

BOOK REVIEWS

Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments: Theological Reflection on the Christian Bible. By Brevard S. Childs. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1993, 768 pp., \$40.00.

This work constitutes not only the *magnum opus* of Brevard Childs, esteemed Professor of Old Testament and Sterling Professor of Divinity at Yale University, but also the capstone to years of wrestling and refinement regarding the method, nature and content of Biblical theology. Childs has long been an advocate of the “canonical” approach to the Scriptures—that is, that in affirming two testaments (parts) of one Bible he is affirming not only a hermeneutical activity but that the reception of the multi-leveled compositions/traditions (books) of Scripture within a faith community is the reception of a norm whose authority and meaning lies in the literature itself as a whole—of course in relation to God, its object, to which it “bears witness.” By such an approach, Childs is endeavoring to lead modern Biblical studies into a new and more fruitful way of reflection on the contextual elements of Scripture in relation to and within the whole (canon), thus renewing Biblical theology as a discipline. He also intends to build more effective avenues of relation to the systematic/dogmatic theological disciplines, with which he is clearly much concerned—especially within the Reformed lineage from Calvin to Barth. Like Calvin and Barth, Childs sees in theological reflection on the “witness of scripture” a further tool in illuminating Scripture.

While this volume is “officially” structured in seven interrelated parts, the book actually unfolds in four parts, each part critical in either method or content to what follows. The first two major sections, “Prolegomena” and “A Search for a New Approach,” together form the “why?” of Childs’ canonical approach to Biblical theology. He overviews Biblical theology since Gabler, along with appreciative analyses of earlier Christian approaches since Irenaeus. This sets the stage for Childs’ canonical approach to the two parts of Christian Scripture as “witness” to the subject matter (i.e. God). Here the surprising but interesting influence of Barth is evident in his approach. “The Discrete Witness of the OT,” the second section of this tome, takes the argument sequentially (diachronically) through the prominent “traditions” (e.g. creation, patriarchal, Mosaic, monarchical, prophetic, apocalyptic, etc.) to uncover in each the critical “consensus” on development and shapings that occurred within and between them, while uncovering through these layers (understood as they now stand in their canonical context) the “trajectories” that are critical to the larger Biblical-theological enterprise. Likewise, in “The Discrete Witness of the NT,” Childs probes historical-critical problems related to the various leading “traditions” (e.g. Church’s earliest proclamation, Pauline gospel, four gospels, post-Pauline age, etc.), and thereby, again, the leading theological “trajectories.” It is in this third section where Childs really comes into his own Biblical-theologically, with Paul’s “theology” being apparently of central interest. The last and longest major section and, indeed, the heart of the work is “Theological Reflection on the Christian Bible.” Herein Childs unfolds what at first glance may seem to be semitraditional theological *loci*, but this assessment would be a mistake. Chapter by chapter he presents the Biblical-theological fruit of his canon criticism, which, it seems to this reviewer, is much (and rightly so) informed by the

Heilsgeschichte approach, as well as the theo-logical, Christocentric thinking of Karl Barth. He begins with the "Identity of God." This is not in the way of Pannenberg but out of the revelatory-encounter/experience nexus, i.e. God and historical peoples, Israel and the Church, in the world. He concludes with "God's Kingdom and Rule" and "The Shape of the Obedient Life: Ethics."

In response, it may be said initially of this remarkable book that it starts slowly but soon picks up much speed. Despite clear acknowledgment of most normative post-Enlightenment historical-critical methods and their conclusions about origins, dating, redactional shaping levels, and sources of the OT and NT texts of the Christian canon, Childs is often quick to defend the Scriptures from extreme positions that he takes to be false, overzealous applications of critical methodology. He is also defender of the integrity of the canonical text in its present form. He is meticulous (especially in the OT) in his discussions of text-critical outcomes in relation to the most prominent traditions and the problems arising from each, with solutions. Then Childs' ever-present and consequent concern for the leading "trajectories" arising from the traditions is garnered toward his Biblical and dogmatic theological outcome. His discussions of Q and of issues directly and indirectly connected to the Jesus Seminar are, as in all like discussions, most insightful and helpful.

But Childs is also not merely theologically concerned, desirous to bring together again what others have torn asunder, i.e. the disciplines of exegesis and Biblical theology *from* systematic theology; he also is well informed in both the systematic/dogmatic and historical-theological issues and trends. As noted, his admiration of the Biblical-theological methods of Calvin and especially Barth are rooted, not superficially but profoundly, in what he perceives to be the "spirit" of their Reformed methods. Childs is a consciously committed *Christian* scholar, and his repeated affirmation of and submission to the authority of the Christian canon as a whole, along with central Christian doctrines (e.g. the Trinity, and the deity, atoning death and bodily resurrection of Jesus Christ), clearly reflect this fact. Throughout, it is Childs' intention first to demonstrate that an essential aspect of real theological reflection in Biblical theology is the move from the dual witness of Scripture to the reality of God, to which the "witnesses" of the canon point. This is the Barthian movement from witness to Reality. In this way Childs enacts his canonical Biblical-theological purpose.

Yet concerns about this text do face the evangelical reader. At a surface level, Childs' section on the OT is so meticulous in its detailed "pro-con" discussions about the various historical-critical outcomes that preliminary theological trajectories seemed all too few and thin at best. This surely reflects his OT specialization. Childs regularly knuckles under to the "authority" of critical "consensus" upon which, and in reaction to which, he then appears to build his own canonical approach. But a present consensus will soon crumble as will all that is built upon it. In this way Childs too often seems to be running a "dialectical gauntlet" between "rationalistic, reductionistic liberalism" and "biblicism"/supernaturalism, though his sentiments theologically would often seem to be closely allied to historical orthodoxy. Again, this is more often the case in his handling of the OT than in the NT section. Somehow, in all this, he can then critically deny an OT claim about an event while affirming that God acted! It seems that by his "canonical approach," for all of its possibility, Childs allows himself to have and use the critical methods in approaching the discrete texts while affirming the authority of the *whole*. Such a straddling would seem to lack real historical and conceptual unity. Over and over, Childs' only reply to certain critical methodologies (e.g. history-of-religions approach) is that they thus crippled the theological enterprise. But that is the realist point at issue. In the process he seems to affirm implicitly the greater authority of the NT in relation to the OT (p. 379). Childs wants to show

that the Church's path of theological reflection lies in its understanding of its Scripture, its canon and its Christological confession as it encompasses the reality and mystery of God's ways in the world with his people. Yet for all of the helpfulness of his Biblical theologizing, via the hermeneutical-theological insights of Karl Barth, he has fallen prey to the Barthian dilemma regarding both history and finite human language. Scripture as text is (*à la* Hans Frei) finally separated from issues of true historicity, while the Word of God remains "transcendentalized" from time and human language (cf. Bonhoeffer versus Barth).

None of the above remarks is intended to undermine the intrinsic value of Childs' book. The last half of this work, the critical-Biblical-canonical-history of redemption-dogmatic theological reflection of Brevard Childs, with the preceding analyses of the NT, is an absolute jewel, exciting to behold, follow, and hear. This book is extremely helpful and insightful, and its potential usefulness, whether for classes or as a springboard toward further theological reflection on the Christian Scriptures, is obvious. It is highly recommended.

John D. Morrison
Liberty University, Lynchburg, VA

Studies in Old Testament Theology: Historical and Contemporary Images of God and God's People. Edited by Robert L. Hubbard, Jr., Robert K. Johnston and Robert P. Meye. Dallas: Word, 1992, 333 pp., \$17.99.

This collection of essays on OT theology, dedicated to the life and ministry of former Fuller Theological Seminary president David A. Hubbard, is a fitting tribute to a man who contributed much to evangelical scholarship, both as a scholar in his own right and as a facilitator of scholarship at the helm of a prominent seminary faculty for almost thirty years.

After four personal tributes to D. Hubbard in the opening chapter, the design of the volume is intended to be comprehensive of the discipline it treats, dividing its attention among methodology and the three canonical divisions of the Hebrew Bible (Torah, Prophets and Writings). A final section, composed of two chapters on current issues of concern to numerous Christians today—Israel and the Church, and the environment and OT ethics—serves as a capstone.

The eighteen authors of this volume represent, quite intentionally I suspect, a broad range on the theological spectrum, even including one Roman Catholic writer, thus giving the work the stamp of ecumenism that D. Hubbard fostered within the Christian community.

The main contribution of the book, aside from the well-deserved tribute to D. Hubbard, comes in the first ("Methodology") and middle sections ("The Old Testament") of the volume. Section 1 contains studies by Robert L. Hubbard, Jr., on "Doing OT Theology Today," Elizabeth Achtemeier on preaching, "From Exegesis to Proclamation," and Daniel P. Fuller on "The Importance of a Unity of the Bible." Quite effectively does R. Hubbard introduce the whole volume in that he suggests a topical approach to OT theology that "conceives of the OT-NT relationship as a series of parallel theological trajectories moving from one testament to the other" (p. 41). In point of fact, that is the general approach of the book to the discipline. Not to disparage this system, which has served OT theologians beneficially through the centuries of interpretation, it nevertheless is sometimes resorted to when no theological center can be identified, an issue

that gets virtually no attention in the book. From the layout, the reader might get the impression that it is Yahweh and his relationship to Israel.

The desire of the authors to be both descriptive and normative (see p. 35 of R. Hubbard's essay) is evidenced at various points in the collection, not least in Achtemeier's helpful chapter on preaching from the OT. Unfortunately, she did not have the same indulgence given the authors of the three canonical divisions, that of focusing on the literature of one division, making her task broad and challenging, to say the least. Her grasp of the OT generally, however, and her expertise in preaching more particularly, assisted her in rising to the challenge nevertheless.

Section 2 ("The Old Testament") deals with the three canonical divisions of the OT: Torah, Prophets and Writings. This literature is considered under three rubrics: (1) Images of Yahweh, (2) Images of Israel and (3) Images for Today, each by a different author, thus furnishing a diversity on the literature that is both a strength and a weakness. The images of Yahweh in a literature like the Prophets, for example, is impossible to extricate from the images of Israel, and there are theological advantages of hearing the interpretation of a single author on the topic as well as his or her application to contemporary life. That obviously would not spread the task widely among the honoree's admirers. Thus the division of labor contributes to a rather rich diversity of insights, but at the same time to a different way of explicating the theology in the chapter on the images of Israel. For example, John D. W. Watts suggests that the prophetic images of Yahweh grow out of two root metaphors, "Yahweh as King" and "Yahweh as the Divine Spirit" (p. 135). In the following chapter Leslie C. Allen presents the images of Israel in the prophetic literature in terms of Yahweh's covenant relationship. Thus the reader does not see precisely how the images of Yahweh as King and divine Spirit are worked out in the images of Israel.

Yet, for a volume with so vast a literature to cover, this format is functionally quite useful, even though it is obviously restrictive. For example, the topic of humanity or the world more generally comes under consideration in the third rubric ("Images for Today"), but mainly in a practical rather than historical light. Perhaps the final two chapters on the Church's relationship to ethnic Israel and its responsibility to the created order in view of the ethics of Hosea were intended to pull together the threads of this third rubric. The latter topic, handled well by William A. Dyrness, is a bit curious in view of the fact that the focus of the volume is on Yahweh and Israel rather than the world.

Robert K. Johnston's chapter on wisdom seems also agenda-driven. While he ably acknowledges the capacity of wisdom literature to speak to our contemporary world, his choice of topics ("Our Ecological Dilemma," "Our Continuing Male Bias," and "Our Global Village") seems to arise more out of a social-political agenda than the theological nature of the literature itself. The feminine images of Lady Wisdom ("Woman Wisdom" is his phrase) certainly do cast a vote in favor of balance and equality, but he does not satisfactorily address the counterpoint, even though he acknowledges it, that gender bias (that is our term and probably an unfair one to apply to the literature because we live in a very different world) punctuates the book of Proverbs.

The task of reviewing a multi-authored volume such as this one is as difficult as that of the authors, and I am reminded of that as I write these words. Overall this volume makes a helpful contribution to the theology of the OT in an introductory way.

C. Hassell Bullock
Wheaton College, Wheaton, IL

Covenant: God's Purpose; God's Plan. By John H. Walton. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994, 192 pp., \$14.99 paper.

Walton's thesis is straightforward: Covenant functions primarily as revelation. Relational or salvific dimensions within covenant are secondary. The rift between dispensationalists and Reformed, largely due to a salvific interpretation of covenant, can be greatly narrowed, so Walton thinks, through an understanding of covenant as revelation.

Continuity rather than discontinuity characterizes the covenants since each is a part of the single unified program of revelation. The OT "people of God," defined as serving a revelatory function, cease once the Messiah appears. In the NT, given the rollover of covenant into redemption dimensions with a consequent new definition of "people of God," Israel now becomes an identifiable subset. Law within covenant need not be a soteriological issue if law is understood as revelatory of God's holiness. The issue of conditional or unconditional covenants recedes in importance once it is realized that the covenant functions to reveal God. The covenant is then unconditional since God who retains the prerogative of initiative will follow through on his self-revelation.

Support for the thesis is drawn initially from the phrase "and you will know that I am Yahweh," a phrase that speaks to a revelatory result, "if not a revelatory purpose." (Zimmerli's classic 1954 essay on the "recognition formula" is not mentioned.) Walton claims that covenant is essential for revelation and not the other way around (Exod 6:2-8). Other specific passages enlisted for support include: Deut 4:32-40; 7:7-9 (election of Israel is the result of revelation); Ps 106:7-8; 2 Sam 7:23-24; Ezek 20:5-14, 19-22, 38-44; 37:24-28; and Isa 43:25-28. A covenant can be put into "revelation" jeopardy (e.g. Abrahamic, Mosaic, Davidic), and less often into "benefit" jeopardy.

The book is important as charting a fresh angle of vision on covenant. Like O. Palmer Robertson's *Christ of the Covenants* and Thomas McComiskey's *The Covenants of Promise*, Walton seeks to break the impasse on the subject. He cites some 150 authors, includes charts, and elaborates on the implications of his view. The book deserves to be taken seriously.

The book triggers certain questions, however. Walton aims at a Biblical-theological treatment, which by consensus means employing Biblical categories. But it has been argued that "revelation" is a western and largely imposed category (cf. R. Knierim); there is not a Hebrew word for "revelation" except perhaps *gālā*. If the stress on "knowing God" is granted, there is still the question of how that knowledge is mediated: prophetic word (Th. Vriezen), the acts of God (G. E. Wright) or event and word (cf. W. Zimmerli, R. Rendtorff). Is not the claim that through the Davidic covenant God was revealed as king problematic in view of Exod 15:18, Judg 8:23 and 1 Sam 8:7? In terms of formulaic language, is not the covenant formula "I will be their God and they shall be my people" (some 17 occurrences) more characteristically linked with covenant proper than is the formula "then they will know that I am Yahweh"? Loyalty (*hesed*) seems to me to be more at the heart of *covenant* than of revelation. Even more fundamentally, one might ask whether "covenant" is really as dominant a theme as generally assumed (cf. J. H. Stek, "'Covenant' Overload in Reformed Theology," *Calvin Theological Journal* 29 [April 1994] 12-41). All of this is but to say that Walton's book is most profitable; it challenges older positions by offering an alternative view on covenant.

Elmer A. Martens
Mennonite Brethren Biblical Seminary, Fresno, CA

Introduction to Biblical Interpretation. By William W. Klein, Craig L. Blomberg and Robert L. Hubbard, Jr.; with Kermit A. Eckleberger, consulting editor. Dallas: Word, 1993, xxiii + 518 pp., \$28.99.

The present work seeks to provide an up-to-date and comprehensive account of Biblical interpretation. It consists of eleven chapters that cover all relevant topics: the need for hermeneutics, the history of interpretation, canon and translations, the interpreter (including qualifications and presuppositions), the goal of interpretation (which discusses levels of meaning), general rules for prose, general rules for OT poetry, genres of the OT, genres of the NT, using the Bible today, application. In addition, the book includes an appendix on modern approaches as well as an annotated bibliography.

It must be said at the outset that this volume is an example of cooperative work at its best. The authors have not only capitalized on their individual strengths but have also succeeded in producing an integrated book that reflects a carefully worked-out consensus; indeed, the reader is seldom aware that the material has been put together by different hands. As a result, the student is assured that the contents have passed under the scrutiny of several well-qualified scholars, reducing the likelihood of idiosyncrasies or significant omissions.

Hoping to meet the needs of nonadvanced students, the authors aim at clarity of expression. For the most part they succeed, but I seriously doubt that the typical beginning student could assimilate so much material. Very high motivation and/or previous familiarity with Biblical scholarship would seem to be necessary prerequisites. Accordingly, I do not think that this volume would serve well as a textbook in, say, an elementary college course. On the other hand, upper-division Bible majors and, especially, seminary students will find in it a rich treasure of information and guidance.

Given the scope of this book, one inevitably notices a large number of places that raise questions or could otherwise stand improvement. The survey of the history of interpretation, for example, depends heavily on other surveys (such as Grant and La-tourette) and could have benefited from greater interaction with specialized works and with the primary sources themselves. The discussion of canon (especially with regard to the criteria of canonicity, pp. 64–65) needs theological beefing-up; the comment that the canon “theoretically” (though not “practically”) remains open is, to say the least, unnerving. And so on.

One also comes across misleading statements from time to time. On p. 70, for instance, in an attempt to illustrate for the English reader what unvocalized Hebrew might look like, the authors quote Gen 1:1–2 in the NIV, but only the consonants, which are run together. This is quite a false analogy, however, which obscures some fundamental differences between the two languages. (Incidentally, the line-wrapping of Hebrew text, as on p. 71, is nonstandard.) Again, it is not true that an early date for Galatians is unnecessary to relate Acts 14 with Galatians 3 (p. 353); the authors appear to think that a South Galatian destination is possible only if the letter was written prior to the Jerusalem council, whereas in fact such a destination is compatible with any dating of Galatians.

To their credit, the authors address head-on such controversial topics as reader-response interpretation, the application of the Bible to the modern context, *et al.* The challenge presented by these issues is one of avoiding, on the one hand, abstract discussions that do not offer much help and, on the other, concrete guidelines that turn out to be superficial or ambiguous. While it cannot be said that the book provides ground-breaking solutions, most students will be genuinely helped by observing how the authors, committed to the authority of Scripture, grapple honestly and intelligently with the issues.

This volume is in some ways reminiscent of Milton S. Terry’s standard work of a century ago, *Biblical Hermeneutics*. For myself, I think it tries to do too much, so that

parts of it overlap with the discipline of general introduction. A little more selectivity, along with greater penetration of some issues, would have made it a better book. Nevertheless, theological students would be well advised to purchase this volume and to familiarize themselves with its contents. It will prove itself a fine resource for the whole spectrum of problems that arise in the task of Biblical interpretation.

Moisés Silva
Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, South Hamilton, MA

Biblical Hermeneutics. By Gerhard Maier. Translated by Robert Yarbrough. Wheaton: Crossway, 1994, xiii + 526 pp., \$22.00 paper.

Twenty years after the publication of his provocative "Streit-," even "Kampfschrift," *The End of the Historical-Critical Method (EHCM)*, Gerhard Maier has given us a well-reasoned, much more seasoned, fleshed-out treatment of Biblical hermeneutics. His new choice of title reflects a less inflammatory stance toward his opponents while still subtly pointing toward "unbiblical" counterparts.

The radical approach taken in Maier's first book attacked historical criticism as an interpretive method unsuitable for its subject matter, i.e. Biblical revelation. The sympathetic author of the foreword even called it "a godless technique." Maier pointed to the fact that, two hundred years after Semler's separation between Scripture and the Word of God and the ensuing search for a canon within the canon, Biblical scholarship was left in a state where the writings of Scripture were widely conceived of as a mere collection of diverse testimonies. Historical criticism, Maier stated, led scholars into a blind alley, so that conservative evangelicals were subsequently faced with the responsibility of finding a method that was more suitable for its subject than historical criticism. In contradistinction to Stuhlmacher and Hengel, who had called for a historical-theological method, Maier envisioned a historical-Biblical approach since, in his observation, theology often elevates itself above the conceptual framework and the terminology of Scripture itself.

What progress has Maier made toward developing such a method in the last twenty years? Unfortunately, judging by his latest book, very little. While a full third of the book is devoted to a detailed critique of historical criticism, only twenty pages are given to Maier's own constructive proposal, almost as an appendix to the book. While Maier's scholarship is considerable and his knowledge of German scholarship remarkable (especially of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries), his attitude toward the historical-critical method remains as unyielding and categorical as in his earlier work. Maier continues to call historical criticism to shed its Enlightenment presuppositions and has absolutely no room for it in his own method. He thus cuts himself off from much helpful recent work in Biblical studies. One wonders whether or not Maier has thrown out the baby (i.e. critical historical research) with the bathwater (i.e. historical criticism as a whole).

