighting a Hebrew word in the BHS window to do a Quick Search will not work properly, though it works well with the English Bibles. This is because the program also records the Hebrew accents. Highlighting ברית (with vowels and accents) in Gen 9:16 to do a Quick Search will produce only 36 matches, but typing ברית (without vowels, but strangely requiring dagesh) into the search dialog box results in 269 matches. Fortunately Quick Search and the dialog box search in Greek are more consistent.

The Hebrew Keyboard Layout and the Hebrew Transliteration chart for typing Hebrew in a word search as shown in “Help” are not completely identical. For “),” the former uses “a” while the latter uses “),” and for “(,” “[” versus “(.” In reality the program follows the former. Discrepancies also exist among some vowels (notably ׀ and ׀). The program does not support grammatical searches in the Hebrew and Greek texts. Users who need these types of searches may have to turn to BibleWindows, BibleWorks or the

Logos Library System. As a scholar's edition, another weakness of this program is the lack of the LXX.

The stated weaknesses, however, are minor compared to what the program has offered. This scholar's edition is one of the best programs available today, not only because of the quality resources it contains but also the powerful interface it supports. Seminary students, pastors, and scholars whose primary task is not working with the original languages will find this package an invaluable addition. Even scholars whose research deals extensively with the original languages may find it a useful supplement to the programs that provide grammatical searches and other ancient texts.

Alex Luc

Columbia Biblical Seminary and School of Missions, Columbia, SC

*Tolkien and C. S. Lewis: The Gift of Friendship.* By Colin Duriez. Mahwah: Hidden-Spring, 2003, xii + 244 pp., \$15.00 paper. *The Inklings Handbook: A Comprehensive Guide to the Lives, Thought and Writings of C. S. Lewis, J. R. R. Tolkien, Charles Williams, Owen Barfield and Their Friends.* By Colin Duriez and David Porter. St. Louis: Chalice, 2001, xi + 244 pp., \$32.99.

J. R. R. Tolkien's masterpiece of the battle for Middle-earth has recently recaptured a new generation of Christian and non-Christian fans worldwide through a massive film trilogy. One of C. S. Lewis's most popular volumes from his imaginative Narnia series is forthcoming as a major film. The enduring popularity of these authors makes a biography of their friendship valuable for understanding the work they produced and their two visions of Christian proclamation in the postmodern world. Colin Duriez's biography, *Tolkien and C. S. Lewis*, and *The Inklings Handbook* are excellent resources to acquaint the newly interested reader of their work. These books will also deepen and extend the understanding of a devoted reader who delights to re-read the various imaginative and provocative writings of both authors ten times or more.

Duriez's biography is a unique contribution for its attention to the two men's lives together. The significance of both Lewis and Tolkien shows in the dozens of biographies and monographs that detail their life and work. But there has been a need for a study of the well-known friendship between them that enriched each man with the courage and inspiration to write Christian mythology and apologetics that continue to benefit so many others. While other books, such as Humphrey Carpenter's *Inklings*, have recounted the unusual marvel of the select reading group known as the Inklings, Duriez shows the special importance of Tolkien and Lewis for each other, and the many ways that the writing and thinking of each man influenced or empowered the other by a fruitful overlap of their lives.

To accomplish his focused study, Duriez spends the bulk of the book on the decade of years when Lewis and Tolkien were closest and most collaborative. Along the way, he develops the important differences and affinities between Lewis and Tolkien, by the end demonstrating his conclusion that the affinities were obviously what made the men great allies in their defense of a distinctly Christian worldview. Among the themes Duriez uncovers that are common to the vision of each man are an opposition to the modern age (in which mechanization is the new magic of possession and power), a delight in imagination as the human portal to meaning (for Tolkien, accessed through words; for Lewis, through mental pictures), and an embrace of historic Christianity (Roman Catholicism for Tolkien, the Anglican Communion of his childhood for Lewis).

This last affinity of a common devotion to Christ came only in 1929 when Tolkien's explanations were a contributory cause in Lewis's conversion to Christ.