Having said this, one notes some remarkable changes between *EHCM* and the present work. To begin with, Maier changes the designation of his proposed method from "historical-Biblical" to "Biblical-historical" to focus on the *Biblical* element and to appear less reactionary to the historical-critical approach. After commenting very negatively on methods such as redaction criticism in his former volume, Maier now makes room for form, tradition, and redaction criticisms, claiming that such had been part of proper hermeneutical methodology at least since Matthias Flacius' *Clavis Scripturae* in 1567. The incorporation of these critical tools, however, appears to run

counter not merely to the approach taken in Maier's earlier work but also to his wholesale rejection of historical criticism elsewhere even in the *present* volume.

It seems that much of Maier's argument takes on its particular orientation in relation to his German context where a conservative position, i.e. one that affirms Biblical inspiration and inerrancy, is grossly underrepresented. For example, Maier opposes P. Stuhlmacher, who merely affirms the inspiration of the Biblical *writers* but not necessarily of everything they *wrote*. On the other hand, Maier's grasp of Anglo-American evangelical scholarship seems limited to some representative works (especially by J. Barr, N. Geisler, B. Ramm, J. I. Packer, and C. F. H. Henry; remarkably, he makes no reference to the work of A. Thiselton). It is thus doubtful whether or not he is aware of the full orbit of viewpoints and practical solutions developed in the conservative evangelical North American context.

What, then, is the value of Maier's work for scholars working in North America? Despite the limitations mentioned above, there is much that is of use. By his own admission, Maier focuses primarily on hermeneutics as *understanding*, rather than following the Anglo-American emphasis on hermeneutical *skills*. In the context of the North American pragmatism in hermeneutical circles (one just needs to look at the titles of some recent books, such as R. Stein's *Playing by the Rules*, or the many "how-to" guides), Maier could help conservative evangelicals come to terms with many of the important issues in hermeneutical theory that are frequently assumed rather than pondered. For example, Maier's advocacy of a *theologia regenitorum* (i.e. a "theology of the regenerate") could be profitably discussed in a scholarly climate where many still feel uncomfortable in approaching their research from an explicitly believing stance. Finally, Maier's concerns regarding historical criticism, whether taken too far or not, are well worth considering. In the end, Maier successfully exposes some of the questionable philosophical underpinnings of the historical-critical method as it developed historically. It still remains, however, for him to provide a more detailed constructive proposal as a credible alternative to the method he so skillfully critiques.

Andreas J. Köstenberger

Trinity International University, Deerfield, IL

Playing by the Rules: A Basic Guide to Interpreting the Bible. By Robert H. Stein. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994, 219 pp., \$11.99 paper.

American readers, blessed with a multitude of Bible versions, are equally blessed with books on how to interpret them. Just as every Greek professor writes a grammar, so every professional hermeneut writes a book on hermeneutics. Stein justifies his with "various reasons"—unenumerated (p. 9). He provides a nontechnical, "basic" guide, and one may wonder how it will compete with the comparable classic "how-to" volume by Fee and Stuart. It can on two grounds: It is both less technical and (as we would expect) more up-to-date than the other.

Stein admirably puts contemporary Biblical interpretive theory into language comprehensible to laypeople. Mixing traditional insights with newer ones from linguistics, discourse analysis, narrative and reader-response criticism (as found in recent texts like those of Silva, Cotterell and Turner, Tate), he distills a useful evangelically based guide for reading the Old and New Testaments intelligently.

The title derives from the somewhat overly clever scheme of viewing Bible interpretation as playing a variety of games, a notion arising from the fundamental assumption that the meaning of a Biblical text is determined by its author's intended, or willed, pattern of meaning for that text (there is an unacknowledged circularity in this

definition; cf. p. 38). In order to convey their willed meaning to their readers, authors must submit themselves to the rules of the game: language norms, utterance norms, genre conventions, etc. Similarly, in order to recover an author's intended meaning from a text, interpreters must play by those same rules.

Stein first considers general rules of interpretation (four chapters). Chapter 1 explains the relationships among author, text and reader, rightly promoting the primacy of author-based meaning. No consideration is given, however, to any benefits derivable from text-centered or reader-centered theories of meaning. The second chapter expounds the preferred theory through detailed definitions of key terms. Part 1 closes with short chapters distinguishing understanding a text (possible for believer and nonbeliever alike) from responding to it, as well as acknowledging the variety of Biblical genres (games).

The final nine chapters describe the "specific rules for the individual games": Wisdom (proverbs), Prediction (prophecy), Rhythm (poetry), Jargon (idioms), Exaggeration (hyperbole), Comparison (parables), Stories (Biblical narrative), Correspondence (epistles) and finally, in a single chapter, Treaties, Laws and (referring to psalms) Songs.

A short glossary (27 definitions, many repeated from chap. 2), an even shorter bibliography (15 entries), as well as subject and Scripture indexes complete the book. Each chapter is supplied with discussion questions (chap. 2 also offers a quiz), and helpful graphics appear throughout. There are no footnotes or endnotes.

Glaringly absent is any explicit advice on discerning the historical situation behind a text; the idea is alluded to now and then and is apparently taken for granted everywhere (hence the primacy of author-based meaning), but it is never explained. Experienced readers will find some discussions oversimplified (e.g. that there are two kinds of language: referential and commissive [p. 73]), but this suits the book's purpose as a "basic guide." The same may perhaps be said of the occasionally maddening repetitiousness of certain illustrative examples (love-hate, love letter vs. chemistry report, etc.); repetition teaches.

Two key terms are, unfortunately, misspelled: the French term *langue* (pp. 31, 204) and "chiasmus" (p. 113).

All in all, the book is highly readable (no mean feat these days) and very suitable for use in colleges and congregational adult education; one might even consider using it as a supplemental text in a seminary course.

Rich Erickson
Fuller Theological Seminary, Seattle, WA

The Original African Heritage Study Bible, King James Version. Edited by Cain Hope Felder. Nashville: James C. Winston, 1993, 1893 pp., n.p. leather.

This Bible is intended to fill a void and meet a perceived need. In the introduction, Felder states that the purpose of this Bible is to "interpret the Bible as it relates specifically to persons of African descent and thereby to foster an appreciation of the multiculturalism inherent in the Bible." More clarification of purpose comes from publisher and associate editor James W. Peebles, who says, "One purpose of this volume is to bridge the gorge that universal racism has created, and show that humankind was created from one stock and one blood type by one Divine and Omnipotent God, who used the peoples of Africa as His initial tool by which He affected His creation plan. . . . The primary purpose of this edition is to point out and emphasize Africa's role in the formation of Judaism and Christianity and to highlight those biblical persons of African descent. . . . It is therefore an honor indeed to present to readers of all races

everywhere an edition of the Bible that seeks to restore and correct ancient biblical facts rather than to demean and distort the African presence." If people read the preface in full, they will see that the editors desire to set forth their agenda with gentleness.

The choice of the King James translation is due to the fact that it plays a significant role in African-American church history and because it is the version used in most black churches.

Several features make this a unique study Bible. Prominent among these are the shaded (in gray) text throughout the Bible wherever passages, places, names and information related to African/Edenic presence occur. (Throughout, "African/Edenic" refers to the view that Eden was in Africa near Ethiopia, and that Africa originally extended east into what is now considered the Middle East, but was separated by the Suez Canal in 1859–69.) In passages with bold headings (all shaded), there are footnotes that mostly emphasize African aspects of the text but that also explain some of the Biblical terminology from the standpoint of Greek or Hebrew. This Bible is also illustrated with pictures and drawings that portray all of the Biblical characters as black, and the authors raise arguments that call for consideration of the racial background of key Biblical figures. Nevertheless, most people will be taken aback by the exclusive portrayal of Biblical figures as black.

Similar to other study Bibles, there are helps like maps (though these emphasize Africa), book instructions and major subject indexes. It would have been useful to have a concordance in back, but that may have only made it a larger Bible than it is already. A final unique feature worth mentioning is the abundance of articles related to African presence in the Bible and early African Christianity. There are several contributors (most, if not all, unknown to evangelicals), and the topics include racism, recovering multiculturalism in Scripture, an introduction to the epistles, pre-Christian religion in Ethiopia, and ancient black Christians. Most are well written, and the articles are quite helpful for gaining a perspective on the actual multiculturalism present in Scripture.

Does this Bible succeed in setting forth its agenda with gentleness? In many ways it does, yet there are areas for concern from an evangelical standpoint. In some places, there seems to be a revisionist approach to issues born out of frustration with the past. While many points are legitimate, I wonder if an Afrocentric zeal goes too far in others. There are also scholarly aspects of some articles that one may question, such as the adherence to higher-critical conclusions on some Biblical issues (e.g. the dating of Daniel).

This Bible does not really compare with other study volumes because it is so unique. For the most part, it succeeds in occupying a much-needed place, and it fills a void as the authors intended. If we evangelicals peruse the contents of this well-crafted and well-produced Bible, we may find that there is a considerable amount of valuable and educational material, that we can benefit from the knowledge of African presence and influence in the long history of our faith. One need not agree with every conclusion in the volume, but if it is approached with an open mind this Bible will enrich our faith.

Vincent Bacote
Trinity College, Deerfield, IL

Computer Bible Study: Up-to-Date Information on the Best Software and Techniques. By Jeffrey Hsu with Kermit A. Ecklebarger and Terri A. Gibbs. Dallas: Word, 1993, 212 pp., \$12.99 paper.

Computer Bible Study is a good introduction to the world of Bible computing and will encourage the nonintrepid to investigate Bible software. It seeks to provide "a book on how to do computer Bible study" and to give one "the opportunity to consider a wide variety of programs on the market" (p. vi). It surveys basic computer technol-

ogy and techniques and presents the primary features and benefits of computer-assisted Bible research (CABS). These goals are admirably met, given the wide range of software options and the continual advances and upgrading in software production. Readers unfamiliar with or skeptical about the advantages of CABS will profit from the first two parts of the book, "Basics of Bible Computing" and "Examining Computing Resources." Software programs discussed include those that help one learn or teach Biblical Hebrew and NT Greek as well as others that work directly with the Hebrew and Greek texts (grammatically, sometimes morphologically, tagged *BHS*, *LXX*, and *UBSGNT* texts). Macintosh users, however, will find little help here because the book describes only DOS- and Windows-oriented programs.

Part 3, "Applying Computer Technology to Bible Study," attempts to "discuss a range of Bible study methods" to show how the programs enhance and expedite basic word, biographical, historical-geographical, and topical studies. This material, while it shows how one can use the tools available for Bible study, contains misleading views on what the untrained Bible student produces and receives as a result of this technology. And, granting that the book is for the nonspecialist, the value of academic and language training (while mentioned) is undercut by a misguided understanding of what is required for Bible research. Consider three statements: "[T]he wealth of information these programs provide and the intricate functions they perform can almost make a scholar out of even a novice computer operator" (p. 4). "[T]here are programs and resources that allow the user to work successfully with the original Greek and Hebrew without any previous knowledge of these languages. . . . [W]ith the many Bible study tools and resources available today, the lack of specialized training in Greek or Hebrew is not a hindrance to a thorough study of original Bible words and phrases" (p. 48). "[A]ll you need is a concordance and a Bible dictionary that gives you the range of meaning of each English word and suggests which meaning best fits the specific passage you are studying" (p. 136).

Many such overstatements fill the book and cannot be mere hyperbole due to their sheer number. The general reader could come away from this book and his computer feeling as if he has the equipment needed for Bible research. But mere ease, speed and access to the Biblical data do not constitute the primary tools for nor result in accurately approaching, studying, interpreting and understanding Scripture. For those, however, who are trained with the essential language, linguistic, hermeneutical and theological skills and are willing to gain some mastery over the better Greek and Hebrew text-oriented programs and are "keeping in step with the Spirit" there is much to be gained and produced in Biblical research in ways hardly addressed heretofore.

Since software publishing is so dynamic, to keep abreast of new products, upgrades and advances in the field readers should consult *Christian Computing Magazine* and the periodic "Bible Reference Update" section in *Christianity Today* for a wide range of relevant Bible study and ministry oriented programs. One might also find someone who uses the program(s) of interest and persuade him or her to give a hands-on demonstration. Better yet, persuade the local bookstore to host a software demonstration where the various products can be displayed in all their glory.

Stacey L. Douglas
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

The Land and the Book: An Introduction to the World of the Bible. By Charles R. Page II and Carl A. Volz. Nashville: Abingdon, 1993, 285 pp., \$15.95 paper.

The preface states that the "intended audience is twofold. It will serve as a guide for students of the Jerusalem Center for Biblical Studies and for any other visitors to

the biblical lands of Israel, Jordan, and Egypt; and we hope that it may be useful as supplemental reading for students of the Scriptures and history, especially if they do not have the opportunity of visiting these sites in person" (p. 13). The book will no doubt serve the first audience well, since Page is academic dean of the Jerusalem Center. Other visitors will also likely find this a useful resource. It will not replace the standard guides in that it is not arranged to lead one from site to site nor around a given site. It will be less useful to the Bible student who is not traveling to the sites.

The work is divided into three sections: (1) a geographical and historical overview, (2) a survey of Biblical sites in Israel, Jordan and the Sinai, and (3) a collection of appendices, including a helpful survey of archeological method. The geographical overview is a brief, simple and straightforward description of the major regions and features of Palestinian geography, providing a useful framework for the discussion of the sites. The historical overview and discussion of sites reveal that the authors' purpose is more to discuss the archeological and historical sites that may be visited in Palestine than merely to discuss the Biblical sites. Roughly a fourth of the 58-page historical overview covers the OT period, a fourth the intertestamental, a fourth the NT, and a fourth the period from the second century to the present. The section on "Biblical Sites" includes many not mentioned in the Bible, such as Gamla, Hammat Gader and the Dome of the Rock, as well as longer discussions of Qumran, Masada and the quarters of Jerusalem's Old City.

The authors describe the historical overview as an "at times uncritical acceptance of the biblical narrative, albeit recognizing challenges to the text and problems relating to it" (p. 14). In general the discussion seems less critical of the gospel narratives than of the OT and less critical of 1 Maccabees and Josephus than of the canonical texts. The inconsistency of the criticism is seen, for example, in the authors' suggestion of a possible alternate date of Esther between 150 and 100 BC. But on the same page they make no mention of the challenge to the 458 BC date for Ezra's return. Similarly the authors do not mention the doubts some have raised concerning forced Hellenization under Antiochus IV, but later they call into question the historicity of John 21. The appendix listing the dates of the prophets includes Second and Third Isaiah but not Jonah or Daniel.

The entries on the Biblical sites are arranged alphabetically in four sections: Israel (outside Jerusalem), Jerusalem, Jordan, and other sites (mostly in the Sinai). Each entry lists the Biblical reference to the site (if any) and briefly summarizes the Biblical accounts and subsequent historical events. Attention is given to what may be seen at the site, including archeological remains and existing churches. The archeological and historical information is generally reliable, although there are a few problems (e.g. the authors fail to note the questions raised concerning Kenyon's ceramic dating at Jericho, Kursi is not clearly identified as Gergesa, and the dates given for some Roman emperors seem to have been confused in editing). The numerous diagrams and pictures enhance a generally clear and readable text.

Despite its flaws the book should prove a helpful companion to Bible students visiting Israel and Jordan, especially first-time visitors who are prepared for the authors' critical stance.

Rob McRay
Northtown Church, Milwaukee, WI

The World of Biblical Literature. By Robert Alter. New York: Basic, 1992, xiii + 225 pp., \$12.00 paper.

Alter is justifiably renowned as one of the prime movers in the recent emphasis on literary study of the Bible. His *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, published in 1981,

has become a classic. In 1985 he published a similar volume on Hebrew poetry, and he co-edited *The Literary Guide to the Bible* in 1987. The present work is a collection of nine loosely connected essays, five of which have previously appeared. It continues Alter's brief for a literary reading of the Bible—the "world" in his title does not mean the ancient Near Eastern world, as I thought when I first read it, but rather the literary and social "world," both ancient and modern, that the Bible inhabits—but it is the most disjointed of his trilogy of works (excluding his edited volume).

This volume engages current scholarship much more than his first two did. In many respects it is a running dialogue with—and sometimes a diatribe against—scholars who have built upon his ground-breaking work or disagreed with it. Thus, for example, chap. 7 ("The Quest for the Author") is not a theoretical exploration of the place of an author in a text (as one might expect), but rather a scathing review of H. Bloom's *The Book of J*, and chap. 1 ("A Peculiar Literature") reviews and evaluates literary approaches since 1981, when his first book appeared.

Chapters 3 ("The Literary Character of the Bible") and 8 ("The Medium of Poetry") are reprinted from *Literary Guide* and are general restatements of his positions in his 1981 and 1985 works.

Chapters 2 ("Biblical Imperatives and Literary Play"), 4 ("Narrative Specification and the Power of the Literal") and 5 ("Allusion and Literary Expression") are vintage Alter. In chap. 2, Alter argues that Biblical authors were driven by more than their serious messages (their "imperatives"), but also by the modes (literary genres, literary devices, literary "play") by which they communicated these messages. In chap. 4, Alter perceptively shows how the Bible's narratives, which are normally sparing in their details, many times use the smallest bits of information to make important although often subtle points. Chapter 5 deals with how these narratives draw upon each other, directly and indirectly, frequently in texts widely separated from each other in textual context and in time.

Chapter 6 is a fascinating look at how commentaries are written and how they deal with literary criticism. Choosing the first three volumes of the Jewish Publication Society's new commentary on the Torah as examples, Alter analyzes the methods of the three authors and shows how they do and do not measure up to what he considers a proper feel for the literary qualities of the texts. I recommend this chapter highly to all commentary writers.

Alter's final chapter ("Scripture and Culture") attempts to deal with the problem of the Bible's authority. Since the Bible has been dethroned by post-Enlightenment movements it retains little authority for most moderns, and Alter certainly does not want a return to pious "fundamentalism." Yet he is uncomfortable with the Biblical illiteracy abroad today, from a literary standpoint if nothing else (otherwise how can one read many secular classics, whose allusions are so heavily rooted in the Bible?). The uncomfortable perch occupied by many who approach the Bible from a secular stance (including Alter) is revealed well in this chapter.

Nevertheless this is another fine work from Alter, filled with examples of his vaulted close readings to illustrate his points. In one sense it is a work that needed to be written, given how much Biblical studies have changed since 1981, when he published *The Art of Biblical Narrative*—changed in no small degree by his own work. This work, however, cannot be read on its own. The reader must at least have read Alter's 1981 work, which in my mind is still his finest. If readers have not read that one, they should do so forthwith. Then they may come to this present volume if they like.

David M. Howard, Jr.
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

A History of the Bible as Literature. By David Norton. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1993, xvii + 375 pp. and xii + 493 pp., n.p.

The Bible-as-literature movement in its contemporary form has been on the scholarly scene for a quarter of a century now, and it shows no signs of losing its momentum. The movement helped to change the paradigm by which Biblical scholars ply their trade, and it changed the canon of literature to which literary critics ply their trade. Given the degree of current interest in the subject, it is only natural to ask how we got where we are today. Norton has provided an answer to the query on the grand scale of 800 pages of text (plus excellent indices). The resulting two-volume history (with the volumes subtitled respectively *From Antiquity to 1700* and *From 1700 to the Present Day*) shows exactly the same virtues and weaknesses of the movement itself.

The most salient feature of the contemporary Bible-as-literature movement is its lack of criteria by which to define itself. Virtually every imaginable type of scholarly commentary on the Bible has labeled itself a “literary” approach during the past two decades. Whatever a scholar has decided constitutes a literary approach is accepted as such, with no questions asked. Norton’s *History* runs true to form. From one point of view it is an utterly undisciplined and unfocused book. It shuttles back and forth among four main topics: the nature and content of the Bible itself, statements of virtually whatever type about the Bible by religious and literary figures through the centuries, English translations of the Bible (along with the translation theory underlying those translations), and the Bible as a source and influence for western literature.

Is this mixture a history, first of all? I do not believe so. It is instead an encyclopedic collection of data, chronologically arranged, that one would find useful and in fact essential in constructing his or her own history of the topics listed above. Is the book, secondly, a history of the Bible as literature? I remain skeptical, but given the amorphous nature of that movement, the case can certainly be argued that the book delivers what its title promises. My guess is that few readers will find that the book’s content meets their expectations as raised by the title. But if the book is in this sense a frustration, the positive side is that reading the two volumes is a continuous adventure, filled with surprising inclusions, pleasurable side trips, and aphoristically stated insights (a leading strength of the book).

If the Bible-as-literature movement has been ungoverned, its compensating virtue is its naive zest for its subject. Norton’s two volumes possess this same quality—a spirit reminiscent of the Renaissance approach to life and literature. The most obvious virtue of the book is its scope. The author has done a prodigious amount of research in old volumes. He is in fact a researcher above all else, which makes the first volume better than the second because it uncovers material more likely to be hidden from common view. As a researcher, Norton gravitates naturally toward major texts rather than broad movements. The result is a book copious (by my taste, disproportionately so) with descriptive summary of the content of old sources, accompanied by the author’s readiness to offer his evaluations of the viewpoints that those sources express about the Bible. But the book is relatively light on interpretive analysis of underlying principles, and to some degree it substitutes accumulation of data for interpretive insight.

The Bible-as-literature movement has provided wide scope for riding hobby horses, and Norton’s *History* does this too. The villain of the piece is the KJV, and a unifying theme of both volumes is to denigrate the KJV in a way that finally becomes an annoyance. Norton heaps scorn on the veneration of the KJV (which he stigmatizes with the term “AVolatry”), but he never refutes the almost universally accepted and easily validated literary superiority of the KJV. Partisans of the NIV will no doubt have their

interest aroused by what I have just noted, but they will not find a kindred spirit in Norton, who devotes six pages to the NKJV and 25 pages to the NEB, while the NIV fares no better than simply to be named twice in lists.

The Bible-as-literature movement is partly a publisher's ploy, as publishers have been falling over themselves during the past decade to claim that their books represent a literary approach. The two volumes under review illustrate this trend as well. In the first instance that I have ever seen in a scholarly book the first page of both volumes, appearing before even the title page, is a paragraph of advertisement enticing the reader to read the book that follows. While I believe that the books themselves do not quite live up to the promise of these promotional blurbs, it is only fair to let these preliminary advertisements indicate what the publisher believes the volumes accomplish. By the publisher's testimony the first volume "is the only full account of how people have thought of the Bible and Bible translations from biblical times to the end of the seventeenth century." The second volume "shows not only how criticism has shaped understanding of the Bible, but how the Bible has shaped literary criticism." These intentions are in themselves splendid—exactly what the movement needs.

The book's strengths are also its weaknesses. The two volumes are comprehensive but undisciplined. The author finds it hard to omit anything interesting, with the result that anyone looking for something specific will probably find it but at the cost of having to wade through a lot of extraneous material in the process. The book covers all the bases and is a gold mine of information for the initiate into the field, but veterans who are already knowledgeable in a given topic will find some (not all) of Norton's analysis cursory (especially the treatment of the last half century). The author's unpredictability makes reading the volumes an adventure, but the same quality makes some of the reading tedious.

Leland Ryken
Wheaton College, Wheaton, IL

Interpretation and Bible: Essays on Truth in Literature. By Sean McEvenue. Collegeville: Michael Glazier, 1994, 187 pp., \$16.99 paper.

Most of the fourteen chapters of this book have been previously published as independent essays. They focus on a discussion of how the Biblical writings communicate truth and "to exploit the extraordinary clarity which the late Bernard Lonergan has brought to our understanding of interpretation" (p. 5). McEvenue draws heavily on the insights of Lonergan, who has had significant impact on Roman Catholic hermeneutics through his *Method in Theology* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1972). Lonergan's hermeneutical method of cognitive theory is best described as "reader-response," an approach that begins by "being attentive to one's personal inner experience of thinking as the primary data for investigating cognition" (p. 8).

McEvenue tips his hand at the outset by stating that the Bible "is so full of factual errors regarding science and history, and contains so many contradictory affirmations, that it is positively embarrassing," with the result that "simple readers of the Bible have to choose between rejecting its authority or rejecting their own intelligence" (p. 7). To solve this dilemma McEvenue defines truth specifically as "an authentic affirmation about ultimate reality" (p. 9). According to him, literary truth is subjective, intending "to include a personal, and often original [!], perspective and

evaluation" (p. 12). The author, the reader and the text find common ground for communicating truth within the context of the believing community (pp. 31, 42–43). His chief indebtedness to Loneragan is the affirmation that the Bible's truth is not doctrinal in nature but is literary (using stories and poetry to evoke images, emotions and response), which cannot be paraphrased into propositions without doing it irreparable damage. Thus one cannot speak of normative doctrines within the Bible, but rather the fact that the Bible aims to compel conversion of the reader through appeal to ultimate reality: "Literature cannot be resumed, or simplified, or summed up in a lesson. . . . One first feels it, then distinguishes it from other messages, then reacts positively or negatively towards it, loving it or hating it" (pp. 164–165).

McEvenue is certainly correct in stating that the Bible demands a response and that any hermeneutical method that overlooks this fundamental aspect is flawed. He advocates a reading that is literarily sensitive both by reading texts holistically and by recognizing genres and adjusting our expectations accordingly.

Criticisms of the book would include all those that could be leveled against "new criticism" and "reader-response," especially concerning the subjectivity and nonreferentiality of the Bible's "truth," as well as his low view of its veracity. I certainly could not endorse the positions taken within the book, but I could recommend it for observing how certain contemporary Roman Catholics are doing hermeneutics.

Ray Lubeck
Multnomah Bible College, Portland, OR

A Witness Forever: Ancient Israel's Perception of Literature and the Resultant Hebrew Bible. By Isaac Rabinowitz. Edited with afterwords by Ross Brann and David I. Owen. Bethesda: CDL, 1993, xvii + 148 pp., \$20.00.

Every so often one encounters a book that raises questions one has never contemplated before. This little posthumously published volume is such a book. The author's aim is to "describe and exemplify the beliefs and assumptions involved in ancient Israel's perception of literature" and to explain the phenomenon of Scripture, specifically the OT, in the light of these assumptions. In the first two chapters Rabinowitz analyzes the nature and power of words in ancient Israel and the implications of these perceptions of spoken words for the composition and function of written words (i.e. texts). In chaps. 3–4 he examines a series of rhetorical and textual anomalies (words as future historical realities, words directed to insentient addressees, hopes expressed as accomplished actualities, reading as a means of effecting "booked realities," evidences of editorial involvement in the text, etc.) that characterize Biblical writings. Chapters 5–6 explore two specific higher-critical issues: the nature, contents and purpose of *The Book of the Upright* (*sēper hayyāšār*), and the intentional literary cohesion of the canonical Hebrew Scriptures. The book concludes with a bibliography of works cited, index (subject and Biblical reference), bibliography of publications by Rabinowitz, and appreciative tributes by Owen and Brann.

At a time when Biblical studies are being driven more and more by the subjective agendas of its readers, it is refreshing to find an exploration of the OT on its own terms. Rabinowitz insists that so long as we treat this collection of sacred writings through western cultural assumptions and expectations we will fail to understand its nature and its content. For example, he argues that to the ancients words were not merely symbolic vehicles through which people communicated ideas and feelings; they represented the concentrated essences of actual or imagined realities. To speak a word

is to create a reality. Unlike some, the author—correctly in my view—falls short of attributing the power to the word itself, placing the emphasis rather on the power of the one who speaks. Whenever a text is read, the reality announced by the word is actualized, which accounts for the special nature of Scripture and the way in which the ancients handled Biblical writings.

On the whole Rabinowitz' thesis is convincing, though occasionally his specific comments are somewhat misleading. For example, while he correctly avers that oracles addressed to foreign nations probably never reached their declared addressees, his statement that "a prophet's speech did not require an audience at all" (p. 55) is patently false. While Ezekiel is specifically commanded to turn his face toward insentient audiences (the mountains of Israel, Tyre, Egypt, etc.), his real audience is made up of his fellow exiles. His rhetorical aim is not to effect change in the declared addressee but in the hearts of his countrymen. They were his real audience. On the other hand, Rabinowitz raises many intriguing new questions. If *The Book of the Upright* was a recognized collection of writings in existence in Joshua's and David's times, what is its relationship to the Pentateuch? Could this be the original Mosaic core (the so-called P source)? If Isa 8:16 calls upon Isaiah's disciples to bind up the "testimony" and to seal the "law," documents that he suggests date to the Solomonic period, could this be a reference to some form of the Tetrateuch and Deuteronomy respectively?

This is a fascinating study, well organized, well written, and well edited (except for an erroneous reference to the Book of David instead of Book of Daniel, p. 119). I commend it to all who seek to interpret the OT from the inside out.

Daniel I. Block
Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, KY

Helpmates, Harlots, and Heroes: Women's Stories in the Hebrew Bible. By Alice Ogden Bellis. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1994, 281 pp., \$19.99 paper.

This introduction to feminist and womanist (African-American feminist) approaches to Scripture and its subsequent survey of literature about women in the Hebrew Bible begins by asserting that the stories of women in the Bible influence the way women think of themselves as well as how men perceive them. Since the Hebrew Scriptures were written in an androcentric and patriarchal culture, many of its stories about women are negative in nature and have been used to justify the oppression of women. The purpose of Bellis' book is to retell these stories so that they become tools in women's "struggle for wholeness and dignity."

The introductory chapter provides a brief, helpful survey of the history of feminist studies of the Hebrew Scriptures and the various methods used by feminist interpreters. The following chapters discuss the stories of specific women in the OT. One whole chapter focuses on Eve. Subsequent ones discuss a plethora of women, including Sarah, Shiphrah and Puah (the midwives who delivered Moses), Abigail, Jezebel, "Wisdom" and even the woman in the Song of Songs. The scholars cited use a variety of hermeneutical approaches, including literary, sociological and anthropological methods. The book's conclusion outlines what can be learned from the stories of women in the Hebrew Scriptures and stresses the health of using a multiplicity of interpretive methods.

The strength of this work is that it highlights the patriarchal nature of the world in which the OT was written and demonstrates how that culture could and did violate

its women. It also gives a glimpse of how men have traditionally interpreted stories about women in the Scriptures and how insensitive or frightening those interpretations can be to modern female readers.

The evangelical interpreter will have difficulty with the assertions of many of the authors cited: Some feminist writers prefer to fill in the gaps of the text, resulting in conclusions that are based more on conjecture and assumption than on the data of the text itself. Furthermore Bellis assumes that any woman portrayed in a negative light has been unfairly treated by the Biblical redactors. She states, for example, that Jezebel cannot have been truly as evil as she is portrayed in the text. In spite of these differences with traditional evangelical interpretation, the perspectives offered are valuable and deserve a reading.

This book is a helpful introduction to feminist approaches to Scripture, and it serves as a convenient survey of modern discussions concerning the women in the OT. It will not replace the classics of feminist hermeneutics, but it is not intended to do so.

Joyce Miriam Brooks
Biola University, La Mirada, CA

An Introduction to the Historical Books of the Old Testament. By Robert L. Cate. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1994, xii + 175 pp., \$16.99.

Teachers of undergraduate courses in the historical books of the OT will welcome and be helped by this attractive, readable, and pedagogically sound introduction to that part of the Bible. Following the order and format of the so-called Protestant canon, Cate provides basic information on each of the twelve books including background (canonicity, authorship, date, etc.), a glossary of terms, an outline, a summary of contents, the distinctive theological message, character studies, questions for review and reflection and brief select bibliographies. He writes in a lucid, engaging style, one that is certain to capture and sustain the interest of even those to whom the historical books of the OT have held little fascination.

The author clearly embraces a high view of Scripture and a respect for the historical factuality of the OT. He does appear to make some concessions to historical-critical views when, for example, he cites Israel's easy access to Shechem under Joshua as evidence for an earlier, pre-Mosaic exodus (p. 20). This ties in to his advocacy of a late (13th-century) exodus, one involving massive physical destruction (p. 21). Both the date and the interpretation of the aftermath of the conquest are at odds with the Biblical evidence itself (see, respectively, 1 Kgs 6:1; Josh 24:13).

Perhaps more serious are errors of fact and/or failure to consider more than one option. The following are only the more glaring examples: (1) "Hagiographa" means "sacred writings," not "wise writings" (p. 46); (2) the marriage of Ruth and Boaz is probably not an example of Levirate marriage (p. 50; cf. R. L. Hubbard, Jr., *The Book of Ruth*, pp. 50–51); (3) the "band of prophets" (p. 62) is not to be viewed as a typical ancient Near Eastern group of ecstasies but as Samuel's own disciples (cf. 1 Sam 19:20); (4) the "succession narrative" is usually thought to begin at 2 Sam 9:1, not at 23:1 (pp. 80, 82); (5) the length of Saul's reign is 40 years, not 20 (p. 88, cf. Acts 13:21; 2 Sam 2:8–11 and its implications); (6) Solomon reigned 40 years, not 30 (p. 88, cf. 1 Kgs 11:42). Unfortunately, the book is marred by many typographical errors as well.

These caveats notwithstanding, Cate has produced a work that will prove to be of great benefit to undergraduate students and informed laypeople. Those interested in

the same subject at a more advanced level will want to acquire D. M. Howard, Jr., *An Introduction to the Old Testament Historical Books* (Chicago: Moody, 1993).

Eugene H. Merrill
Dallas Theological Seminary, Dallas, TX

Achaemenid Imperial Administration in Syria-Palestine and the Missions of Ezra and Nehemiah. By Kenneth G. Hoglund. SBLDS 125. Atlanta: Scholars, 1992, xii + 275 pp., \$44.95/\$29.95.

Hoglund's volume presents groundbreaking research that goes a long way toward making sense of the perplexing Biblical literature that has come down to us from the time of the Persian (i.e. Achaemenid) empire. The book attempts (successfully, I think) to press forward the major reassessment of the Persian period advanced in E. and C. Meyers' superb 1987 Anchor Bible volume on Haggai and Zechariah 1-8. As might be expected of a Meyers protégé, Hoglund makes ample use of Biblical, historical and archeological data in supporting his theses.

Hoglund's major thesis is that the missions of Ezra and Nehemiah ought to be understood as expressions of the strategically important Persian policy of securing the Levantine frontier against the threat of Greek incursions. In the history of scholarship, OT references to the Greeks have often been taken as evidence of very late authorship, as though the Greeks had little to do with Syria-Palestine until the conquests of Alexander the Great in 331 BC. One of the virtues of Hoglund's work is his synthesis of classical, Biblical and archeological sources in building a case for extensive Greek influence, especially geopolitical interests along the western Persian frontier, including Syria-Palestine, through the first half of the fifth century. The missions of Ezra and Nehemiah can now be seen as expressions of the (quite rational) Persian policy of containment against Greek expansionism. One of the implications of Hoglund's work is that the references to the Greeks in the prophetic literature, found in Zech 9:13 and Joel 3:6, can be confidently placed in this period as evangelical scholars have long maintained, and not in the late fourth century as historical critics have often supposed.

Ezra and Nehemiah have sometimes been interpreted as only tangentially related to Persian interests, an approach that Hoglund says we must abandon. Nor may we follow those who read Ezra and Nehemiah as Persian puppets, or Nehemiah as a petty tyrant. Nor may we follow those who seem to invent new data out of whole cloth. Hoglund successfully argues against radical proposals by J. Morgenstern, A. Alt, M. Noth and M. Smith.

What evidence does the author present for a Greek geopolitical threat to Persian security in the first half of the fifth century? This section of the book is perhaps its most intriguing. Here Hoglund meticulously reconstructs the tangled history of military and diplomatic struggles between the Persian empire and the Athens-led Delian league. The principal episode of this reconstruction is the Egyptian revolt against the Persians led by the Libyan chieftain Inaros in 464-454 BC. Hoglund's work clarifies the geopolitical interests of the Delian league: It aimed not only to force the Persians out of Egypt but also to wrest control of the eastern Mediterranean from them.

A significant aspect of the research, reflecting a great deal of hard labor, is Hoglund's synthesis of archeological materials from many sites in the southern Levant. This material includes some excavated sites but is otherwise dependent on surface surveys. It also involves a new typology of fortifications and some redating of the sites.

Thus it is a tentative proposal that invites testing by other researchers. The pattern suggests, however, that in the mid-fifth century the Persians built a string of fortifications along the heights overlooking major road systems of the Levant. These fortifications feature a similar square architecture and, as known from the excavated sites, were abandoned not long after they were built. Høglund proposes that this evidence can be best explained as Persia's response to a temporary threat of incursion from the Mediterranean. Once the threat ended, the garrisons could be safely abandoned.

It was this temporary Greek threat that provided the geopolitical rationale for the Persians' interest in Jerusalem. Ezra's mission of 458 BC reasserted Torah as the law of the land and thus encouraged Jewish loyalty to the empire. In Høglund's analysis Ezra and Nehemiah's reforms regarding marriage with non-Jews reflect a Persian policy of tying resettled peoples to the land of their resettlement. This reflects a revision of J. P. Weinberg's "citizen-temple community" hypothesis, in which the right to occupy the land was tied to ethnicity and membership in the temple citizenry. For Høglund, imperial administration depended upon clear ethnic identifiability of the resettled peoples in their assigned territories. This accounts for the Jewish complaint that "we are slaves in the land you gave to our ancestors" (Neh 9:36). Hence, he suggests, intermarriage threatened the imperial administrative policy for the region. The tightening of Persian control that appears in the archeological remains of the Levantine fortresses comports well with Nehemiah's work of fortifying and garrisoning Jerusalem in 445 BC, as well as with his other reforms. But far from serving merely as Persian collaborators or petty tyrants, Høglund argues that Ezra and Nehemiah created the conditions whereby subsequent generations of Jews could survive with both their ethnicity and their religious identity intact.

Høglund's work is a major new synthesis embodying a number of significant proposals. This research merits careful attention and further testing from specialists in the fields of archeology, postexilic Biblical history and the study of the Persian empire.

Byron G. Curtis
Geneva College, Beaver Falls, PA

A Hermeneutic of Curiosity and Readings of Psalm 61. By W. H. Bellinger, Jr. Macon: Mercer University, 1995, 151 pp., \$20.00.

The "hermeneutic of curiosity" is Bellinger's way of saying that "we give up the notion that there is one unitary meaning for a text and the optimism that we can determine that meaning. Texts generate multiple readings. . . . Texts have various levels of meaning or layers to reveal. The call is to accept the pluralism of results in the interpretive task" (p. 7). So he first traces the history of interpretation with special emphasis on the novel and current schools: new criticism, structuralism and post-structuralism, which includes deconstruction and reader-response criticism.

The succeeding chapters take up the subjects of form, setting, canon, rhetoric, readers and theology. Psalm 61's twelve verses are viewed from all these perspectives with intense and sometimes repetitive scrutiny. For example, we read five times in three pages that this psalm is a prayer for protection (pp. 53–55).

Bellinger gives evidence that he has done an enormous amount of reading about hermeneutics in general and about Psalm 61 in particular. The book serves almost as a survey of scholars and their positions on matters related to hermeneutics. There are copious footnotes, and the bibliography (pp. 133–148) contains about 300 entries. This is the strength of the book. It is not that we need to know that Psalm 61 is

in the trouble and trust category and is in fact a prime illustration of that genre, but how this psalm and any psalm, or any part of Scripture for that matter, can be and should be viewed from many angles. Bellinger provides an outline of the kind of questions a serious Bible student should ask of the text. For those accustomed to asking only one set of questions the book is a reminder that there are other riches to be mined from the Bible. His message is that we engage in "methodological pluralism" (p. 5) without being prejudiced for or against any of them simply because they have been abused.

The book might serve as collateral reading in a seminary course on OT hermeneutics. It is a technical book and probably beyond all but the most earnest of lay students of the Bible.

Robert L. Alden
Denver Seminary, Denver, CO

The Message of the Song of Songs: The Lyrics of Love. By Tom Gledhill. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1994, 254 pp., \$12.99 paper. *The Song of Songs: A Continental Commentary.* By Othmar Keel. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994, ix + 308 pp., \$29.95.

These two additions to the vast bibliography on the Song of Songs come from very different scholarly contexts and theological traditions and yet are surprisingly close in their actual work on the text itself.

Gledhill's book on the Song reflects both a careful concern for a systematic approach to his subject matter and a pastor's heart for the practical day-to-day relevance of the lessons learned from the ancient text.

In a short (20-page) "Orientation to the Song" Gledhill touches briefly on questions of canonicity, the role of King Solomon, vocabulary, poetic genre, God and sexuality, allegory, and the question of the morality of the Song. He concludes that the two lovers in the Song are not "real people" but are "typical of all men and women in love" and that the Song does not have a cohesive story line moving toward a resolution but is rather a series of six cycles of poems that repeat common motifs and themes, rather like a series of paintings in an artist's retrospective. Gledhill has much of interest to say here, although I find his position a little too open-ended to be entirely satisfactory.

Part 1 is a three-stage overview of the Song: (1) a prose summary of each of the 42 subsections Gledhill identifies in the text, (2) a 14-page "Literal Translation," and (3) a 25-page "Free Paraphrase" that unpacks some of the possibilities in the more difficult passages.

Part 2 is a unit-by-unit examination of the text. Gledhill gives careful attention to the often extremely difficult problems of teasing out the meaning of passages where vocabulary and grammar are far from clear. His treatment of the text is extensive enough to open up the poems, but he does not get bogged down in incomprehensible detail. As I noted above, he is always aware of the larger issues of how these individual passages illuminate the present-day concerns of pastors and parishioners alike. Gledhill has a real love for the poetic literature of the western tradition and sprinkles his comments with illuminating excerpts from Aristotle to Donne to Milton to Shakespeare to Tennyson, as well as dozens of others. His contribution should find wide acceptance in classes and study groups for adolescents and young adults.

Keel's book is the latest in the series of European (primarily German) commentaries that Fortress is presenting to English-speaking audiences. Like others in the series it reflects the current state of continental scholarship and opinion. His approach is

“to pay equal attention to the form and content of the songs with indirect reference to the Hebrew text” (p. viii). That approach is both the strength and the weakness of the commentary.