The dual biography is organized chronologically, with chapters for each major stage in the friendship, and a prologue and epilogue that briefly but adequately tell the men's separate stories before and after the years when their friendship was closest. The chapters show Duriez's focus is the decade of 1929–1939. Four chapters unfold the events of those years; a fifth chapter explores the intellectual context for their friendship with discussion of their academic writing in the climate of the 1930s. Further chapters show the influence of Charles Williams and other Inklings members on the friendship (1939–1949). Next, Duriez recounts the full flowering of their productivity in the years 1949–1954, during which time both *The Lord of the Rings* and *The Chronicles of Narnia* were published. An appendix helpfully details a chronology that summarizes important events of both Tolkien and Lewis, including their publications. A second appendix explains the enduring popularity of each author for contemporary readers, giving at least three reasons for why each writer is so well-liked today. An extensive bibliography and a detailed index make the book useful as a reference for further study of either Tolkien or Lewis.

Throughout the book, Duriez includes quotations from letters and publications, usually providing the sources according to chapter and page number in the endnotes (though some seem to have been forgotten). The absence of notation for these quotes shows that the intended audience is not academic. A particularly interesting use of sources is the way Duriez reconstructs a brief vignette as the setting for each chapter. These narrative re-enactments of typical scenes introduce each chapter to draw the reader directly into the smoky pub or college meeting room, giving vivid description and frequently first-person perspective of either Lewis or Tolkien, making them present to the reader. These vignettes are creative and rich, adding little new information but imaginatively re-casting what is known realistically about these men, bringing them back to life for the reader who delights to encounter the men who shared the gifts of their imagination.

Also included throughout the book are Duriez's helpful summaries of important books by Lewis and Tolkien. These summaries are set in context of their composition, within the life and thought setting of the authors; these become mutually illuminating. Furthermore, Duriez offers frequent hints so that readers will get the most out of the books and enjoy what Lewis and Tolkien intended by imaginative myth-making. Important concepts such as joy, myth, Old West, and imagination show up with an appropriate amount of explanation. Theologians will be interested in Tolkien's view of the Gospels as God's story written as myth in the actual materials of human history. This is a key idea of Tolkien's correlation between God's storytelling and the human imagination that mimics God by mythopoeia (myth-making)—what Tolkien called being a sub-creator. Duriez's telling of the life and work in dual biography digests the available details that are told in several biographies and literary analyses elsewhere; thus, his work has less new data and is more a new way of framing the details in a common story of the Tolkien-Lewis friendship.

The overall theme of the book is the way Lewis and Tolkien functioned for the other in their mutual friendship, as reflected in their writings. This theme is the main strength of the book, because Duriez shows the relation of their work to their lives, not simply to the chronological events, but as related to their development as thinkers. By this means, Duriez shows how to see their lives in light of the stories and how to understand the stories in light of their intellectual growth.

Some readers may want to know more details about the other lives that join with Lewis and Tolkien along the way. Duriez devotes only brief space to Charles Williams, Joy Davidman, and Owen Barfield, among others. The decision to limit these other stories keeps the focus on the friendship between the two primary figures; besides, the

interested reader can readily turn to the bibliography for other works that tell these other stories more fully. Some readers may also find Duriez's telling of the disagreements between Lewis and Tolkien to be overly brief. This is particularly the case concerning Lewis's fascination with Charles Williams (compared to Tolkien's disapproval of Williams's dark discussions of the occult in his writings), and Tolkien's disdain for Lewis's work as an amateur theologian. Duriez mentions these and other disagreements with illustrations from letters, but the emphasis of the book is best served in the way Duriez devotes himself to telling the affinities between the men more than their disputes.

As Duriez tells the story of Lewis and Tolkien in relation to each other, the length of the book is comfortable and the picture of each man's significance to the other is clear: Tolkien influenced Lewis into his turn to Christ and then towards an allusive communication of Christian reality through mythopoeia, and Lewis supported his friend with encouragement and praise that empowered Tolkien to follow through on writing *The Lord of the Rings*. Though not intended as such, the biography is a guide to their writing and an introduction to what they were trying to do and why from a Christian theological perspective.

*The Inklings Handbook*, co-authored by Duriez and David Porter, is a resource for readers of books by Inklings members. As the authors explain: "Our Handbook tries to capture the elusive complexity of these friendships and these individuals who made up the Inklings as an entity" (p. viii). The primary emphasis is on the work of Lewis, Tolkien, and Charles Williams, because these were the most prolific of the Inklings. The main value of the book is to provide background for the works in relation to the influences on the authors from literature, friendships, historical events, philosophy, and theology.

The handbook has two parts. Part one is a series of five essays on important topics and a detailed chronology that integrates major events and publications of the Inklings as reconstructed from correspondence and diaries. This chronology is similar to that given as an appendix in *Tolkien and C. S. Lewis*, but there are additional details specific to Inklings meetings and other events excerpted from Warnie Lewis's journal entries and letters of C. S. Lewis and Williams. Titles of the essays in part one are "The Life and Times of the Inklings," "The Making of Narnia," "J. R. R. Tolkien's Middle-earth," "Arthur, Logres, and the Empire," and "Theology and Fantasy in the Inklings." Each of these is brief and informative, addressing some of the largest themes in the work of Lewis, Tolkien, and Williams. While Humphrey Carpenter's book on the Inklings tells the story of the group as the central members walked through life together, the handbook brings the reader more quickly into the Inklings' thought world through the thematic essays and articles.

Part two (four times the size of the first part) is an encyclopedia of articles arranged alphabetically for easy reference. Some are as brief as a few lines, and others are moderate length of a few pages. Two bibliographies are included. The first is a listing of each author's major writings, followed by posthumous writings and collections. The second is a bibliography of secondary sources about the writers; while this overlaps significantly with Duriez's six pages of bibliography in *The Gift of Friendship*, it contains at least a page more of sources. Together with the suggestions for further reading that accompany many articles, the bibliographies will be useful for scholars who want a starting place for research, as well as for more casual fans who are interested in finding other works that are lesser known than *Mere Christianity*.

Among the articles are summaries of the Inklings' published works and helpful explanations of important concepts—for example, evil, scientism, Old West, death, allegory—in their writings. Many articles are relevant biographical sketches of the Inklings' friends and literary influences, such as George MacDonald and Samuel Taylor Coleridge, and some who resemble one or another of the Inklings, such as Susan Howatch

(as compared with Charles Williams). Many entries are for lesser known people who were Inklings at one time or another, showing the diversity of the group. While there are many handbooks available on Lewis and Tolkien, *The Inklings Handbook* makes an excellent contribution by introducing the reader to Williams's many writings and providing book summaries and explanations of important themes. (Most of the past studies on Williams seem to be out of print.)

Both the biography by Duriez and the Inklings handbook will be most helpful for non-specialist readers who enjoy Tolkien, Lewis, and the Inklings but who lack the time to study the more serious and narrowly focused academic analyses.

John E. McKinley

The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, KY

*Jonathan Edwards: A Life.* By George Marsden. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003, xx + 640 pp., \$35.00.

Two thousand three marked not only the tercentennial of the birth of Jonathan Edwards, but also a landmark year for Edwards studies. A number of local, regional, and national conferences convened; scores of essays were published—including *Journal of Religious Ethics* and *Reformation and Revival Journal* devoting entire issues to Edwards; and a number of important books on Edwards rolled off the presses—not the least of which was George Marsden's much-anticipated biography of one of America's most celebrated Christians. The first full-length scholarly biography of Edwards in roughly half a century, Marsden's *Jonathan Edwards* joins the work of Ola Winslow, *Jonathan Edwards, 1703–1758* (1940); Perry Miller, *Jonathan Edwards* (1949); Patricia Tracy, *Jonathan Edwards, Pastor: Religion and Society in Eighteenth-Century Northampton* (1980); Iain Murray, *Jonathan Edwards: A New Biography* (1987); and Kenneth Pieter Minkema, "The Edwardses: A Ministerial Family in Eighteenth-Century New England" (1988). While each of the previous biographical studies captured important facets of Edwards's life and times, Marsden had the fortune not only to draw from a deep and rich Edwardsian historiography, but he also enjoyed ready access to Edwards's vast corpus, made increasingly available by Yale University Press's *The Works of Jonathan Edwards*. Thus Marsden rightly dedicates his book to the "generation of scholars" (p. xviii) who preceded him. The result is a comprehensive portrait of Edwards, rich in detail and lucid in prose.