The introduction is a very valuable treatment of the literary and formal structures of ancient Near Eastern love poetry. A unit on the history and development of allegorical and typological interpretation is followed by one on the dramatic theory in which Keel rejects the idea that there is any overall formal structure to the Song. But he is forthright about the formal elements in the individual poems. Twenty-seven pages are devoted to examining themes and metaphors from Egyptian and Sumerian love poetry and sacred marriage rituals. The section on pp. 26–30 should be required reading for anyone caught up in the current craze to deconstruct ancient texts. It is a healthy antidote.

In the body of the commentary Keel identifies 43 individual poems that have been collected and edited into the current Song. He treats each unit as an isolated entity, linked to its context in the Song by a catchword or motif shared with surrounding units. Each section begins with Keel’s translation of the text. This is followed by an analysis that seeks to describe the limits of the passage and how it relates to its context and that moves easily into the commentary proper. About a quarter of the units have a concluding section (“Purpose and Thrust”), which summarizes the ideas in the unit.

The commentary contains a wealth of linguistic and literary information drawn from the ancient literature. Much of it is interesting in its own right, but I frequently found myself asking, “Does this really have anything to do with this passage?” Nevertheless the treatment is thorough and of great value in shedding light on the text. I have just one serious caveat. In these days of Polaroid, easy scanning and digital imaging, is it really necessary to use 158 black-and-white line drawings, many of which are rather poorly done, to illustrate the text?

Both of these books, different though they are, deserve a place in the library of any serious student of the Song. Gledhill particularly will be of immense value to the pastor who confronts the contemporary world every day.

G. Lloyd Carr
Gordon College, Wenham, MA

Wisdom and Creation: The Theology of Wisdom Literature. By Leo G. Perdue. Nashville: Abingdon, 1994, 420 pp., \$21.95 paper.

The place of wisdom literature in OT theology has not been an easy question to address. Wisdom literature seems to neglect the prominent themes of salvation history and the Sinai covenant. Perdue’s book is a major attempt to address the relationship of wisdom literature to the rest of the OT by setting forth a comprehensive exposition of wisdom theology. Acknowledging his debt to Zimmerli, Perdue proposes that creation theology is at the heart of the sages’ understanding of the world. Creation integrates all other dimensions of God-talk. Perdue attempts to demonstrate this thesis by using the paradigm of metaphor and imagination to interpret Proverbs, Job, Ecclesiastes, Ben Sira and the Wisdom of Solomon.

After a helpful chapter that summarizes the various approaches to wisdom literature in relation to OT theology, Perdue lays the theoretical foundation to his own approach by discussing the nature of metaphor and imagination. He argues that the sages used imagination to construct new worldviews. Traditional metaphors became de-

stabilized and then were transformed, leading to worldviews that were different than the ones they had received in the tradition (restabilization).

Perdue is to be commended for tackling the relationship of wisdom literature to OT theology. A major accomplishment of the book is the comprehensive view of wisdom theology that it sets forth. Avoiding the secular/religious dichotomy found in many approaches to wisdom literature, he makes a good case for seeing creation and anthropology as the basis for the sages' understanding of the world.

There are some problems, however, in Perdue's analysis. First, unwarranted theological tensions are thought to exist between wisdom literature and the early chapters of the Bible (the Yahwist). Universal depravity is set over against the more traditional Israelite view of humans made in the image of God. Second, there is too much dependence on ancient Near Eastern mythological traditions without enough emphasis on the differences of those traditions from Israel's worldview. For example, Woman Wisdom in Proverbs is represented as a fertility goddess, and those who look through the windows (Qoh 12:3) are fertility priestesses encased in darkness. Third, although interaction with tradition may produce transformed worldviews, the stabilizing role of tradition is not given its due. The end of Job and the epilogue to Ecclesiastes reinforce traditional wisdom teaching.

Richard P. Belcher, Jr.
Reformed Theological Seminary, Charlotte, NC

Prophecy and the Apocalyptic Dream: Protest and Promise. By D. S. Russell. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994, 136 pp.

Russell has a well-deserved reputation as an expert in apocalyptic studies. Previous publications of his in this field have become classics, as should his recent *Divine Disclosure* (Fortress, 1992). It is an excellent laymen's introduction to the subject.

Unfortunately the book under review falls short of the fine standard set by its predecessors. It is intended to be a popular guide to appropriating the message of apocalyptic literature. It is an attempt to salvage a word to moderns from the excesses of both literalists and critical scholars. Russell assures the reader that though the details of any particular apocalypse are ultimately unimportant the message of hope they communicate remains valid and inspiring in our own generation.

The book is divided into four chapters. The first two offer a brief but useful introduction to the origin, worldview, and mythological expression of apocalyptic literature. The third chapter chronicles millennialism in the history of the Church and warns against the dangers of too literal an exegesis. Finally Russell outlines in the fourth chapter his own, mostly historical-critical hermeneutic (based rather unconvincingly on the use of the OT in the NT) and offers the "demythologized" message of apocalyptic literature: God is sovereign, evil is endemic to the cosmos but will be overcome, the end is near, the kingdom is coming.

Despite its admirable intentions the book suffers some glaring shortcomings. First, it is not clear from which apocalypses Russell seeks contemporary significance. I was continually confused as to whether he makes a substantive distinction between canonical and extracanonical apocalypses—that is, whether he understands both kinds to be equally authoritative. Second, while Russell acknowledges the existence of a variety of literalist approaches he focuses his critique of literalism virtually exclusively on popular Bible teachers rather than reputable literalist scholars. Russell thus leaves the reader with the impression that the only hermeneutical options are Hal Lindsey's

ultraliteralism or his own more metaphorical procedure. He writes as if there are no literalist scholars who try to take into account the nature of apocalyptic literature generally or the sociopolitical contexts of certain apocalypses specifically. In fairness to Russell, his is a popular book addressing what is probably the view of a majority of his intended readers (certainly the view he finds most frightening and thus most urgently in need of response), but he does both the reader and evangelical scholarship a disservice by homogenizing all literalist viewpoints.

The chief problem with the book, however, is that Russell never actually does what he sets out to do—namely, recover the modern relevance of (Biblical?) apocalypses. He uses the major portion of his work to explain the content and style of (and what not to believe about) apocalyptic literature but does not finally provide a rationale for acceptance of the underlying message that he perceives in these books.

Russell's book is ultimately disappointing. He has written better introductions to apocalyptic literature. It remains for him to write a plausible defense of what he sees as its modern relevance.

Alan Hultberg
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

The Prophecy of Isaiah. An Introduction and Commentary. By J. Alec Motyer. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1993, 544 pp., \$29.99.

It is not often that a reader must wait thirty years for a promised volume to appear, but perhaps like Isaiah, who waited a long time before his prophecies came to fruition, the author's motive was to teach patient anticipation. This commentary is a thoroughly evangelical presentation of the book of Isaiah, an increasingly difficult task in the field of Isaianic studies, for which Motyer deserves commendation. He discusses how Isaiah illustrates God's dealings with the nation of Israel, including both punishment and restoration, to the people of the late-eighth and early-seventh centuries BC. Motyer believes that the second part of the book of Isaiah refers to the return from the exile, which initiates a time of restoration but also reaches far beyond it to a future restoration. The book is clearly written, and the author makes a conscious effort to apply Biblical concepts to life when possible. He also includes helpful word studies and particulars, especially in difficult passages (e.g. 3:17, *šāpā*; 4:5, *bārā*²; 36:1–37:7; 52:13–53:12). Motyer has attempted to combine a literary approach with a more historical-critical approach, which at times effectively highlights the structure of the book (e.g. 1:21–26; 7:1–17; 19:1–20:6).

It is this last strength, however, that also gives rise to one of my sharpest criticisms, in that there are points at which the literary connections or structure are forced (e.g. 1:27–31; 6:1–13; 7:18–8:8). Some difficulties may have arisen because of the unusual way he has divided part of the book: chaps. 1–37 (instead of 1–40); chaps. 1–5 (instead of 2–4); chaps. 6–12 (instead of 5–12); 7:1–17 and 7:18–8:8 (instead of chaps. 7 and 8 as separate oracles referring to the same time period); 9:8[7]–11:16. Motyer has also apparently missed some important literary elements, such as: (1) Isaiah 1 as the introduction to the book (which is indicated by the second heading in 2:1); (2) the envelope or *inclusio* pattern of Isaiah 2–4 (he appears to recognize this structure on p. 52, but it is not clear why he adds Isaiah 5 to this unit); and (3) Isaiah 5–12, which I believe has a chiasmic structure highlighting the Isaianic Memoir at the center (6:1–9:7 [MT 9:6]). Therefore it seems to me that one of the expected strengths of the book (i.e. an examination of the literary structure of the book) needs significantly

more work. To be fair, it seems that the second part of his book fits the structure of Isaiah better (though I would like him to further evaluate Isa 57:21 to determine whether the refrain "There is no peace," says my God, "for the wicked" should be reflected in the structure; cf. 48:22).

Another weakness is the lack of a Hebrew translation and textual notes. Motyer often corrects or evaluates the NIV translation in the text or in footnotes, which are difficult to follow (e.g. pp. 435 nn. 1, 3, 4; 436 n. 1; 441 nn. 2, 3). This book could (and should) have been edited down so as to include a translation and textual notes. There is much good description, but better synthesis of the material would have shortened its length.

The dearth of recent evangelical commentaries on the book of Isaiah is understandable, since the book is difficult and a healthy balance in interpreting it is hard to reach. I agree with Motyer that there is a great deal of work to be done before the last word has been written on the book of Isaiah. But Motyer's book fills a gap in Isaianic studies especially for chaps. 40–66 (it will be interesting to see how J. N. Oswalt's second volume on Isaiah will compare).

Paul D. Wegner
Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, IL

The Dead Sea Scrolls Today. By James C. VanderKam. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994, 208 pp., \$12.99 paper.

VanderKam begins his welcome addition to the current resurgence in Dead Sea scroll publications with a concise review of the discovery, acquisition of the textual materials, and archeological examination of the caves and nearby ruins (chap. 1). He includes here a helpful discussion of dating techniques with collaborative information from recent carbon-14 testing.

Chapter 2 provides a useful survey of the manuscripts themselves under three headings: Biblical, Apocryphal/Pseudepigraphal, and Others. The final category includes the texts that in VanderKam's estimation are characterized by the distinctive views of the Dead Sea (Qumran) community.

The identification of the group that collected, copied and in some cases penned the scrolls is discussed in chap. 3. VanderKam concludes: "Many strong arguments point to the residents of Qumran being Essenes, and no certain points tell against the identification" (p. 92). L. H. Schiffman's Sadducean hypothesis and N. Golb's theory of Jerusalem origin are examined and dismissed.

The history and theology of the Qumran Essenes are discussed in chap. 4. Historically, VanderKam places the origin of the sect at around 150 BC. Following J. T. Milik he suggests the possibility that the Teacher of Righteousness may have been the high priest between 159 and 152 (1 Maccabees 10), ousted by Jonathan, brother of Judas Maccabee, first of the Hasmonean high priests. Such a scenario, although lacking definitive proof, would provide the impetus for the Teacher's self-imposed exile. Theologically, VanderKam notes that the sect held beliefs that separately became keynotes of both Christianity (eschatological/messianic fervor) and rabbinic Judaism (covenantal conduct).

Chapter 5 examines the text and canon of the HB in light of the Qumran finds. E. Tov's original estimate that 60% of the more than 200 Biblical manuscripts are proto-Masoretic has here been downsized to 40% (in agreement with Tov's current, although yet unpublished, conclusions), while nonaligned texts have been increased

from 10% to 25%. Manuscripts exhibiting Qumran “translation” characteristics account for 25% of the texts and can be shown to have had a proto-Masoretic exemplar. Evidence for canon is discussed at some length, and a helpful table of OT books quoted as authorities is presented. I might suggest that a list of Qumran Biblical manuscripts would be a welcome addition to this table (see p. 30). It might also be helpful if conclusions concerning the canon made in chap. 2—the Qumran canon likely lacked the book of Esther—were summarized in chap. 5 as well. The chapter ends with an interesting discussion of possible inclusions to the Qumran canon, suggesting *1 Enoch* as a most likely candidate.

Parallels between the scrolls and the NT are discussed in chap. 6, concluding that the “Qumranites and the early Christians . . . were children of a common parent tradition in Judaism” (p. 162). The various family resemblances are examined.

The final chapter is an overview of the controversies concerning publishing and access. A more detailed and spellbinding account is given by E. Cook, *Solving the Mysteries of the Dead Sea Scrolls*.

VanderKam’s book is ideally suited for classroom use in any college or seminary course discussing the background or foundation of the NT. Although a complete topical index is included, it is unfortunate that Eerdmans did not provide a reference index. Besides the minor points mentioned, the work fulfills the expectations of an introduction and can be recommended without reservation.

Martin G. Abegg, Jr.
Trinity Western University, Langley, BC

Solving the Mysteries of the Dead Sea Scrolls: New Light on the Bible. By Edward M. Cook. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994, 181 pp., \$12.99 paper.

Cook’s introduction to the Dead Sea scrolls is the first in a continuing stream of books spawned by the recent freedom of access to previously unavailable textual materials from Qumran. The first half of the book (chaps. 1–4) is a compelling account of the history of the find with all of the intrigue and suspense of the story’s made-for-Hollywood cast and script well in place. Chapter 4 brings the account of the delay of publication to its conclusion in the fall of 1991 when, as reconstructed texts and photographic plates became available from unauthorized sources, the Israel Antiquities Authority agreed to end what had effectively been a research monopoly. Cook has personally interviewed many of the participants in the most recent events and thus provides factual information that is not available elsewhere.

The second half of the book forms an introduction to the scrolls themselves and what their contents relate to us concerning the Jewish sect that collected, copied, and in some cases authored the scrolls (chaps. 5–6). Cook examines the various theories concerning the identity of this community and concludes that “it is possible, even likely, that we don’t have all the information needed to identify the sect beyond the shadow of a doubt” (p. 101). Chapter 7 examines the Dead Sea material in light of the frequent claims made concerning its relationship to first-century Christianity. Of special interest are the critical discussions of the wildly idiosyncratic but, at the popular level, highly influential views of R. Eisenman and B. Thiering. Cook also examines and rightly denies the claim made by papyrologist J. O’Callaghan and more recently C. P. Thiede that the gospel of Mark is among the scroll remains. Chapter 8 includes a helpful survey of messianic issues, useful to those who would seek to understand Jewish expectations extant at the time of Jesus’ ministry. An appendix completes the

study, offering a short assessment of Qumran Biblical manuscripts and how they affect issues such as text-critical studies and canonicity of the OT.

Cook's contribution is a welcome and highly readable introduction, suitable for both the interested lay reader and college or seminary classroom. An index of references would have been helpful to allow the user access to Cook's informed comments concerning various manuscripts. I also sensed that the author was under imposed size limitations. We would look forward to an expanded revision allowing Cook a hearing for his ongoing research in scroll texts.

Martin G. Abegg, Jr.
Trinity Western University, Langley, BC

Dictionary of Paul and His Letters. Edited by Gerald F. Hawthorne, Ralph P. Martin and Daniel G. Reid. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1993, xxix + 1038 pp., \$37.99.

The dictionary under review lives up to its billing as "a one-of-a-kind reference work." With its companion volume, *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, InterVarsity Press has attained a publishing landmark in producing a set of reference works that will serve the Church well as reliable guides for interpreting the gospels and the Pauline epistles for many years down the road.

This is a thousand-page volume with more than two hundred substantive entries written by more than a hundred contributors. It provides not only detailed introductions to each of the letters but also numerous entries on theological themes and historical background matters. What sets it apart from other Bible dictionaries is the unique focus on Paul and the meatier content of each of the entries.

Readers will find that the designation "dictionary" may not be the most appropriate description of the contents of this volume, which is more a collection of essays on key themes in Pauline studies that summarize and interact with current scholarship. Thus one must take seriously the subtitle: *A Compendium of Contemporary Biblical Scholarship*. The scholarly bent of the dictionary does not narrow its usability only to scholars and professors. It is quite readable for the nonspecialist and is the kind of volume that would be a great resource for teachers of adult Sunday-school classes. The value of the dictionary is precisely in the fact that it makes top scholarship on Paul accessible to laypeople.

In light of modern critical scholarship's suggestion that Paul only wrote seven letters and that Ephesians, Colossians, 2 Thessalonians and the pastorals reflect a post-Pauline situation and theology, it is foundational to ask what constitutes "Paul" for this work. It is refreshing to see that, in contrast to mainline critical scholarship, "Paul" means all thirteen letters for most of the contributors. Each of the authors who wrote the introductory pieces on the so-called disputed letters argues for their authenticity and for their rightful place as primary source material for developing a full Pauline theology. Similarly the various entries on theological themes incorporate the testimony of the disputed letters.

The three editors of the volume did a good job of ensuring a fair amount of internal consistency among the articles. This does not mean, however, that each of the contributors agrees on all the major issues. One will find disagreement, for example, on interpretive issues such as Paul and the law (there are advocates of some form of the "new perspective" [e.g. F. Thielman] and proponents of the traditional view [e.g. T. Schreiner]) and the old issue of expiation (J. Gundry-Volf) versus propitiation (L. Morris) in Rom 3:25. The generally conservative approach taken by the various

writers leaves no doubt that this is an evangelical work. There is also a surprising degree of consistency on such matters as the level of readability, style, and the amount of scholarly interaction. The editors can also be commended for ensuring that the entries did not become a platform for idiosyncratic or eccentric exegesis. Each of the entries provides a good summary of the scholarly debate with good, sober-minded analysis and judgments.

There is a handful of superb entries that I would recommend as starting points for the reader of the dictionary. For a general introduction to Paul, the reader should begin with "Paul in Acts and Letters" by F. F. Bruce. This should be followed by reading "Paul and His Interpreters" by S. J. Hafemann, who has done an excellent job of summarizing the interpretation of Paul's letters. On the background and formative influences to Paul's thought I would recommend three entries: "Jew, Paul the" (W. R. Stegner), "Jesus and Paul" (J. M. G. Barclay) and "Jesus, Sayings of" (S. Kim). Finally the entry on "Mission" by W. P. Bowers is also an excellent foundational article describing the activity and passion of the apostle Paul.

The dictionary contains a wide variety of entries that makes it particularly useful for providing information that is normally accessed through a number of different sources (such as commentaries, NT introductions, histories, etc.). It will help the reader to think of the different categories of information that can be gleaned from the dictionary: (1) traditional introductions to the various letters (e.g. "Romans, Letter to the"; "Corinthians, Letters to the"); (2) Pauline theology (e.g. "Justification"; "Christology"; "Redemption"); (3) historical background (e.g. "Athens"; "Citizenship"; "Diaspora"; "Religions, Greco-Roman"); (4) methodological issues (e.g. "Rhetorical Criticism"; "Social-Scientific Approaches to Paul"); (5) people (e.g. "Apollos"; "Barnabas").

As with any dictionary, there are some very helpful and interesting essays that may not be discovered by the typical reader because of the unique or specialized nature of the subject matter. In this category I would mention five outstanding entries: "Pastor, Paul as" (P. Beasley-Murray), "Paul in Early Church Tradition" (J. R. Michaels), "Preaching From Paul Today" (S. Greidanus), "Psychology" (J. K. Chamblin), "Spirituality" (R. P. Meye).

One feature that makes the dictionary even more user-friendly is the comprehensive Scripture and subject indices.

There are a few entries that one would wish to find that actually do not appear in the volume. I was surprised, for instance, not to find an entry on "Tarsus." Paul's background in Tarsus is covered, however, in a couple of different entries. Still, a separate entry on Tarsus would have been appropriate. One will also not find an entry on "Boasting." A careful system of cross-referencing, however, will point the reader to seven other entries that touch on this topic. Some of the entries are too brief and do not adequately cover the scholarship on the theme (at least they are proportionately inconsistent with the bulk of the other entries). For instance, I would have wished for more in the entries on "Slave, Slavery," "New Nature and Old Nature," and "Rhetoric," to name a few.

The volume is a top-priority resource for anyone who engages in a study of one or more of Paul's letters. At our seminary we have begun requiring it for a core course in our M.A. and M.Div. curriculum on interpreting the epistolary literature. It has served the course well, and the students have been happy to invest in a book they know will serve them as a valuable resource in ministry in the years to come.

I would highly recommend the dictionary to pastors, Sunday-school teachers, and Bible-study leaders who are working through one or more of Paul's letters. For example, the person preparing a study of Phil 2:5-11 would find exceptional help in the entries on "Philippians," "Hymns, Hymn Fragments, Songs, Spiritual Songs," "Servant, Service," "Christology," "Pre-existence," "Death of Christ" and "Exaltation."

InterVarsity has made an extraordinary contribution to the Church with the publication of this dictionary and its predecessor. We all look forward to the third volume that will cover the rest of the NT and the apostolic fathers.

Clinton E. Arnold
Talbot School of Theology, La Mirada, CA

Paul: An Introduction to His Thought. By C. K. Barrett. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1994, xii + 180 pp., \$12.99 paper.

The appearance of this succinct, vigorous book on Paul by one of the premier NT scholars of the century is an event that no serious student of the NT can afford to overlook. Barrett writes with the pastor and layperson in mind, but, as with his well-known commentaries on Romans, the Corinthian letters and the pastorals, this book will also enlighten the seasoned scholar.

Barrett follows a carefully considered and noteworthy method. He maintains that Paul's theology was hammered out on the anvil of his missionary labors and refined in the fires of controversy. Because of this, a description of the apostle's thought should begin with what is known of his missionary labors and the controversy those labors entailed. Before turning to Paul's theology, then, Barrett spends two chapters on the apostle's career and the controversies he faced.

For those who have read Barrett's other works on Paul, these chapters contain no surprises. Barrett believes that only the seven undisputed letters can form a sure foundation for a description of Paul's thought and considers Acts to be more reliable in matters of chronology and geography than of theology. One Judaizing movement lies behind the trouble in Galatia, Corinth and Philippi, and Romans is, in part, Paul's answer to controversy over whether the gospel should go to the Gentiles only after the Jews have been successfully evangelized.

Paul's responses to all of these controversies, argues Barrett, focus on Christ alone: "*Solus Christus*, Christ alone, is the primary motto of Paul's theology, and most of the errors against which he fights can be regarded as in some form or other qualifications of that *solus*." Thus in Corinth Paul repudiates human wisdom, and in Galatia he abolishes the Mosaic law because his opponents allowed them to stand alongside Christ, and Christ must stand alone.

After setting the stage in this way, Barrett is ready to discuss in brief compass the standard themes of Pauline theology: evil, law, grace, righteousness, Christ crucified, the Church, the Holy Spirit, ethics. Barrett is fully aware of the "new perspective on Paul" but is also unimpressed by it. Paul's contrast between faith and works of the law is a contrast between trust in God's ability to justify the sinner and the sinner's attempt at self-justification. It is true that the OT contains grace, as did the Judaism of Paul's time, but the law was a matter mostly of doing, and it is easy to see how this might lead to doing the law as a means of self-justification. Barrett is also critical of the axiom that Paul is not a systematic theologian. It is, Barrett admits, better to treat Paul's theology thematically than systematically in recognition of the occasional nature of the apostle's correspondence. Nevertheless Paul does not react to his circumstances at random. He reacts on the basis of carefully considered principles and in dialogue with his Jewish and Hellenistic environment. If this is not the method of a systematic theologian, argues Barrett, it is hard to understand what is.

Barrett follows his study of Paul's theology with a chapter on how the disputed Pauline letters can both shed light on difficult problems in the undisputed letters and

demonstrate how Paul's thought was interpreted in later times. The authors of Colossians and Ephesians provided authentically Pauline responses to the problems they faced, while the authors of 2 Thessalonians and the pastorals were less successful at the task.

The book concludes with a few pages on the relevance of Paul to the modern theologian. Barrett identifies two basic elements of Paul's theology that remain crucial to the modern theological enterprise: It was polemical and dialectical. Since the theologian must describe what is beyond human power to describe, his or her task will always generate controversy about whether a particular description is accurate. And since the mark of a creative mind is that it is able to generate questions from within as well as respond to questions from the outside, good theology engages in debate with itself. Paul was a master at both polemical and dialectical theology, and modern theologians have much to learn from him.

Everybody will have their own idea about how a study of Paul's thought ought to look. Some will undoubtedly ask whether Barrett might have helped the uninitiated reader with a few notes to scholars like Bultmann, Goodspeed, Sanders and Beker. He certainly interacts with their positions but seldom cites them by name or their works by title. Some will be irritated by the constant cross-references to substantive matters whose discussion is reserved for a later section in the book. Those of us with a more conservative approach to introductory questions will wish that Barrett had found more of a place for the disputed letters in his description of Paul's theology.

Still, this remains a splendid book. Without ignoring recent advances in Pauline studies, Barrett offers a persuasive portrait of Paul as a consistent and brilliant thinker correctly understood by the Protestant Reformers. These days that is no small achievement.

Frank Thielman
Beeson Divinity School, Birmingham, AL

Paul's Narrative Thought World: The Tapestry of Tragedy and Triumph. By Ben Witherington, III. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1994, 373 pp., \$24.99 paper.

The volume under review is an exegete's systematic theology of Paul with a literary twist. As is often the case in this genre, the conclusions tend to be exegetically sound, but the system of organization appears to be complex and somewhat repetitive. Witherington seems to be developing the principle of holistic analysis that E. P. Sanders (*Paul and Palestinian Judaism*) has promoted and the emphasis on story or narrative (which was promoted years ago by A. Wilder as a further step in form criticism). Unlike Sanders, Witherington concludes that Paul affirms a "covenantal nomism" (p. 56).

For Witherington "story" is the narrating of events in oral and written form, and Paul's "narrative thought world" is "Paul's reflections on his symbolic universe in terms of the grand Story" (p. 6). The book has several parts to correspond with the four parts of Paul's story: the story of a world gone wrong (part 1), which refers to Adam and sin; the story of Israel in that world (part 2), which refers to Abraham and faith as the basis of the covenant and Moses as representative of the law; the story of Christ (parts 3-5), which includes the themes of grace and redemption, death and resurrection; and the story of Christians (part 6), which includes Paul's own story and the themes of sanctification or new creation and the future resurrection. Witherington seeks to show that Paul's arguments in specific texts are misread unless they are seen in light of Paul's larger story (e.g. p. 28).

Surprisingly, Witherington has quite an extensive section on wisdom and Jesus the sage (chap. 7). He seeks to navigate a middle river in the many streams of theological views. He bases his study on the letters the majority of scholars consider to be by Paul (eliminating Ephesians and the pastoral epistles), although he himself may allow for these letters to be by Paul or by a close associate (p. 6). He highlights the place of personalized wisdom in Jesus' and Paul's theology, although he does not take wisdom to be separate from God (chaps. 7–9). He thinks that Paul's foundational story of Christ is based more on the story of wisdom than of Israel, but he has a forceful apologetic for atonement (pp. 111, 116). He concludes that Paul's story is based on several pre-Pauline Christological hymns (Philippians 2; Colossians 1; 1 Thess 1:9–10), yet largely he takes Paul's words as his own. He decides that Paul or Luke insert certain words on Jesus' lips, yet he also insightfully harmonizes other events in Acts (pp. 223–224). He concludes that Paul teaches subordination in the Trinity (p. 203) and a creation order between men and women (p. 311), but he supports the view that believers are "all called to be ministers," including women (pp. 303, 305).

I would have appreciated a clearer organization of the exegesis and a subject index. Possibly the final diagram (p. 355) could have been presented at the beginning as well as the end, and the book's overall organization could have been unpacked more in detail in comparison to the diagram. At points I would also have appreciated a firmer stand for the Bible's reliability. I differed with a few exegetical conclusions. Witherington has more of a word game when he states that "Paul only occasionally speaks of suffering with Christ." Paul "shares" but does not "identify with" Christ's sufferings (p. 277). Rather than "nakedness" in 2 Cor 5:3 referring to an interim bodiless state (pp. 333–334), I think Paul more likely refers to the present mortal state with its difficulties.

I found insightful, however, his summary of the similarities of the teachings of Paul and Jesus (chap. 12), why Jesus had to die on the cross (chap. 13), the imagery of a king used for the *parousia* (p. 194), and the insight that Eph 5:18 should be read "let yourselves be filled" (not "become filled") with the Spirit (p. 285). He dramatically concludes that "Paul's vision and the stories he told" were true and are still "Good News" (p. 336). That is the overall effect with which he leaves the reader as well.

Aída Besançon Spencer

Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, South Hamilton, MA

Liberating Paul: The Justice of God and the Politics of the Apostle. By Neil Elliott. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1994, viii + 308 pp., \$18.95 paper.

The burden of this provocative book is that Christians have read Paul for centuries in ways that have encouraged the oppression of the poor but that the historical Paul stood against the politically oppressive powers of his time and advocated the cause of the disenfranchised. The book's title seeks to capture this twofold purpose: Elliott hopes that the book is both (1) an exercise in "liberating Paul" from the shackles of politically oppressive misinterpretation and (2) a portrait of the "liberating Paul" who preaches good news to the poor.

The book is divided into two parts that correspond to the twofold nature of the task. In the first, Elliott describes ways in which Paul's letters have been used to support various forms of oppression. He then attempts to explain how such perverse readings of Paul arose. Much of the blame lies with the six canonical Pauline pseudepigrapha, whose domestication of Paul's originally radical political convictions has contaminated the interpretation of the authentic Paul even among critical scholars. In more recent

times, and particularly since the Reformation, Paul's radical political convictions have been "mystified" to refer only to the justification of the individual before an angry God. Paul's letter to the Romans has received especially bad treatment at the hands of domesticating interpreters. They have shackled the letter's original argument against the oppression of Jews with a theology that casts the Jew as the enemy of the gospel.

In the book's second part, Elliott explains that the answer to these disastrous misreadings of Paul is to recognize the apocalyptic and political nature of Paul's letters. Paul understood the crucifixion as a symbol of the political oppression that God would eventually destroy and as God's call to stand with the poor against oppressive societal structures. Paul's letters reveal the political ramifications of these convictions. He advises the Thessalonians to withdraw from "the public frenzy of exploitation," the Corinthian privileged to stop abusing the poor in their midst, the Philipppians to govern their lives not by their earthly *politeuma* but by their heavenly one, and the Roman Gentile Christians to stand against the popular anti-Semitism of their culture. When the shackles of twenty centuries of theological "mystification" are thus removed from the apostle's letters, Elliott concludes, Paul becomes free to aid the liberation of the poor and oppressed in our own day.

Elliott has performed a valuable service for Christian Biblical scholars in reminding them that the use of the apostle in the suppression of the poor and disenfranchised is a perversion of his letters. Elliott's interpretations of Philemon, 1 Cor 7:21, and Rom 11:11–24; 14:1–15:13 in this light are historically plausible and theologically compelling. He has also issued a forthright and timely challenge to all Christians to make sure that their own political convictions are molded by the Bible's concern for the poor and not by the perverse use of the Bible among the poor's oppressors.

Despite these valuable qualities, the book argues for a number of improbabilities. Are we really to believe that Rom 1:27 refers not to God's punishment of sexually perverse behavior generally but the assassination of Caligula? That the author of Rom 3:21–26 only accepted the notion of Jesus' atoning death with reservations? That Paul's conversion was largely political in scope, moving Paul from a Niebuhresque realism to a radical opposition to the governing structures? Most improbable of all is the notion that the traditional Protestant interpretation of Paul's letters represents a perverse "mystification" of the apostle's theology. Such a thesis fails to explain Paul's focus on individual justification in Phil 3:7–11, a passage that Elliott does not discuss. It also fails to recognize the enormous energy on behalf of the poor and oppressed that the doctrine of justification by faith alone through God's grace alone, as classically interpreted, has released. Far from being an impractical "mystification" of Paul's theology, the classic Protestant understanding of Paul has empowered many down through the centuries to "accept one another just as Christ accepted [them], to the glory of God" (Rom 15:7). In light of the bad press that evangelical Christians often receive on social issues, perhaps that is a story that needs to be told again.

Frank Thielman
Beeson Divinity School, Birmingham, AL

Paul's Letter Collection: Tracing the Origins. By David Trobisch. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1994, 107 pp., \$10.00 paper.

The author's basic thesis is that Paul himself collected and edited some of his own letters. This Pauline collection/edition gave birth to the concept of a NT canon and prompted further development. Paul's first edition consisted of Romans 1–15, 1 and

2 Corinthians, and Galatians. The four epistles were to be read as a literary unit, and what is called Romans 16 is really a covering note for the Ephesian church.

The purpose of this collection was to provide Paul's view of the theological and practical views that were involved in the conflict between himself and certain people in Judea and Jerusalem who were opposed to his theology.

Trobisch has an interesting thesis and supports it in various ways, including the examination of existing NT manuscripts and the order in which they place the various epistles. He has also examined hundreds of ancient letters and studied the methods in which ancient writers collected and edited their work. He investigated over 200 letter collections from 300 BC to around AD 400 written by more than 100 authors comprising over 3,000 letters. In the very nature of the case his thesis is not ultimately provable, but it has interesting plausibility and may explain a number of phenomena that have long intrigued NT scholars. For example, Romans 16 is really addressed to the Ephesian Christians, and 1 and 2 Corinthians are composed of seven letters put together by Paul himself with his redactional notes. This is a good read.

Edwin A. Blum
Honolulu, HI

The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology. By N. T. Wright. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993, xiii + 316 pp., \$16.00 paper.

Wright's 1978 *Tyndale Bulletin* article, "The Paul of History and the Apostle of Faith," presaged many of the key components in the "new perspective" on Paul (before Sanders or Dunn had gotten on board). And his 1980 Oxford dissertation on Christology in Romans broke new ground in a number of categories. As these contributions might suggest, Wright has been particularly interested in Paul's theology and especially his Christology and his teaching on the law.

The present volume comprises fourteen essays on these subjects. They are each revised (some thoroughly, others only superficially) forms of or seminar papers published or delivered between 1978 and 1991. As a collection of essays, some only vaguely related to the professed themes of the volume, the book is difficult to describe or to review. Few will want to sit down and read it through from beginning to end. Most will be interested in specific essays as they relate to subjects of interest. This being the case, I take the liberty of listing the essays: "Christ, the Law, and 'Pauline Theology,'" "Adam, Israel and the Messiah," "ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ as 'Messiah' in Paul: Philemon 6," "Jesus Christ Is Lord: Philippians 2.5-11," "Poetry and Theology in Colossians 1.15-20," "Monotheism, Christology and Ethics: 1 Corinthians 8," "Curse and Covenant: Galatians 3.10-14," "The Seed and the Mediator: Galatians 3.15-20," "Reflected Glory: 2 Corinthians 3," "The Vindication of the Law: Narrative Analysis and Romans 8.1-11," "The Meaning of *περι ἁμαρτίας* in Romans 8.3," "Echoes of Cain in Romans 7," "Christ, the Law and the People of God: the Problem of Romans 9-11," "The Nature of Pauline Theology."

Even a superficial survey of so much diverse material is impossible. At the risk of making a tendentious choice, let me comment on three themes that emerge from the essays.

First, developing the central theme from his doctoral dissertation, Wright continues to explore the idea of Jesus as the Messiah of Israel who takes up into himself the story and fate of Israel. Jesus takes on himself the curse Israel deserved, and he fulfills the expectations of Israel's restoration by coming back to life again. This concept explains very nicely certain emphases and texts in Paul. We must question, however,

whether it is quite as dominant or basic to Paul's thought as Wright suggests. Additionally I wonder whether the concept of "story" that Wright uses here (and makes basic to his five-volume *magnum opus* on NT theology) is as basic to the NT as Wright seems to suggest.

A second theme worthy of note stems from this first one. If Christ takes up into himself the past and future of Israel, it is clear that there can be no future for Israel *qua* Israel. And this is just what Wright argues in his essay on Romans 9–11, taking what in these days is the very unpopular view that "all Israel" in Rom 11:26a comprises all (Jew and Gentile) who are redeemed. I do not think this interpretation works exegetically, but Wright makes a good case for the resulting theological coherence of Romans 9–11 and rightly chastises those at the other extreme from him who hold to some form of "bi-covenantal" theology.

Third, the law in Paul. Wright's advocacy of the "new approach" to Paul and the law comes through in a number of his essays. He stresses that Paul's polemic on this subject has to do with the problem of Israel's "national" righteousness and not with the "self"-righteousness that so many have found in Paul. This whole issue is too immense to speak to meaningfully here. Suffice it to say that I remain unconvinced that the "new approach" is able to offer satisfying exegeses of the bulk of Paul's texts on the issue. Indeed, if I might offer a general caveat about the tendency of these essays, it would be that I do not always find Wright's refreshing and stimulating theological arguments adequately buttressed by hard exegetical data. *Caveat emptor*: Beware of buying into the theological system before the exegetical underpinnings are carefully examined.

Douglas J. Moo
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

Paul's Letter to the Romans: A Commentary. By Peter Stuhlmacher. Translated by Scott J. Hafemann. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1994, xiii + 269 pp., n.p.

In a very brief treatment of introductory matters (pp. 1–16), Stuhlmacher boldly affirms the occasional character of Romans, an epistle that arises out of the dovetailing of two situations—that of the apostle Paul himself and that of the church in Rome. The apostle needs the support of the Roman church for his coming mission to Spain (Rom 15:23–24, 28–29), but this support is in danger of being undermined by the work of Judaizing countermissionaries who have now come to Rome and are attacking both his person and his message. Throughout the commentary Stuhlmacher returns again and again to the polemical nature of the argument of Romans as Paul sets forth his gospel against the background of Judaizing activity in Rome. These Judaizers or nomistic Jewish Christians, with the tolerance or possibly even the sanction of James, the leader of the Jerusalem church (p. 6), have dogged Paul's footsteps from Galatia to Philippi and Thessalonica, then to Corinth and now to Rome. They claim that Paul teaches cheap grace, that he accommodates the gospel to the wishes of his morally weak Gentile converts by sitting loose with such important requirements as circumcision, that he is an antinomian who nullifies the salvation-historical significance of the Mosaic law, and that he disavows the election of ethnic Israel. While much of Stuhlmacher's reconstruction is plausible, it draws too heavily on the traditional Tübingen reconstruction of early Church history and its pitting the Jewish section of the Church against its Gentile counterpart. Though some of the argument of Romans is no doubt polemical (cf. 3:8; 6:1–2; 7:7, 13), much of the progression is just as likely driven for-

ward by the logic inherent in the gospel itself, a gospel that Paul has preached in the eastern Mediterranean world for the past two decades and upon which he reflects deeply as he winters in Corinth.

The commentary follows Stuhlmacher's carefully structured outline of the epistle (pp. 14–16), developing each literary unit in a twofold pattern: Section A gives the logical structure of the text, followed by the background traditions—Biblical, Jewish, Greco-Roman, early Church—that informed Paul's thinking; section B offers an essay-style running commentary that captures the progression of thought but will only rarely provide help to the scholar wrestling with the major interpretive issues in Romans.

The strength of this work lies in section A rather than B. Stuhlmacher assiduously mines the primary sources, Biblical and extra-Biblical, for background material that might shed light on Paul's language (e.g. Gentile reprobation, judgment of the Jew, the divestiture of man's glory at the fall, the suffering of the righteous, the fall of Adam and the messianic Son of Man, dying to the law and the flesh-Spirit dualism, Adam and the giving of the law, dichotomy in man between what is desired and what is accomplished, lament over the fallenness of creation, God's sovereignty and patience in judgment, the body of Christ, allegiance to secular authorities and the command to pay taxes, the love command and the decalogue). Though the parallels are at times overdrawn (e.g. I question the primarily Adamic background of the "I" of 7:7–25), the author has provided a wealth of background material that Paul either appropriated, revised, or reformulated in the light of his gospel. The present work would be greatly enhanced by an index of Biblical and extra-Biblical citations, which is unfortunately missing.

Stuhlmacher is to be credited for demonstrating the conceptual agreement between Jesus and Paul, plotting the multiple trajectories of continuity that bind Pauline thought to dominical tradition. Such trajectories include Jesus as the Isaianic suffering Servant, the gospel as God's reign over his people, God's judgment against all people as sinners, faith as the sole means of God's acceptance, Jesus as the messianic Son of Man, baptism in water and with the Spirit, radical revision of the law and yet its fulfillment in the love command, prayer to God as Father and the privilege of sonship, the cosmic scope of redemption, nonretaliation and blessing one's enemies, rendering to God and to Caesar their respective due, and the invalidating of the distinction between clean and unclean foods. The OT and intertestamental Jewish traditions, then, are not the undeflected source of Pauline thought but in many cases were reformulated and redefined by Jesus himself before Paul inherited them. This is a healthy antidote to the Jesus-Paul polarization so common to critical scholarship.

Though the essay style of the commentary proper (section B) does not often treat major interpretive issues in detail, we catalogue here Stuhlmacher's exegetical conclusions on some of the most debated texts in Romans. (1) 1:17: The "righteousness of God" refers both to God's salvific activity of declaring sinners righteous (Schlatter) and to the status of juridical righteousness before God that is its effect (Luther) and includes the entire cosmos within its comprehensive range (Käsemann). (2) 2:6–11: not a hypothetical offer of life to those who obey the law perfectly, but a real, final judgment of the works of believers, which works constitute the evidence of the reality of their faith and the genuineness of their spiritual standing. (3) 3:25: Translate "whom God publicly appointed to be the place of atonement," taking *hilastērion* as a reference to Golgotha as the Christian's mercy seat or place of atonement. (4) 5:12d: rejects the Augustinian view of all people participating in the sin of Adam—rather, all people willingly sin "in their own way" and so incur death (is this the Pelagian view?). (5) 7:7–25: The "I" is the person under the law's declaration of guilt, before baptism and without Christ, with Adam (Genesis 2–3) rather than Israel as the primary background (thus representative postconversion view, though a situation that "constantly presents itself

anew" as a danger to Christian believers). (6) 8:4: The believer has died to the misuse of the law and its sentence of condemnation but is now freed to obey the law by the Spirit (i.e. the Reformed view that the condemning aspect of the law is ended but its commanding aspect is still in force). (7) 9:5b: "God, who reigns over all, be praised," thus a doxology to God the Father, not to Christ. (8) 10:4: *Telos* is best rendered "end," not "goal," but refers to the termination of the law's verdict of guilt on the sinner, not the annulment of the moral commands of God. (9) 11:25–32: In chap. 11 Paul reverses his earlier pronouncement in 1 Thess 2:16 that Israel has been permanently overtaken by God's wrath by now affirming the coming redemption of ethnic Israel; thus Paul is himself partly responsible for the criticism of his Judaizer opponents that he disavows God's election of ethnic Israel (a questionable exegesis of 1 Thess 2:16 indeed, though we endorse Stuhlmacher's comment that "a Gentile-Christian anti-Semitism can never legitimately be derived from Paul" [p. 183]). (10) 12:20: "Burning coals on his head" is a picture of remorse, produced by the nonretaliatory actions of believers toward unjust treatment. (11) Chapter 16: The original text of Romans included 1:1–16:27 with the shorter fourteen-chapter edition due to Marcion's excision.