To observers of American religious history, the story of Jonathan Edwards is a familiar one. The progeny of sturdy New England ministerial stock, Edwards's father (Timothy Edwards) and grandfather (Solomon Stoddard) possessed reputations as able and accomplished preachers. After graduation from Yale, Edwards served as a tutor and then pastored congregations in New York City and in Connecticut before taking the ministerial reigns of Stoddard's Northampton church upon his grandfather's death in 1729. Here Edwards labored under the long and daunting shadow of his grandfather until 1750. It was also in Northampton that Edwards oversaw several periods of revival and eventually became an authoritative voice, not only among colonial revivalists, but also among transatlantic (and "international") Protestants. Edwards was known both from his large network of correspondents and through his voluminous writing ministry. In addition to *A Treatise Concerning Religious Affections*, Edwards's attempt to explore the tension between reason and emotion, he also published works on the extent of sin, on the importance of ethics and virtue, on the dynamics of the human will, and on the nature of exemplary mission work. Edwards also kept various notebooks, recording his

theological observations and attempting to draw summaries between the Old and New Testaments, among other subjects.

On top of a rigorous writing schedule, Edwards was a busy parish minister, tending to the needs of a provincial congregation and laboring to compose sermons on a weekly basis. Unfortunately for Edwards, his exhaustive ministerial labor ended in dismissal. Following the expulsion, Edwards spent the closing years of his life as a missionary in western Massachusetts and served for six months as the president of Princeton (at the time the College of New Jersey) before succumbing to a smallpox inoculation. Edwards led an active, busy, and overall productive life, and Marsden perceptively navigates and negotiates the complexities of Edwards's pastoral and provincial milieu. While Marsden deftly examines the theology of Edwards, he also opens up to readers the unique and conflicted personal dimensions of this towering intellect.

Marsden vividly portrays the world in which Edwards was raised. Edwards grew up in a "world of women" (p. 18) and the company of his immediate family (ten sisters) seemingly set the intellectual bar quite high as all but one sister received a formal education. Edwards's mother, Esther Stoddard Edwards, possessed a keen intellect as well, leading Bible studies in East Windsor, Connecticut well into her nineties. Edwards's father Timothy, in addition to his pastoral dynamism, was an exacting perfectionist and possessed a disciplinary pathos. He levied loving but exacting rules and statutes by which his family was to operate. In addition, students entering Yale who sat under Timothy Edwards's tutelage were routinely exempted from entrance exams. The extent of Timothy's preparatory exercises was exhaustive; it should come as no surprise, then, that Jonathan knew Latin, Greek, and Hebrew by the age of ten. If Edwards's immediate family was one of learning and discipline, several of his relatives deserved lesser titles. Interestingly, Marsden notes that Timothy's mother was a quarrelsome wife, an adulteress, and a victim of "psychosis"; Edward's great-aunt killed her own child; and a great-uncle committed murder. Marsden also reminds readers that as Edwards was part of the Stoddard-Williams clan of the Connecticut Valley, his reflection on the inner workings of the human heart were also shaped by several tenuous personal and professional conflicts with members of these families (and other kin) during his lifetime. "Jonathan Edwards is sometimes criticized for having too dim a view of human nature," Marsden candidly observes, "but it may be helpful to be reminded that his grandmother was an incorrigible profligate, his great-aunt committed infanticide, and his great-uncle was an ax-murderer" (p. 22).

Above all, Edwards was a minister, and Marsden helpfully places Edwards in this context. Edwards's intense piety, coupled with a prodigious intellectual aptitude and a perfectionist tendency, worked in tandem to produce a staggering vocational industriousness. It was not uncommon for Edwards to labor for thirteen hours a day or more, his schedule punctuated by prayer, Scripture reading, Bible study, and sermon composition. Here one is reminded of Edwards's early resolution to never "lose one moment of time; but improve it the most profitable way I possibly can." Edwards also resolved, "when I think of any theorem in divinity to be solved, immediately to do what I can towards solving it, if circumstances don't hinder." The workshops in which Edwards's "theorem[s] in divinity" were forged are found in places like his "Notes on Scripture," in his vast collection of miscellaneous theological observations, and in his commentary on the Bible. Though a pastor, Edwards was also clearly a scholar of considerable repute. For Edwards, the publication of books and the composition of sermons (among other activities) were rooted in a passionate devotion to God. As Marsden colorfully comments, Edwards's "discipline was part of a constant, heroic effort to make his life a type of Christ" (p. 133).

Finally, Marsden displays stupendous insight as he ably narrates the closing years of Edwards's life, from his dismissal from Northampton to his wrangling over whether

or not to assume the life of a college president. Edwards was dismissed from Northampton because he reversed an inclusive church admission policy set by his grandfather and adopted and upheld for many years by Edwards himself. The decade before Edwards's expulsion (1740–1750) began with what Edwards saw as the outpouring of God's Spirit, but things eventually soured between pastor and people. In addition to salary squabbles, among other reasons, several combative cases of church discipline produced a contentious party spirit. In the end, Edwards's principled doctrinal convictions cost him his job. The pastor's fateful stand against his congregation, Marsden glowingly proclaims, reveals important character traits. Edwards was consistently principled and unfailingly logical; moreover, he possessed "reverence for Scripture" (p. 349). On the other hand, Marsden importantly points out, Edwards had some "tragic flaws" (p. 370) that crippled his Northampton ministry. His perfectionist tendencies were unsettling to many, his "brittle, unsociable personality" (p. 349) made large-scale controversies prohibitively difficult, and his "authoritarian assumptions" (p. 370) about societal and ecclesiastical order were unfashionable in mid-eighteenth-century New England. "Perhaps the greatest tragedy for Edwards," Marsden respectfully concludes, "was that his pastorate was undone by his commitment to principle" (p. 370). Though Marsden clearly admires the moral courage of Edwards, he does not shy away from rounded criticism.

Following his expulsion, Edwards preached to the Stockbridge Indians of western Massachusetts. Through Edwards's vigorous correspondence, Marsden again highlights Edwards's ministerial context, but in an entirely new setting. While Edwards was not free from the standard eighteenth-century hierarchical, authoritarian, and prejudicial bent towards the natives, according to Marsden his Indian sermons carried the same edge and delivered the same spiritual punch as they once did in Northampton. Marsden points out that Edwards never described any large-scale revival among the natives, though he believed that Indians possessed considerable spiritual potential. Edwards arrived at this conclusion from his reflection on and study of world religions and from his painful experiences with the spiritually apathetic and devotionally lethargic parishioners in Northampton and elsewhere. Economic incentives and focused self-interest, among other things, trumped spiritual considerations no matter what race or nation, and Edwards was intent on reversing such trends. Consider this short section from a 1751 sermon to the Mohawks: "The Christian religion teaches kindness and love to all mankind. And therefore the white people have not behaved like Christians, that they have not shown more love to your souls. . . . And many of the English and Dutch are against your being instructed. They choose to keep you in the dark for the sake of making a gain of you. . . . But you have been neglected long enough. 'Tis now high time that some more effectual care should be taken that you may be really brought into the clear light, and know as much as the English do" ("To the Mohawks at the Treaty, August 16, 1751," in *The Sermons of Jonathan Edwards: A Reader*, eds. Wilson H. Kimnach, Kenneth P. Minkema, and Douglas A. Sweeny [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999] 105–10). Marsden carefully explores and fruitfully illuminates Edwards's post-Northampton ministry, a topic that has generated considerable interest as of late. Readers may wish to consult Marsden's "Jonathan Edwards, the Missionary" (*Journal of Presbyterian History* 81 [Spring 2003] 5–17) along with the recent work of younger Edwards scholars Stephen J. Nichols ("Last of the Mohican Missionaries: Jonathan Edwards at Stockbridge," in *The Legacy of Jonathan Edwards: American Religion and the Evangelical Tradition*, eds. D. G. Hart, Sean Michael Lucas, and Stephen J. Nichols [Grand Rapids: Baker, 2003]) and Rachel Wheeler ("Friends to Your Souls": Jonathan Edwards' Indian Pastorate and the Doctrine of Original Sin," *Church History* 72/4 [December 2003] 736–65).

Edwards also took a keen interest in the education of native children, often relating Bible stories to them, supporting the education of both boys and girls, teaching them

to sing, and even advocating that native children live with British families for a time. On this point, Edwards practiced what he preached. Thus, as Marsden clearly portrays, Edwards continued to minister, but in a new setting and according to renewed principles. "The Edwards who emerged at Stockbridge," Marsden attentively concludes, "after passing through the fires of Northampton, while hardly without his flaws, was truly an extraordinary figure" (p. 389).