In conclusion, Stuhlmacher's discussion of background traditions to Paul's thought makes this a valuable book for the teacher of Romans to have on his/her shelf, though it in no way approximates the major exegetical commentaries in English (Cranfield, Moo, Fitzmyer) for detailed interaction with the text.

Don N. Howell, Jr.
Columbia Biblical Seminary, Columbia, SC

The Justification of the Gentiles: Paul's Letters to the Galatians and Romans. By Hendrikus Boers. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994, xvii + 334 pp., \$24.95.

The "new perspective" on Paul had its roots in the revised view of Judaism associated with E. P. Sanders and was immediately apparent in studies of Paul's view of the law. But so intertwined in Paul's letters are the law and justification that it was only a matter of time until the new perspective embraced this cardinal doctrine of the Reformation. Boers represents the dominant trend in the new perspective at this point, seeing Paul's teaching on justification as focused not on the relationship of man the sinner to God but on the relationship between Jew and Gentile in the early Church. Reconciliation of human beings within the body of Christ, not reconciliation of human beings before God, is the real purpose of Paul's justification teaching.

Boers uses a semiotic method to come to this conclusion. Semiotics is a product of the linguistic work of scholars such as A. Greimas and J. Coutés. It views "language as the system of signs through which meaning is expressed" (p. 7). Applying this method to Galatians and Romans uncovers a basic opposition in Paul's thinking between salvation limited to an exclusive group (e.g. Jews) and salvation extended to all. It is this opposition that provides the "generative grammar" of Paul's teaching in both letters. Justification by faith functions not as a supposed antithesis to justification by good works but serves as the doctrine that enables Paul to include Gentiles in the scope of eschatological salvation. Boers finds this universal salvific thrust in both Galatians and Romans. Romans differs from Galatians, however, in adding the theme of salvation-historical development: The salvation entrusted to Jews is fulfilled in the salvation of Gentiles (pp. 140, 145).

Boers develops his argument in two basic stages. After introducing his method (pp. 7–34), he uncovers the "macro-structure" (e.g. the underlying argument) of Ga-

latians and Romans and then compares them (pp. 35–170). He then uses his conclusions from part 1 to discover the basic “system of values” and the “micro-universe” that generates these structures.

This approach gives rise to my first criticism: Boers repeats himself a great deal. He describes his basic approach to Galatians and Romans in early chapters but then goes back to these same points once, twice, even in some cases three times. More is involved here than a rhetorical device of repetition for emphasis. Some tighter editing or better thinking about structure would have done a lot to make the argument of the book stronger and clearer.

But my more fundamental criticism has to do with the basic conclusion. Boers shares with many modern scholars a concern with what they perceive to be an overly individualistic thrust in Reformation interpretations of Paul and his teaching on justification. Certainly some such concern is justified: The Reformers and especially some of their heirs tended to downplay the Jewish/Gentile “people” dimension of Paul’s teaching. But when Boers claims (p. 39) that it was an “almost universal assumption” that “the main theme of Romans is justification by faith” he is perilously close to setting up a straw man. Calvin does not claim that justification by faith is the theme of Romans (only of chaps. 1–5), many scholars since have denied it, and few who thought it was the main theme simply assumed it. More important, I am not convinced that the semiotic method that Boers employs is guaranteed to produce accurate exegetical conclusions. As one method among others it is certainly helpful. But it must be balanced with other approaches, and especially its claim that underlying structures of thought must always exhibit certain oppositions is open to question.

With respect to justification, then, the opposition that emerges most clearly in Paul is one between “faith” and “works” (Romans 4; cf. Romans 9–10) / “works of the law” (Galatians 2–3; Romans 3). Boers follows a growing number of scholars in thinking that this contrast is one between reliance on Christ and reliance on Jewish covenant privileges. But there are all kinds of problems with this approach. Furthermore Paul’s teaching on justification, when set in its OT/Jewish context and explored through his actual textual focus, is at root concerned with the relationship of human beings to God. That this way of getting right with God opens the doors to the Gentiles is of course of great concern to Paul. But it is not his basic concern in Romans, and perhaps not even in Galatians.

Boers’ study is part of a trend away from the question of a human being’s relationship to God toward the question of the relationship of human beings to one another. The latter is of course important, but we might wonder whether the attempt to transform Paul’s teaching on justification into a primarily social doctrine reflects more the concerns of late-twentieth-century theology than the context of Paul’s life and work.

Douglas J. Moo
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

St. Paul’s Theology of Proclamation: 1 Corinthians 1–4 and Greco-Roman Rhetoric.
By Duane Litfin. SNTSMS 79. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1994, xiii + 302 pp., \$59.95.

Scholars are painfully aware of the difficulties surrounding the interpretation of 1 Corinthians 1–4. Often discussion centers on the number and identity of the parties listed in 1:12 and the nature of the opposition faced by Paul in the Corinthian church.

The well-worn approach to this task is for the exegete to probe background sources for linguistic and conceptual parallels to important terminology in 1 Corinthians 1–4 and from this data to reconstruct the substance of the Corinthian viewpoint as described and critiqued by Paul. In this monograph Litfin argues that Greco-Roman rhetoric is the proper background against which to understand the position of Paul's Corinthian foils.

Litfin begins by noting that contemporary scholarship often dismisses Greco-Roman rhetoric as a viable background to 1 Corinthians 1–4, largely because it has uncritically adopted the Platonic caricature and condemnation of rhetoric as the ornamental and deceptive handiwork of unscrupulous sophists and itinerant orators. A careful analysis of the historical development of Greco-Roman rhetoric from its beginnings to Paul's time, Litfin contends, would balance this view with that of a continued popular appreciation of skillful oratory in first-century Greco-Roman culture. Once this is acknowledged it becomes virtually certain that the focus of Paul's criticism is directed toward a presentation of the gospel that is dependent on adornments of human rhetorical acumen rather than the sovereign work of the Spirit.

Litfin adopts a bipartite structure for his study. Part 1 surveys the development of rhetoric from its beginnings (fifth century BC) through the first century AD, focusing upon its rise in Athens with the sophists and handbooks (chap. 2), its maturation in the thought of Plato, Isocrates and Aristotle (chap. 3), its height in Roman authors Cicero and Quintilian (chap. 4) and its status in first-century Greco-Roman culture as gleaned from several "lesser" writers (chap. 5). Part 2 investigates 1 Corinthians 1–4 in light of the role played by rhetoric in the larger cultural context. Litfin assesses both Paul's and the Corinthians' familiarity with and acceptance of rhetorical convention (chap. 6), surveys critical matters in the study of 1 Corinthians 1–4 (chap. 7) and examines the background of Paul's preaching ministry in Corinth (chap. 8). The next two chapters deal with the text, dividing it into the "central passage" of Paul's argument, 1:17–2:5 (chap. 9), and the completion of the argument, 2:6–4:21 (chap. 10). Chapter 11 summarizes his argumentation and poses questions for further research.

Litfin concludes that 1 Corinthians 1–4 reflects contrasting theories of discourse arising from differing theological assumptions. Some Corinthians highly esteemed Greco-Roman rhetoric and so criticized Paul for a lack of rhetorical flair in his preaching. In 1 Corinthians 1–4 Paul defends his practice of proclamation, asserting that his simple "word of the cross" is the very power of God that brings salvation. The "wisdom of word" valued in Greco-Roman rhetoric, in contrast, relies upon human oratorical strategies to secure a predetermined response from the audience. At issue is more than stylistic preference. For Paul, acceptance of the gospel must come in response to the Spirit's prompting at the hearing of God's saving work in the cross. The persuasive techniques of rhetoric, in Paul's thinking, implicitly asserted that more than the proclamation of the cross was necessary to produce saving faith in hearers. An inflated estimate of oratorical eloquence effectively displaced the soteriological centrality of the cross. This implication was clearly unacceptable to Paul, forcing him to defend his homiletical practice by demonstrating that it was formulated from kerygmatic, soteriological presuppositions. Paul defends his unadorned preaching style by arguing that it is the *modus operandi* most befitting the God who would violate the canons of human wisdom by providing salvation in the foolish display of weakness that is the cross of Christ.

Litfin's presentation is to be applauded on many fronts, not the least of which is that it provides an excellent overview of Greco-Roman rhetoric. Perhaps the greatest strength of this book, however, is that it puts forth a coherent, consistent hypothesis that resolves many difficult issues in 1 Corinthians 1–4 without resorting to speculative reconstructions of alleged theological influences. This is most evident in his treat-

ment of the interaction of important rhetorical terms in 1 Cor 1:17–2:5 (*sophia, logos, dynamis, apodeixis, krisis*) and in his discussion of how *sophia logou* (best rendered “cleverness of speech”) nullifies the cross (pp. 190–192). Litfin’s thesis has the further advantage of describing the nature of the problem without requiring a resolution to the problem of identifying the “parties” in Corinth (though in an excursus [pp. 228–235] he contends that the party of Apollos best accounts for the enthusiasm for rhetoric in Corinth).

The greatest criticism of Litfin’s presentation is to be leveled against the relative lack of detailed exegesis of his target passages. Though part 2 is entitled “1 Corinthians 1–4,” the first 37 pages focus on the status of Greco-Roman rhetoric in Corinth and how this influenced the reception of Paul’s original preaching. The central passage, 1:17–2:5, receives 36 pages of coverage, while 2:6–4:21 is covered in 14 pages. Litfin is clearly more concerned with establishing the viability of Greco-Roman rhetoric as background to issues raised in 1 Corinthians 1–4 than he is with providing a detailed exegetical commentary on these chapters. The skeptic might wonder if the data would produce similar results under more intense scrutiny.

Having made this criticism, I must state that Litfin’s arguments are quite persuasive. This book, along with recent works by S. Pogoloff, B. Winter, and the forthcoming publication of M. Bullmore’s dissertation (*St. Paul’s Theology of Rhetorical Style: 1 Cor. 2:1–5 in Light of First-Century Greco-Roman Rhetorical Culture*, where Litfin is critiqued on other grounds), has suggested a background that promises to shed further light on a difficult passage. As such, Litfin’s proposals should stimulate further discussion and research. For those who believe that scholarly efforts should benefit the larger Church, Litfin’s discussion should challenge homileticians to examine their own ministries of proclamation.

Jeffrey S. Lamp

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

Returning Home: New Covenant and Second Exodus as the Context for 2 Corinthians 6.14–7.1. By William J. Webb. JSNTSup 85. Sheffield: JSOT, 1993, 247 pp., \$50.00.

The volume under review blazes a new trail in illuminating one of the most puzzling literary enigmas in the Pauline corpus. Due to its seemingly abrupt changes of subject matter and tone, 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 has been the focus of much debate, including its origin (Paul, a Jewish Christian, Qumran, Paul’s opponents), theology (Pauline, un-Pauline, anti-Pauline) and integrity (contextually fitting, a misplaced interpolation). These notorious difficulties have led many virtually to give up any hope of a satisfactory resolution. In the midst of this impasse comes a Paulinist who argues for a contextual integration based on OT tradition analysis.

Webb argues that new-covenant and exilic-return motifs are major theological currents in the fragment as well as in the entire section of 2 Cor 2:14–7:4 (see the especially good discussion of 6:1–2 on pp. 131–145). After stating the problem and his hypothesis in chap. 1 and reviewing the history of its interpretation in chap. 2, Webb systematically performs tradition analysis within the passage (6:14–7:1) and its remote (2:14–5:10) and immediate (5:11–7:4) contexts. A helpful critique of alternative theories in chap. 6 and a brief recapitulation of his thesis in chap. 7 round out the book. Two appendices on the meaning of *apistois* and *heterozygountes* in 6:14a, Scripture and author indices, and a comprehensive bibliography are included.

His unique methodology of starting with the OT catena (6:16d–18) within the fragment and relating it to its outer shell (a departure from the recent trend) succeeds in establishing a closer correspondence between the catena and its context than has been shown before. Webb takes care in identifying the precise source of each of the OT quotations, and his wrestling with the context of the relevant OT texts is evident in the index. His excursus on the identification of the Isaianic *'ebed YHWH's* ministry with that of Paul is also informative. Also interesting is his discussion of the vexed problem of the conceptual background of the triumphal procession in 2:14–16 (pp. 79–84) in light of the OT triumphal-procession theme developed by the prophets. This work is a well-designed study with many helpful charts (pp. 32, 50–51, 92, 125–127, 132–133), and the inclusion of the full texts of the MT, the LXX and the NT in the body also facilitates their discussion.

On the other hand, while Webb's overall thesis seems plausible, his arguments for viewing some sections as "clearly colored by exilic return motifs" are less persuasive (e.g. in 5:1–10, 11–21). The purported association of return theology with the reconciliation and new-things motifs needs to be strengthened further.

This work joins other recent quality works on 2 Corinthians by S. Hafemann on 2:14–3:3, L. Belleville on 3:1–18, and C. Stockhausen on 3:1–4:6. From now on any haphazard dismissal of 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 as a misplaced interpolation will be untenable without serious interaction with this work.

Jae Young Noh

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

The Theology of the Later Pauline Letters. By Andrew T. Lincoln and A. J. M. Wedderburn. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1993, x + 185 pp., n.p.

This volume, which seeks to provide "a programmatic survey of the individual writings of the New Testament," investigates the respective theologies of the letters to the Colossians and the Ephesians. Wedderburn examines the background to Colossians and the situation of the readers, along with their implications for interpreting the theology and Christology of the letter. Unlike M. Hooker, Wedderburn considers that there was a "Colossian heresy": The church was exposed to Judaizing pressures of a mystical kind in which the proponents, who "could have regarded themselves as Christians *and Jews*" (*italics mine*), made their appeal to visionary experiences. It is against this backdrop that Colossians develops its stress on the supremacy of Christ.

According to Wedderburn, Colossians was not written by Paul. Instead the letter is a "Paulinizing interpretation of basic ideas," which do not stem directly from the apostle, in which the author draws on the same thought world as diaspora Judaism to combat the false teaching. The *stoicheia*, which can refer to both the physical elements and the powers controlling human life, is used as a "polemical and contemptuous denigration of [the readers'] beliefs." The author has quoted a hymnic or creedal passage (1:15–20), but much of the original hymn that remains in the letter is at variance with his own views. Why the author could not have excised these discordant elements is not satisfactorily answered. Instead Wedderburn raises the question as to whether one should interpret the hymn in its own right (as though we could be certain as to what the original was) or only as the author has utilized it. The key term "body," it is claimed, is used of both the cosmos and the Church. But Colossians does not employ the term of the former. Christ is said to be "head" of the cosmos, but this does not mean that his body is the cosmos. Instead of speaking of the application

of the hymn in vv. 21–23 Wedderburn refers to its reinterpretation, while in relation to the difficult 1:24 he picks up stoic and Jewish-Hellenistic references but does not interpret the verse in the light of the OT people of God undergoing suffering.

As to the applicability of Colossians to today, it is claimed that we “cannot limit the scope of Christ’s relevance and redemption to humanity as the author of Colossians at times does” (p. 68). Concerning the powers, it would “be dangerous to concentrate on the exalted Christ, as is done in Colossians.” The answers of Colossians “cannot be our answers, but only a first step towards them.” Its “answers are for its day, not ours.” Clearly Wedderburn begs some massive hermeneutical questions in his approach. His interaction is with the secondary literature of the scholarly guild that holds basically to the same view of non-Pauline authorship and rarely takes into account a more traditional line, while a number of theological themes that are important to Colossians are not treated (note, for example, the motif of thanksgiving).

Lincoln states that Ephesians is virtually devoid of all reference to particular circumstances. He has not taken sufficiently into account, however, the important work of Arnold on the powers in Ephesians. The implied author, Paul, is not the real author. Instead the letter was written after his death by someone who applied his teaching to a fresh situation. The chapter on the theology of Ephesians (pp. 91–126) is the best in the book and is the fruit of Lincoln’s exegesis for his earlier commentary in the WBC series.

When discussing the theology of Ephesians within the Pauline corpus and the rest of the NT, however, Lincoln goes out of his way to emphasize the differences between the former and the generally recognized Pauline material. But many of these could be explained in terms of the different epistolary and rhetorical situation of Ephesians, and one does not need to postulate a post-Pauline author. The particular stress on Christ’s resurrection and exaltation, as part of a salvation that has already been won, makes sense against the pressures facing the readers, while Christ’s death is appropriately prominent in the letter. It seems special pleading to suggest that the household code is significantly different from that of Colossians, so that now (!) believers are to adjust to the values of the surrounding society while at the same time maintaining a distinct identity. Nor is it the case that, over against 1 Corinthians 7, Ephesians “no longer treats marriage as a second-best option but by relating it so closely to the union between Christ and the Church gives it an exalted status” (p. 129). Further, the references to *ekklēsia* do not focus on the “universal church” but on the heavenly assembly with its concomitant expression in the local congregation, and this presentation is no different from that of Colossians.

Lincoln’s final chapter as to how we might critically appropriate the theology of Ephesians for today (pp. 142–166) contains serious hermeneutical difficulties that impinge on the question of the letter’s authority. Concerning the spiritual powers it is argued that we cannot simply appropriate “the cosmic demonology of Ephesians for contemporary theology.” Moreover the straight teaching of the letter on marriage may be laid aside, for “the hierarchical elements in the paraenesis [of 5:21–33] may be rejected in the light of the full implications of the gospel” even if the notion of the permanent “one flesh” union of Gen 2:24 remains the Christian ideal for marriage. Christians are to be “world Christians,” and this will involve them in global politics, interfaith dialogue and ecology. But nothing is said here about the proclamation of the gospel.

The volume is limited in its focus on critical scholarship on Colossians and Ephesians. Important themes in the two letters were treated, although many more could have been handled within the scope of the 170 pages. Too much space was devoted to discussing how the author(s) of the letters may have used existing traditions presumed

to lie behind the text. The presuppositions and approaches of the two writers, which unfortunately were not argued, raise a host of questions about the nature of the theological enterprise.

Peter T. O'Brien
Moore Theological College, Newtown, NSW, Australia

Friendship and Finances in Philippi. By Ben Witherington, III. The New Testament in Context series. Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1994, 180 pp., \$15.00 paper.

A glance at the table of contents shows that the author has presented his commentary according to the framework of Greco-Roman rhetoric, using the categories of epistolary prescript—*exordium, narratio, propositio, probatio, peroratio*—as the structure for following Paul's thought in Philippians. For those not conversant with these technicalities Witherington does an excellent job of explanation, so that this volume could be used as a most effective introduction to this discipline. The presentation of background information in chap. 1 reveals Witherington's skills as a teacher and writer. There is no verbosity or redundancy. Every sentence adds information interestingly presented and germane to what follows.

The strengths of the book are many. The writing style is clear, the outlining is thorough and helpful, and the comments are concise. The book provides a good model for application of Greco-Roman rhetorical form as a guide for analyzing a NT epistle. The introductory chapter is outstanding for its presentation of a wealth of background material in relatively brief compass.

In light of the author's stated purpose to discuss the text of Philippians "according to its discrete rhetorical parts" (p. 29), the weaknesses are few. The reader cannot miss the emphasis on rhetorical analysis. Exegetical analysis of the text, therefore, is cursory. If one is looking for a general commentary on the text of Philippians, much more is needed. Insights provided by the rhetorical features are important, but they need to be undergirded by the study of the text itself.

After reading the book, I also felt that the title suggested more emphasis on finances than was actually given. To be sure, there was some discussion about funds at relevant places in the letter. But to include "Finances" as part of the title while indicating nothing about the rhetorical features that are a constant drumbeat in the book seems a bit misleading. The content, however, is well presented and is valuable for the study of NT epistolary writings. It is heartily recommended.

Homer A. Kent
Grace College and Theological Seminary, Winona Lake, IN

2 Thessalonians: "Facing" the End with Sobriety. By Maarten J. J. Menken. New York: Routledge, 1994, 171 pp., \$49.95/\$14.95.

Part of the New Testament Readings series, this book is not designed to be a traditional commentary. Rather, it consists of readings of the text offering a fresh approach. The series is aimed at the professional rather than the layperson.