So, with all that has been written about Edwards in the last fifty years or so, not to mention the tremendous volume of work even three years into a new millennium, where does Marsden's picture of Edwards leave us? Marsden advances our knowledge in several areas. He effectively presents both the personal and intellectual dimensions of Edwards's life and sets him firmly within an eighteenth-century, British North American context. This follows emerging scholarly trends as historians are discovering the ever-widening context of the British Atlantic. Though Edwards lived on the geographical margins of the provincial British Empire, he was a full participant—intellectually, materially, and spiritually—in Atlantic and even Continental orbits. Edwards was intensely engaged with biblical interpretation and world religions and concerned to bring critical Christian reflection to these topics according to Enlightenment principles. Thus, Marsden's portrait complements the recent work of Michael J. McClymond (*Encounters with God: An Approach to the Theology of Jonathan Edwards* [Oxford University Press, 1998]), Gerald R. McDermott (*Jonathan Edwards Confronts the Gods: Christian Theology, Enlightenment Religion and Non-Christian Faiths* [Oxford University Press, 2000]), Robert E. Brown (*Jonathan Edwards and the Bible* [Indiana University Press, 2002]), and Avihu Zakai (*Jonathan Edwards's Philosophy of History: The Reenchantment of the World in an Age of Enlightenment* [Princeton University Press, 2003]).

Conscious of other scholarly trends, Marsden attempts to "bridge the gap between the Edwards of the students of American culture and the Edwards of the theologians" (p. 502). By background, conviction, and academic training, Marsden straddles these two worlds and is eminently qualified to negotiate the middle ground between history and theology. Readers should know that Marsden's interest in Edwards stems from "admiration" for parts of Edwards's Calvinistic theology; furthermore, Marsden is "committed to a Christian faith in a tradition that is a branch of the same Augustinian and Reformed tree" (p. 6). These facts do not detract from Marsden's picture of Edwards; they instead help readers to understand better the theological universe of which Edwards was a part. All of this makes biography an incredibly daunting task, yet the result is a thorough and profound historical narrative with a conscious look at the important theological questions and issues with which Edwards wrestled. On this point readers may wish to consult Marsden's essay "The Quest for the Historical Edwards: The Challenge of Biography" (in *Jonathan Edwards at Home and Abroad: Historical Memories, Cultural Movements, Global Horizons* [University of South Carolina Press, 2003]).

In the end, Marsden suggests what might be appropriated from Edwards and fleshes out his compellingly mysterious theological vision, knowing that not all readers will venture in such a direction. According to Marsden, Edwards challenges modern assumptions that the visible, material world is the "real" world (p. 503). Similarly, Marsden points out, Edwards prompts one to understand life events not only as the effects of social and material causes, but also as moments on the wide and colorful canvas of God's world—a place where "God [is] the active creator and sustainer of an inconceivably immense universe" (p. 504). Above all, Marsden concludes, Edwards's life asked how, in a world ruled and created by such a perfect divine Being, "inferior" humans could meaningfully communicate with a loving (though sometimes "angry") God. Edwards's detailed answer to this question—found in Marsden's book and by reading Edwards himself—is, according to Marsden, "breathtaking" (p. 505). Thus, "Edwards, despite some evident shortcomings, was a saint according to the highest Reformed spiritual standards to which

he aspired" (p. 495). All told, Marsden's *Jonathan Edwards: A Life* is neither blindly hagiographical nor dismissively critical, but discriminately balanced—and well worth the read.

Phillip Luke Sinitiere  
University of Houston, Houston, TX

*At the Beginning of Life: Dilemmas in Theological Bioethics.* By Edwin C. Hui. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2002, 416 pp., \$25.00.

Edwin C. Hui is professor of biomedical ethics and Christianity and Chinese Culture at Regent College, Vancouver. With both the M.D. and a Ph.D., he joins his medical expertise and theological training to produce *At the Beginning of Life: Dilemmas in Theological Bioethics*. The book is divided into three parts. In part one, Hui lays the theological groundwork for his approach to "personhood." In the second part, he uses an ethic of personhood as an evaluative instrument to examine assisted reproductive technologies. In part three, he examines abortion and personhood.

The author's goal is to develop an "ethic of personhood" that can guide moral reflection on various bioethical dilemmas. Central to his concept of personhood is the "relational" view of the *imago Dei*, particularly as developed by Barth. Hui rejects "developmental" personhood arguments: "Any arbitrary delineation of developmental stages or assignment of moral significance to a particular stage fails to do justice to the whole developmental continuum wherein the whole conceptus is maturing from the moment of fertilization as an individual human life" (p. 223). Instead, pre-born humans should be considered significantly valuable because God has chosen to relate to them: "It is on the basis of the *imago Dei* expressed in this divine-human covenantal relationship that all human beings possess equal dignity and worth regardless of the level of maturity they have achieved" (p. 148). Hui adds: "What is essential to human personhood is this God-creature relationship, intentionally and unilaterally established by God" (p. 160).

Hui comes closest to defining what he means by an "ethic of personhood" when he criticizes human cloning: "The ethic of personhood I advocate maintains that each human being has an inherent dignity as a creature of God, who has dignified each human being with an unprecedented and unpredetermined genome through his providential combination of one's parents' genetic material, and secondly in one's freedom to respond and relate to God and ultimately to participate in the life of God through the Son, Jesus Christ" (p. 245). That Hui makes this statement in the section on cloning leads to one frustration I have with this work: Hui develops this view throughout the book but does not give one controlling definition for what he means by an "ethic of personhood." While he summarizes his view of *personhood* on page 160, I would like to see Hui go one step further and give a firm definition for an "ethic of personhood" prior to addressing particular biomedical issues.

Apparently, Hui favors some form of ideal absolutism as a mode of moral reasoning. Referring to abortions to save a mother in imminent danger of death, he opines: "The loss of fetal life is unquestionably a (lesser) evil, and the action taken, though necessary, needs to be repented of" (p. 291). With this in mind, he also asserts that if a woman chooses to abort in the case of a rape-induced pregnancy, then she "has chosen abortion as the lesser of two evils" (p. 334). In a similar way, Hui also affirms that a limited number of severe fetal deformities (Tay-Sachs, Trisomy 13, and Trisomy 18) may lead parents to abort. In such cases, "the response to this tragic situation should be decided by the

parents before their God, whether they accept or reject the tragic life they have conceived, the life presumably allowed by God" (p. 352).

One specific point in Hui's analysis deserves further thought and reflection by evangelicals. While Hui takes a dim view of human cloning, he clearly articulates the link between cloning, stem cell research, and the many medical possibilities related to the therapeutic use of stem cells. Hui rejects the use of stem cells from elective abortions. He does affirm the use of stem cells from naturally miscarried fetuses, umbilical cord blood, and other sources from adults and children, options already advocated by many evangelicals. Hui goes further and creatively suggests that scientists "search for cellular mechanisms that help multipotent stem cells to switch to pluripotent stem cells" (p. 253) and investigate ways to stop the cloning process at the pluripotent stem cell level. Both of these suggestions are speculative, but if successful, they would provide a source of stem cells untainted by the destruction of pre-born humans.

Hui's work reflects a deep respect for pre-born human life. For example, he argues for the personhood of anencephalic babies (p. 366). That said, this work does raise some significant questions. Though Barth's relational view of the *imago* has been widely influential, is this view foundational for the doctrine of the *imago Dei*, or should we begin with the substantive view of the *imago*? Concerning Hui's allowances for abortion in a rare number of cases (rape-induced pregnancies and three specific genetic cases), perhaps his argument would be more persuasive if he addressed concerns about "slippery slope" arguments more thoroughly. One senses that his goal is not to condemn women or couples in some very difficult circumstances. Yet, all abortions seem to flow from some difficult life situation. Though Hui cautiously suggests a very narrow range of abortions left open to Christians, the inevitable question is, "If it is allowable for these cases, then why not others?"

I also believe Hui has understated the radical nature of the *Roe v. Wade* decision. He says the Supreme Court in *Roe* declared that abortion was "not an absolute right and must be subject to limitations imposed by the state's interest to protect maternal health, uphold medical standards and protect prenatal life at some crucial point of fetal development" (p. 298). What Hui misses is that *Doe v. Bolton* defined "mother's health" in the broadest possible context, rendering any limitation on abortion virtually impossible. The two cases must be examined together, yet Hui does not mention *Doe*. In a similar way, I believe Hui misses the radical nature of pro-euthanasia advocates when he says "no one" wants to claim that acutely ill adults have a diminished right to life (p. 316). What about the Ninth Circuit Court in *Compassion in Dying*? Greater still, what about Holland and Oregon? Hui may be making a distinction between "acutely" ill and "terminally" ill. If this is the case, it is not clear that he is doing so. The fact is that advocates of medicalized killing are broadening the categories of sick adults who may be candidates for euthanasia.

Edwin Hui's work is a detailed application of an ethic of personhood to the hotly debated issues surrounding pre-born humans. Weaknesses noted, the work is valuable for its breadth of content and irenic tone.

J. Alan Branch  
Mid-America Baptist Theological Seminary