Menken views 2 Thessalonians as a Deuteropauline work written somewhere between AD 80 and 110. For the size of the work he devotes a large amount of space to introductory matters (66 pages for introduction and 76 pages for commentary). The

author interacts with some scholarly literature, particularly basing his authorship decision on Wrede (1903) and Trilling (1972). Although he lists a few evangelical or conservative works in his biography, such as C. A. Wanamaker, E. Best and B. Rigaux, he does not interact with F. F. Bruce, D. Guthrie or I. H. Marshall. His intent does not appear to review the authorship issue but rather to set forth a position of a Deuteropauline work and to explain the work in that setting.

The work does explore the phenomenon of pseudonymity in pre-Christian Jewish literature as well as in postapostolic times. He states that pseudonymity should not be considered a forgery but a recognition of the fact that a disciple was using his master's wisdom. He could have benefited from studying Guthrie's arguments against pseudonymity in the NT. Menken says the strongest argument against Pauline authorship is the difference between the eschatology of 2 Thessalonians and that in the first letter. The teaching in 2 Thessalonians belongs to the realm of what he calls "apocalyptic eschatology," which to him is more in keeping with a late date. An interesting problem in positing pseudonymity is the mention of the temple in 2:4. Menken's explanation of this as a "fiction created by the pseudonymous author who knows very well that the temple still stood during Paul's apostolic career" sounds a bit contrived (p. 107).

The difficult problem of the restrainer in the second chapter is discussed in detail. He thinks that the restraining power of 2:6 may be the plan or will of God and that the restraining person is possibly an angel.

The usefulness of this work will be limited in that it does not break any new ground, but it does put some German scholarship into English dress.

The book contains indices and a bibliography. The hardback price seems inordinately high.

Edwin A. Blum
Honolulu, HI

1-2 Timothy and Titus. By Philip H. Towner. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1994, 271 pp., \$15.99.

In the "General Introduction" the editors justify the new IVP New Testament Commentary series by stating that "no other series has yet achieved what we had in mind." It claims to present a "unique combination of solid, biblical exposition and helpful explanatory notes" in a "user-friendly format." This project is "a series to and from the church" with a "commitment to the authority of Scripture for Christian faith and practice" (pp. 9-10).

Towner brings solid academic training and experience in seminary teaching to the task of writing. With the NIV as the base text he leads the inquirer through a readable, well-organized exposition of 1 and 2 Timothy and Titus. Explanatory notes on matters significant for the interpretation of the text are at the bottom of the pages. This is where matters from history and the Greek language are discussed, along with contributions from other commentaries.

Considering the length and the design of the series, this commentary begins with a remarkably good "Introduction." Most of its material deals with the authorship of the pastorals and their placement in Paul's ministry. Such introductory issues are presented clearly and are confronted honestly. Towner seems impressed by van Bruggen's placement of the writing of 1 Timothy and Titus during a supposed gap between Acts 19:20 and 19:21. Then 2 Timothy would have been written during Paul's prison term

in Rome (Acts 28). This supposition allows a connection of the “false teachers” in the pastorals with questions that arise in 1 and 2 Corinthians. As one follows Towner through the pastorals, the influence of van Bruggen’s hypothesis is noted in the frequent use of the Corinthian materials to interpret allusions in the pastorals.

A “user-friendly format” can leave the reader with the sense that the writer’s interpretation is based on more than is revealed. The commentary could be helped by bringing some of the material in the explanatory notes into the text. The book is a worthy representation of the goal for this series. It can help the person in the pew apply practical matters from the pastorals to personal and church life.

Charles B. Stephenson
Lubbock Christian University, Lubbock, TX

Covenant and Sacrifice in the Epistle to the Hebrews. By John Dunnill. SNTSMS 75. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1992, xii + 297 pp., \$59.95.

This structuralist interpretation of Hebrews opens with the argument that “the last two centuries of scientific criticism have done remarkably little to dispel the air of mystery which surrounds this letter” (p. 2). Indeed scientific criticism has been unable to deal with a book that “positively rejoices in whatever is anomalous or strange,” a work that amounts to “a rich meditation on the glorious oddness of God’s dealings with humanity” (p. 263). But what is a “rich meditation”?

According to Dunnill, the author of Hebrews stands in the tradition of the priestly editors of the Pentateuch in their attempt to locate the interpretive center of the disparate cultic traditions they inherited and to organize those traditions—the “arbitrary contents of cultural memory” (p. 149)—around that center. The “contents of cultural memory” are cultic symbols that emerge from and allude to a larger world of meaning that to a significant degree goes unappreciated especially (pp. 5, 75–76) by those who are closest to the symbols. As the symbols are gathered and organized in a work such as Hebrews, the possibility therefore remains for the reader to grasp their latent meanings and thus also to understand the work better than the author (e.g. pp. 264, 116).

For Hebrews the organizing principle is that of covenant. The epistle “develops its theology of covenant less by direct discursive argument than by reference or allusion to a network of ritual and narrative symbols drawn from this memory (written and oral), selected and deployed in a fashion which itself, however, often seems arbitrary” (p. 149). That arbitrariness is only apparent, however, stemming from our failure to appreciate the tendency—also found in the targumim and midrashim—to “see every symbol in the light of every other symbol, each one thus expressing the whole of Torah” (p. 125), a tendency leading to the interchange and fusion of disparate genres and symbols. Put differently, the various symbols are drawn from a “ritual-narrative system, deeply interfused with the covenant-symbolism of Judaism, which is presupposed as the content of their meaning” (p. 126). Properly appreciated, Hebrews is not firstly an argument but a “*liturgy*, a symbolic action in the sacred sphere: more particularly, a *covenant-renewal rite*, of which the book’s words comprise a long prophetic exhortation” (p. 261; italics his; see also pp. 121–122). Though the book contains an argument, the controlling principle and theological center of the work are found in the attempt to give “force to the necessary network of symbols” by organizing them around “an ideal image of life before God” (p. 261). If therefore we would understand Hebrews we must follow the author into his “symbol-systems” (p. 265), and “structuralist methods as they have been developed in linguistics, literary theory and, most particularly, anthropology” (p. 1) are uniquely suited for such an investigation.

Dunnill's argument advances as follows. Part 1 ("Sociology") is characterized as an "essay in sociological interpretation" (p. 13). Part 2 ("Structuralism") contains two chapters. "Hebrews and Structural Analysis" argues for a "holistic, hermeneutically based approach" (p. 7) to interpreting Hebrews, while "Sacrifice and Covenant in the Old Testament" examines the OT's sacrificial symbolism in the light of recent anthropological approaches. Part 3 ("Renewing the Covenant") contains the remaining five chapters: "A Liturgy for the Day of Salvation," "The Narratives of the Covenant," "The Testing of the Son of God," "The Necessity of Blood," and "Worship in the New Covenant" (this last argues that Hebrews' systematization of the OT sacral types exhibits a movement "away from the expiatory centre which characterises Leviticus and towards an inclusive covenant-symbolism" [p. 239]).

Dunnill's is a fascinating thesis that in its broad conception appears cogent. As for his strongly worded pronouncements on the shortcomings of traditional methods *vis-à-vis* his structuralist approach, these focus for the most part on the failure of traditional exegesis to appreciate the central role of Hebrews' cultic elements along with the author's "process of symbolic association" over against the apparent ability of Dunnill's structuralist approach to do just that. Even so, Dunnill's verdict on traditional exegesis may prove to be more of a distraction than a contribution to the discussion, since his claims demand a response and yet border on the premise of an artificial either/or (in spite of p. 3). Again, while it is appropriate for a groundbreaking study to demonstrate success where other methods have failed by showcasing some of its insights (p. 264), the force of some of these is mitigated by the fact that some traditional exegesis has yielded the same results (as Dunnill admits on 2:9 [pp. 223–224]). Moreover Dunnill's criticism of traditional methods is based in part on their failure to produce a consensus (p. 2), and yet we may wonder whether his associational approach can promise better results (esp. pp. 149–226). To take two examples from one page (p. 150), does Heb 10:29 have Abel in mind, and how strongly should we sense Cain's presence behind 3:7–4:11?

The volume offers a fresh and distinctive view of Hebrews, one with which future work on the book's argument and structure will need to grapple. It is a work replete with thought-provoking suggestions, and its bold exegesis should help to move forward the discussion of some passages. It is to be hoped that others will follow Dunnill's methodological lead.

Jon Laansma
William Tyndale College, Farmington Hills, MI

Introduction to New Testament Exegesis. By Werner Stenger. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993, 183 pp., \$15.99 paper.

The reader of this work is not expected to know Greek because the method developed by Stenger is based on his belief that the "two things needed by a person being introduced to the methods of New Testament exegesis are knowledge of the standard tools and their use and knowledge of where to turn for help with particular kinds of issues" (p. xiii). No Greek is used.

The book is divided into two parts. Part 1 is a theoretical section in which Stenger presents a thorough explanation of the principles of NT exegesis. First, in the chapter entitled "The Problem of the Original Text," the author applies his text-critical methodology to Acts 15:29; Matt 1:16; 1 Tim 3:16. Second, the topics "What is a text?" and synchrony and diachrony are expounded in chap. 3. Third, the tasks of form criticism, tradition criticism, source criticism, redaction criticism and genre criticism are

presented in chaps. 4–5. Even though the topics dealt with in this first part of the book require the use of technical terms, in most instances Stenger explains their meaning.

Part 2 provides the reader with ten examples. In each instance the theory studied in part 1 is tested, offering a kind of hands-on opportunity to the reader. The first pericope to be analyzed is the triple tradition's "Jesus Calls Levi and Eats with Tax Collectors" (Mark 2:13–17 and parallels). Twelve pages are devoted to the application of this pericope to the different criticisms presented in part 1.

A second passage to be studied is "Jesus' Disciples Pick Grain on the Sabbath" (Mark 2:23–28 and parallels). In the previous example Stenger probed mainly the Markan account. In this chapter, however, he takes Mark's account only as foundational and then moves on to the parallels in Matthew and Luke. Thus his critique of the redaction and composition of the text of Mark 2:23–28 is more convincing than that of 2:13–17.

A more extensive treatment is given to "The Storm on the Sea" (Mark 4:35–41 and parallels). Next, Stenger treats "The Centurion of Capernaum" (Matt 8:5–13 and Luke 7:1–10) and "The Healing of a Royal Official's Son" (John 4:46c–54). Even though these three texts, according to Stenger, have several affinities, the synoptics and the Johannine text are in different chapters.

The literary genre of poetry receives an in-depth treatment in chap. 12 entitled "Two Christological Hymns" (Phil 2:6–11; 1 Tim 3:16). The last three genres studied by Stenger are "The Genealogy of Jesus According to Matthew" (Matt 1:1–25), "The Beatitudes (and Woes)" (Matt 5:3–12; Luke 6:20–26), and "Form and Genre Criticism of Paul's Letter to Philemon."

One might disagree with Stenger's tendency to separate the role of the exegete from the role of the theologian in the person of the interpreter. Such a dichotomy creates an unnecessary tension. Perhaps this happens because of his confidence in the critical-historical method. This apparent disjunction induces Stenger to make contradictory statements. For instance on p. 14 Stenger writes: "It is the content of the Bible, not exegetical method itself, that makes exegesis a theological discipline." Thus the reader might feel confused when he or she compares the latter statement with Stenger's concluding words on p. 7: "This introduction of the methods of New Testament exegesis will have done its job when, in addition to the presentation and application of exegetical methods, it also draws attention to the boundaries of historical-critical thinking, boundaries beyond which the real business of theological reflection begins." The charge made by Stenger that theologians are handicapped in philological skills is unfortunate and perhaps a sign of continental hubris (p. 2). Maybe that was the case in Nietzsche's day. The evangelical exegete might also have difficulties in agreeing with Stenger's treatment of 1 Timothy and Matt 1:1–25.

This book will become a valuable exegetical tool to readers as long as they balance it out in light of some other books on NT exegesis (Stenger cites the better ones in chap. 16).

Luiz Gustavo da Silva Gonçalves
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

Divorce in the New Testament. By Raymond F. Collins. Good News Studies 38. Collegeville: Liturgical, 1992, 389 pp., \$19.95.

Collins generates 231 pages of text, 95 pages with 1,161 notes and 643 bibliographical entries in this most comprehensive historical-critical study of Jesus' divorce sayings to date. To labor through this book is to take a course with Collins on modern gospel criticism and its application to the exegesis of the NT divorce texts. The NRSV

translation of key passages is conveniently included, as are relevant Qumran and rabbinic texts. In five chapters Collins presents detailed analyses (transliterated Greek with English equivalents) of how Paul (1 Cor 7:10–16), Mark (10:2–12), Matthew (19:3–12) and Q (Luke 16:18//Matt 5:32) provide classic situation-specific case studies of how the tradition of the Church functions. Chapter 6 is devoted to Matthew's exception (pp. 184–213). Only three of the twelve opinions briefly surveyed (pp. 199–205) are widely reflected in current literature: the early patristic or traditional Catholic view (H. Crouzel, J. Dupont, Q. Quesnell, G. J. Wenham, W. A. Heth), the traditional Protestant or Erasmian view (W. D. Davies and D. C. Allison, R. H. Stein, D. A. Carson, C. L. Blomberg) and the forbidden degrees of kinship view (J. Bonsirven, F. F. Bruce, J. A. Fitzmyer, R. P. Martin, D. E. Garland, B. Witherington).

After reading this book three times and typing nearly 50 single-spaced pages of notes and reflections, I have decided my review will be of most help to evangelicals if I synthesize and comment on Collins' complex analysis of the way Matthew has rewritten Mark's nonunitary conflict story (i.e. one in which the opening question in 10:2 comes from a different stage of the tradition than Jesus' divorce saying in v. 11, "the traditional kernel").

To succinctly summarize how the evangelicals handled the tradition on divorce, Collins notes that Jesus' pronouncement was the "what" of the tradition; Mark created a "why" for it (i.e. the Scriptural proofs from Genesis, designed to appeal to Gentile readers in a way the decalogue could not); Matthew's revision of Mark expressed the "why" more clearly and also added a "how." How could one possibly live up to Jesus' radical teaching on divorce in Matt 19:9? The instruction to the disciples in vv. 10–12 provides the answer: God's grace enables the disciples to do what humanly could not be done.

From the standpoint of Matthean redaction, Collins first argues that Matt 19:3–12 is a literary unity and that vv. 10–12 are not an independent teaching on celibacy simply attached to the unit on divorce. Second, everything about the literary form and narrative development of Matthew's antithesis on divorce in the sermon on the mount (5:31–32) and the debate in Matt 19:3–12 indicate that "Matthew did not consider this exception to be a real exception" (p. 211). The exception clause probably reflects the discipline in force in a largely Jewish-Christian community that did not approve of the way Deut 24:1 was being selfishly used by the Pharisees of Matthew's day. Third, the Semitic form of the exception in 5:32 alludes to the *ʿerwat dābār* ("something objectionable") in Deut 24:1, and the exception in Matt 19:9 is Matthew's reformulation of the earlier clumsier form—one that had already been cast in stone by the tradition. Thus the exception is pre-Matthean: Matthew accommodates the received tradition to the needs of his community. Fourth, one should not assume that Matthew's exception came out of the Hillel-Shammai debate. The school of Shammai had interpreted the "something objectionable" in Deut 24:1 as adultery, the sole reason justifying divorce. But Collins does not believe the Mishna necessarily mirrors the real halakhic situation before AD 70. Fifth, the interpretation of Deut 24:1–4 and the referent of "something objectionable" was "a moot issue within Judaism at the very moment that Matthew's Christian community was sundering its links with Judaism" (p. 208). Sixth, Collins says that even with the exception clause Matthew's presentation of Jesus' teaching was countercultural to the dominant view held by Matthew's Jewish opponents. Matthew wanted his readers to understand God's word the way Jesus had taught it. They accepted the Law (Matt 5:18), and Deut 24:1 was part of that Law. Therefore the Matthean community had to take it seriously. It could not tolerate the use of one portion of the Law against another or the nullification of any commandment of God. "They interpreted its 'something shameful' as *porneia*, that is, *zēnūt*, which connoted adultery" (p. 212). Thus Matthew's Jesus, in line with the distinctive halakhah of Matthew's community, explains that "in the limited case of *porneia*, when both

Jewish practice and Roman law sometimes required a man to leave his wife, a man was not to be judged adulterous if he divorced the wife from whom he was required to separate" (p. 211). The exception clause, with its clumsy allusion to Deut 24:1, was a conscience clause directed to the pious faithful in Matthew's community who, like Joseph (cf. Matt 1:19), felt that it was their duty, either because of Deut 24:1 or the constraints of the *Lex Iulia de adulteriis coercendis*, to divorce their adulterous wives (p. 212; cf. W. A. Heth and G. J. Wenham, *Jesus and Divorce* [London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1984; reprint with addendum forthcoming] 123–126, 168). "The adulterous wife could, and probably should, be dismissed. Forbidden to her husband, she was also forbidden to any other man. The one who dared to marry her was guilty of adultery" (p. 213).

The evidence is far from conclusive, as Collins presumes, that Matthew's gospel arose from a Christian scribal tradition. Several times Collins emphasizes that the gospel's focus is "not so much the situation of the historical Jesus" (p. 153) as it is the situation of Matthew's readers who "were then experiencing the trauma of separation from the Jewish synagogue" (p. 151). (For a critique of such assumptions see D. A. Carson, "The Jewish Leaders in Matthew's Gospel: A Reappraisal," *JETS* 25 [1982] 161–174.)

In my understanding, Matthew's proximity to Jesus' teaching on divorce is not nearly as distant as Collins suggests. Matthew is so far removed from knowing what and where Jesus taught about divorce and remarriage that he must posit tentative community concerns as the controlling hermeneutical factor. It is quite clear from Matt 5:31–32; 19:3–12 that Jesus has no interest in offering his exegesis of Deut 24:1. Collins' numerous references to Deut 24:1 make it clear that he views it as a Scriptural command that "stipulated the conditions that must be fulfilled in order that a man licitly divorce his wife" (p. 74; cf. pp. 75, 112–114, 158, 162, 167, 190–191). Collins rejects E. P. Sanders' contention that Deut 24:1 is a concession and not a legal requirement that contradicted Jesus' radical teaching in Matt 5:32; 19:9. Collins' exegesis of the Matthean tradition will stand only if he can (1) demonstrate the validity of his late AD 80s setting for Matthew's community (2) in which Jesus speaks as a true rabbi to provide his authoritative interpretation of Deut 24:1 (3) in order to harmonize this "legal provision" with the decalogue's "Thou shalt not commit adultery" (4) which Collins has substituted for Gen 1:27; 2:24 as the basis for what Jesus taught about the permanence of marriage because (5) the historical Jesus never uttered Gen 1:27; 2:24. Jesus was a prophetic wisdom teacher, says Collins, and "a critical reader of the New Testament gets the impression that Jesus did not so much appeal to specific texts of the Torah, as base his teaching upon real life situations" (p. 90). (See further W. A. Heth, "Divorce and Remarriage: The Search for an Evangelical Hermeneutic," *Trinity Journal* 16/1 [1995] 63–100.)

Though Collins recognizes that arguments from silence are always weak, he sides with the traditional Protestant view when he suggests that remarriage would probably occur where both Matthew and Paul mention exceptions. I am not yet ready to draw this conclusion.

William A. Heth
Taylor University, Upland, IN

Das Gebet im Neuen Testament: Zugleich Versuch einer vom Neuen Testament aus zu erteilenden Antwort auf heutige Fragen. By Oscar Cullmann. Tübingen: Mohr, 1994, 191 pp., n.p.

Cullmann has given the world of scholarship one more provocative study to crown an already exceptional career. Taking up the subject of prayer, Cullmann offers both a rebuttal to those who would contest the genuineness of the believer's experience and a help to those whose faith is tried by the hiddenness of God. The result is vintage Cullmann: a simple, clear treatment of a difficult topic, written with a compelling logic that any beginning student in theology can readily understand. Now that it has been translated into English (Fortress, 1995), this work will make an excellent resource for a subject that is too often neglected in the seminary curriculum.

The book begins with an introductory segment reviewing the difficulties and objections raised against prayer in the thoughts and experiences of the modern person. Although much of the critique arises from a rejection of a personal God who actively influences history, the evangelical reader will doubtless find some of his own uncertainty and misgivings eloquently represented. From there Cullmann turns to the NT passages dealing with prayer. Without aspiring to the completeness of a concordance he devotes three major chapters to prayer in Jesus' ministry, in Paul and finally in the Johannine literature. The remainder of the NT is only cursorily treated in a fourth, shorter chapter since, as Cullmann explains, the contents of those works merely confirm the emphases already found in the preceding investigation. At the conclusion of his book Cullmann returns to the issues of today, offering a synthesis of his findings in terms of the objections so profoundly articulated in the introduction.

From Matt 6:8 Cullmann concludes that although God does not need our prayers—"your Father knows what you need before you ask him"—he nonetheless desires them. This seeming paradox is not, however, a contradiction, for God has created human beings to unite freely with his loving will and desires to remain in communication with them. Even the admonition to persistence in prayer (e.g. Luke 11:8) stems from this desire, Cullmann maintains. Moreover nothing is fundamentally excluded as an object of prayer, neither prayer for material things nor the cry to God in the moment of need spoken in the face of the very real possibility that he will not deliver (Matt 26:39). Nonetheless the divine response to prayer demands a certain posture on the part of the one praying—viz., both faith and submission to the will of God. The latter must indeed accompany faith, Cullmann concludes, for in subjection to the divine will the lack of an answer to prayer becomes itself the answer.

In approaching the Pauline understanding of prayer, Cullmann chooses to group the entire *corpus Paulinum* together irrespective of the critical issues regarding authorship. His starting point is the indissoluble relationship between prayer and the Holy Spirit, specifically in Rom 8:12–27; Gal 4:6. Since Paul identifies the Spirit as the one speaking in the believer's prayer, conversation with God becomes for Cullmann "eschatological speech." Moreover, in the tension between the "already" and the "not yet" the Spirit intercedes for the Christian not only through intelligible human language but also through "unspoken groanings" (Rom 8:26), an expression that Cullmann takes to refer to glossolalia. This does not mean, however, that the believer thereby becomes a passive nonparticipant. On the contrary: We should actively seek conversation with God because the Spirit speaks in us, Cullmann insists. Seen in this light it is only natural that Paul never tires of exhorting his readers to perseverance in prayer.

Turning to the Johannine literature, Cullmann again chooses to overlook critical questions of authorship in treating the gospel of John together with the Johannine epistles as witnesses to a common tradition. Focusing in particular on "worshiping the Father in Spirit and truth" (John 4:21–24), prayer "in Jesus' name" (John 14–16) and the intercession of Jesus for his own disciples (John 17), Cullmann finds a consistently

Christocentric emphasis to be characteristic of the Johannine perspective. The help that the entire NT deems to be necessary for effective prayer (especially Rom 8:26) is found in Jesus Christ who has opened the way to God and continues to bring our requests before the Father.

The strength of Cullmann's work lies in the crispness of its formulations and its courage in approaching a topic that most scholars would prefer to relegate to the domain of practical piety. Nonetheless, as is perhaps inevitable, there are some gaps that compromise the thoroughness of the project. Cullmann does not, for example, endeavor to deal with the theologies of the individual synoptic evangelists. As a result he fails to note the significance of the fig-tree episode in the plot of the synoptic story, a lapse that, if avoided, might have further illuminated the eschatological dimension of Christian prayer in harmony with both Paul and John. Such minor weaknesses do not, however, greatly detract from the success of the book. One can only hope that Cullmann's contribution stimulates a broader academic discussion of the hard issues surrounding what Luther has labeled "the true avocation of the Christian."

Donald J. Versepunt
Wheaton, IL

The NKJV Greek-English Interlinear New Testament. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1994, 918 pp., \$29.99.

This new interlinear provides a column of the NKJV side by side with a parallel column of the *Greek New Testament according to the Majority Text* as edited by Hodges and Farstad. There are three interlinear text lines: one for the Greek text, one for a literal English translation, and the third for a more idiomatic English translation. Two types of notes are provided at the bottom of the NKJV column. Textual notes give differences between the Majority Text (MT), the Textus Receptus (TR) and the United Bible Societies/Nestle-Aland Greek texts (NU). Also, word-study notes provide insights into the meaning of key Greek words.

The book's introduction provides brief information on interlinear translations, the differences between the above-mentioned Greek texts, the value of the NKJV, and an explanation of the symbols, punctuation and style within this interlinear. The introduction concludes with five pages of an overview of Biblical Greek grammar supplemented elsewhere with a bibliography of useful lexicons and grammars. At the end of the volume there is an index to the word studies, listing Greek words and their English equivalents with the Scripture references where the notes are found. Each of these notes gives the Greek word, its phonetic equivalent, and its meaning as found in various texts. These notes are meant to whet the appetite for further study.

This volume serves to fill a need for those who prefer to use the Greek Majority Text and who want an interlinear to access it. The NKJV follows the TR and not the MT. The textual notes thus point out the differences between these two texts and include major differences with the critical text. Of course these textual notes are not comprehensive.

Both the literal and the more idiomatic interlinear texts generally support the translation decisions found in the NKJV. At times it deviates, as found in 2 Cor 12:7, where the interlinear has "by the extraordinary quality of the revelations" and the NKJV has "above measure by the abundance of the revelations." These differences can be helpful for those who are wrestling with the meaning of the Greek.

All in all, this edition will be of service to those who have a preference for the Greek Majority Text and for those who prefer "the complete equivalence" philosophy of translation of the NKJV.

Fred Karlson
Bibles International, Grand Rapids, MI

Learn to Read New Testament Greek. By David Alan Black. Expanded ed. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1994, xiv + 236 pp., \$24.99. *User-Friendly Greek: A Common Sense Approach to the Greek New Testament.* By Kendell H. Easley. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1994, viii + 167 pp., \$14.99 paper. *New Testament Greek.* By Gerald L. Stevens. Lanham: University Press of America, 1994, xxiv + 492 pp., \$29.50. *New Testament Greek Workbook.* By Gerald L. Stevens. Lanham: University Press of America, 1994, x + 287 pp., \$29.50 paper. *Intermediate New Testament Greek: A Linguistic and Exegetical Approach.* By Richard A. Young. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1994, xi + 308 pp., \$21.99.

The growing tendency among seminaries and Christian colleges to depreciate Biblical language study is being countered by the publication of many excellent tools and textbooks, especially for the study of NT Greek. Each of the volumes reviewed here is an excellent addition to this literature.

Within two years of its first edition, Black's introductory grammar is enjoying heavy use at seminaries and colleges. This expanded edition adds a summary of noun and pronoun paradigms, tables of case and person suffixes, a summary of prepositions, a short list of principal parts, a key to translation exercises, and several other lists, plus minor improvements throughout. Black follows the five-case system and grounds his presentation in linguistic features. His discussion of tense is current. Charts and paradigm lists abound. Most chapters end with extensive Greek translation exercises. He gives especially good explanations of adjectives, the aorist and perfect tenses, personal and demonstrative pronouns, amalgamation in future and aorist tenses, and verb contraction. Biblical examples and exercises are included wherever useful. A review chapter with morphological analysis of the indicative mood is helpful. The chapter on participles is clear and complete. Conditional sentences are dealt with briefly in a way that advances beyond the traditional. Information on word and clause order in the final chapter is excellent but condensed. An appendix on accents is simple and concise, the subject index is extensive and useful, and a summary list of vocabulary is helpful (but should include page or chapter numbers).

The book's weaknesses are not major. Classroom teachers may find the chapter vocabulary lists too extensive for beginning students. Sometimes terms are used without having been defined (e.g. "final clause"). Chapter exercises have little variety, and translating English sentences into Greek (a helpful method) is never attempted. The analysis of the middle voice follows an inadequate traditional model. I find Black's explanation of the following concepts insufficient: cases, prepositions, deponent verbs, adverbs, agency, principal parts, third-declension noun forms, liquid verb forms and the optative mood. The discussion of contract verbs would benefit from a summary chart of contractions. Information on syntactical and discourse structure included in the final chapter will be confusing to most students. It needs broader explanation and application. The inclusion of a key to the translation exercises is a questionable addition. Finally a student workbook, welcomed by most teachers, is still unavailable. Overall, Black's grammar is an excellent tool for learning to read the Greek NT.

Easley's volume, on the other hand, is specifically designed for those who have finished beginning Greek and have either not understood or not studied intermediate Greek or have begun to lose their ability to use Greek for preaching or teaching. Those who have worked diligently to master the language should not let it rust out because it seems too complicated or time-consuming. This easy-to-read volume may help many continue to grow in Greek exegetical skills.

Easley avoids rehashing beginning Greek while teaching the basics of Greek syntax. Intermediate Greek often ignores clause and paragraph analysis, but this is where Easley begins. He shows how to distinguish various kinds of clauses, the grammatical parts of a sentence, verb patterns, conjunctions, sentence types, and structure markers within paragraphs, with the goal of developing a paragraph flow summary of a Greek passage as the basis for a sermon or lesson. Each step is carefully applied to three NT passages as hands-on exercises. Answers are included in the back of the book.

Easley reviews the basic syntax of Greek tenses, moods and genitive nouns. In each category the author distinguishes between the most "basic" use(s) and "special" uses, suggesting that readers utilize the "special" meanings only when the context demands it. He also provides summary charts and simplified names for syntactical designations. The final chapter completes the circle by looking again at macrostructure—how to analyze paragraph, narrative and compositional patterns. He closes by providing updated general guidelines for doing word studies, describing a modern linguistic, synchronic approach. Each chapter is immediately applied in further study of the chosen passages. Although not a general intermediate Greek text, this book fulfills its purpose admirably.

Stevens' *New Testament Greek* is a professor's dream: clear, precise, accurate, fully packed. In 34 lessons he includes 342 tables and charts. The closing pages contain two lexicons (keyed to lesson numbers), a vocabulary list by lesson number, 31 pages of paradigm charts, 15 pages of principal parts, a glossary and an extensive index. Based on a traditional, deductive approach, the book follows the five-case system (with "eight functions"), emphasizes vocabulary acquisition, stresses accents and pronunciation, teaches sentence diagramming and thoroughly explains almost everything imaginable in a beginning text. Each lesson ends with two lists of "what to learn" (points to master), one each for beginning and advanced students. Students are urged to read each lesson, look at the items to master, then reread that material. Type sizes used for explanations of inflections and form changes are large, providing one of the best visual presentations I have seen in any similar text.

The major problem with the book is its questionable design as both a beginning and an intermediate grammar. Intermediate material often confuses beginning students, and intermediate students usually find a beginning text boring. I especially recommend this book for the following: (1) seminary and graduate classes whose students have strong backgrounds in English grammar, (2) those who have learned Greek but want a strong review text, (3) remedial classes for students who passed beginning Greek but are not ready for detailed syntax study, and (4) Greek teachers who want examples of how to explain complex points. Further, the author should consider collecting his tables and charts into a book of reproducible transparencies for sale to Greek teachers as classroom aids.

All of the homework exercises for Stevens' text are included in his *New Testament Greek Workbook* rather than in the main text. Lessons correspond to those in the text. Both the vocabulary and "what to learn" lists are reproduced at the beginning of each lesson. Exercise pages are perforated to allow for classroom use. Combining fill-in-the-blank questions, charts to be filled in with paradigms and translations, and the translation of selected Greek sentences (often from the NT, with helpful hints in footnotes),

the workbook takes students through the essential matters of each lesson. Usually one or two sentences are to be diagrammed, but mere busywork is eliminated. The last five lessons include major selections from 1 John. The format and content of the workbook seem entirely appropriate for beginning students.

The lack of a thorough, up-to-date intermediate Greek grammar has now been partially resolved by Young (see D. Wallace's *Exegetical Syntax* for another). What Easley has simplified, Young has distinguished, categorized and classified, and he has done a remarkable job. Following the descriptive school of linguistics, Young seeks to link grammar, syntax and exegesis, emphasizing language analysis and the deep structure of Greek texts. The surface structure of a passage, says Young, is not a reliable guide to the author's intended meaning. Indeed, knowing the grammar and vocabulary of a language does not necessarily imply that we know the meaning of a text, since form and meaning can be "skewed" (cf. idioms and figures of speech).

This book is a masterpiece of detail and analysis, covering all the major areas of Greek syntax. It describes 24 basic uses of the genitive case (plus 25 other subcategories), 14 uses of the infinitive, and 24 functions of participles. Young analyzes 14 major conjunctions, including 17 distinct uses of *kai*. Each function is defined, described and illustrated, usually with at least one Greek example (with English translation). Each chapter ends with 16 to 20 specific exercises, in which students are asked to state the syntactical function of various words, give alternate possibilities, and translate passages so as to show the force of the selected function(s). Young gives both a traditional and a semantic analysis of conditional sentences, describes the philosophy and method of discourse analysis, explains sixteen types of figurative language, and clarifies word order, clauses and sentence patterns. The closing chapter illustrates various types of diagramming. He shuns line (sentence) diagramming but illustrates both thought-flow diagramming and semantic structure analysis.

The book is well designed and easy to read, with extensive Scripture and subject indices (by the end of the book, however, both indices are off by about ten pages, due probably to last-minute formatting changes). A teacher's answer book for exercises is available. The few weaknesses of this text are perhaps obvious. Much of the semantic information will be difficult for intermediate students to grasp. The mass of information makes the book harder to use as a course textbook, since most teachers will need to omit or abbreviate some parts for class use. Yet my own students have found it very helpful, and I highly recommend it. Even seminary graduates can use it to catch up on recent applications of linguistics and semantics to Greek.

Wayne A. Brindle
Liberty University, Lynchburg, VA

The Morphology of Biblical Greek. By William D. Mounce. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994, 362 pp., \$39.99.

The volume under review is a companion volume to Mounce's grammar, *The Basics of Biblical Greek*, and to his *Analytical Lexicon to the Greek New Testament*. In *Morphology* he categorizes rules based on the relationship between the phonetic and morphological features of Biblical Greek. Rather than simply memorizing irregular or exceptional forms, the Greek student is invited to learn the morphological rules that explain why Greek words have the forms they do.

The book is composed of five parts: (1) rules governing vocalic and consonantal changes, (2) rules governing verb formation, (3) page after page of paradigms of nouns and adjectives organized by morphological category, (4) page after page of paradigms of verbs organized by morphological category and (5) an alphabetical index listing all the words in the NT with their morphological category. The morphological categories are denoted by nomenclature that is difficult to remember, such as “n-3a” for third-declension nouns with stems ending in a labial, and “v-2d(5)” for verbs with roots ending in a nasal. The initial chapter on phonology is a detailed introduction to labials, velars, fricatives, sibilants, etc., and the various morphological changes they cause as they combine.

The author’s erudition and attention to detail required by a book of this nature are impressive. This unique work will be of greatest use to those whose interest in linguistics requires them to become involved with the minutiae of the morphology of Biblical Greek. Instructors will find in it answers to questions such as “Why does the aorist passive of ἀκούω have a σ before the θ (ἤκούσθην)?” The author’s stated goal, to make it easier for the Greek student to learn rules rather than to simply memorize forms, is well taken. But the book probably far exceeds the interest of the typical student of Biblical Greek.

Karen H. Jobes
Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, PA

Linguistics and New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Discourse Analysis. Edited by David Alan Black with Katharine Barnwell and Stephen Levinsohn. Nashville: Broadman, 1992, 319 pp., \$15.99 paper.

Black, in consultation with Barnwell and Levinsohn, assembles here fourteen essays on NT discourse analysis (DA), most of them drawn from a 1991 conference held at the Summer Institute of Linguistics in Dallas and a few specially written for the volume. Sometimes called text grammar, DA has over the last two decades become a growing phenomenon in literary criticism and in the theory and practice of Bible translation. Only recently have various manifestations of it begun to be applied more broadly in Biblical exegesis. Although the term is also used of certain sociological studies as a method of linguistics and literary criticism, DA focuses on the organization of language above the sentence level. It attempts to understand a text’s flow of thought by analyzing how it produces that flow of thought. The stated aim of this book (pp. 11, 13) is to provide beginning students (of DA?) an idea of the contribution DA makes to understanding the NT message, an overview of current scholarship in this application of the subject, and especially a tool for all Bible students.

The first five essays approach the subject from a more generalized point of view. J. P. Louw opens the collection by elaborating his method for reading a text as a discourse. It is the same method presented in his *Semantics of New Testament Greek* (1982). Levinsohn’s article analyzes the ways participants are referred to in a narrative as a means of discerning seams and emphasis. Other general topics include an analysis of semantic paragraph patterns as reflecting ways readers inherently process information (J. Tuggy, some of whose article is obscure); the relative order of subject, complement, and verb in copula clauses, as an indication of contrast, emphasis, focus, and relation to theme line (J. Callow); and the importance for the question of Marcan

priority (or posteriority) of viewing the details of grammar and style from within the broader framework of choice in the communication event (Black).

The remaining nine essays apply DA to particular NT texts. Within the limits of this review there is room only to list them. E. Wendland studies the interaction of text, cotext and context in the story of Simon and the woman who anointed Jesus (Luke 7:36–50). R. Buth considers *oun*, *de*, *kai* and asyndeton in John's gospel, and the imperativals in Romans 12 from N. Miller's subject. K. Callow analyzes what it means in the Corinthian letters when an expected *de* does not appear, and then in a second article she investigates patterns of thematic development in 1 Cor 5:1–13. Other topics include a multidimensional analysis of the components and transitions of Galatians (H. V. D. Parunak), the function of *kai* in the NT and especially 2 Peter (K. Titrud), an approach to the exegesis of 1 John based on a DA of the Greek text (R. Longacre), and a study of DA and Jewish apocalyptic in Jude (C. Osburn).

In his foreword to the collection, linguist E. Nida observes that the wide differences among the papers in the use of technical terminology can make reading this book a difficult learning experience. Still, he believes that because much of what is presented represents insights from work done on the translation field in a wide variety of real languages, there is here a sense of realism lacking in similar academic symposia as well as an unusual opportunity for related disciplines to interact on common ground. Nida is absolutely right on all three points. Equally remarkable in these studies is the sheer variety of issues to which DA can be applied: from the function of particles, to the effect of constituent order, to larger discourse structure, to the synoptic problem, and much more. Some of these approaches may eventually turn out to be dead ends, but most promise to become productive instruments of exegesis.

For too long scholars have lacked a tool for considering NT texts, or any texts for that matter, from a holistic point of view. Discourse analysis in all its diversity, tried and untried, seeks to fill that methodological void. Patiently working through many of the articles of this volume will repay the reader handsomely—not only in fresh insights on particular texts, not only in new methods for approaching old problems, not only in a systematic means of accounting for the ways he or she reads a text, but also in renewed excitement and enthusiasm for the task of interpreting the NT.

Richard Erickson
Fuller Theological Seminary, Seattle, WA

Jesus as God: The New Testament Use of Theos in Reference to Jesus. By Murray J. Harris. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992, 379 pp., \$24.99.

Over the last twenty years the prevailing winds of Christological studies have blown away from an exploration of titles applied to Christ toward what has been termed an "implicit Christology." Believing that titles "encapsulate the early Christian understanding of the role and status of Jesus" (p. 10), Harris desires to reinvigorate the discussion around Christological titles by exploring NT texts where *Theos* ("God") may refer to Jesus. Harris cites three reasons for his study: (1) the trend away from titular Christology, (2) the absence of comprehensive studies of *Theos* as a Christological title, and (3) the assertion that NT writers generally avoided using *Theos* Christologically and, when they did, such usage carried functional rather than ontological significance.

Following an introductory chapter examining the use of *Theos* in the LXX and NT, Harris investigates nine "major" NT texts (John 1:1; 1:18; 20:28; Acts 20:28; Rom 9:5;

Titus 2:13; Heb 1:8–9; 2 Pet 1:1; 1 John 5:20) and seven “other” texts (1 Tim 3:16; Col 2:2; 2 Thess 1:12; Eph 5:5; Gal 2:20; John 17:3; Matt 1:23) in which “God” may be understood as a reference to Christ. Of these he categorizes seven as either probable (John 1:18), very probable (Rom 9:5; Titus 2:13; Heb 1:8; 2 Pet 1:1) or certain (John 1:1; 20:28) regarding a Christological use.

In the final chapter Harris summarizes his conclusions and addresses the significance of *Theos* as a Christological title. Since only seven of the 1,315 NT uses of *Theos* may refer to Christ, Harris insists that one should read *Theos* as “the Father” unless context dictates otherwise. He accounts for the infrequent use of *Theos* as a descriptive title for Jesus in several ways: (1) to maintain the distinction between the Son and the Father, (2) to emphasize the subordination of the Son to the Father, (3) to avoid the charge of ditheism or polytheism from opponents, and (4) to safeguard the humanity of Jesus against gnostic detractors.

Because these texts emerged from several Christian communities in different geographic regions, Harris reasons that the Christological use of *Theos* reflects the mainstream of early Christology, not the musings of an isolated Christian sect. That this practice occurred in Jewish as well as Gentile churches demonstrates that such ideas were not limited to a nonmonotheistic milieu. In fact Harris acknowledges Judaism as the matrix from which the Christological use of *Theos* emerged. The first to address Jesus this way—most likely in the setting of worship—were Jews immersed in a world dominated religiously by the LXX, divine Wisdom and angelic mediators. This religious culture provided the means by which the dramatic events of the first century could be interpreted.

To those who claim that the application of *Theos* to Christ occurred only late in the first century Harris responds that (1) liturgical use was prior to its first literary appearance in the mid-50s, (2) Thomas’ confession (John 20:28) was an historical event, not an invention by the author, (3) the catalyst for such usage was not the passage of time but a demanding event—namely, the resurrection, and (4) Titus, 2 Peter and Hebrews, typically designated as later NT writings, may in fact be much earlier (mid-60s). Therefore Harris concludes that the Christological use of *Theos* began immediately after the resurrection in the 30s.

Harris challenges the scholarly status quo with his insistence that the Christological use of *Theos* is primarily ontological. While acknowledging the importance of the functional element, he argues that “the presupposition of functional Christology is ontological Christology” (p. 289). He finds warrant for his position in the HB, the NT, and the recent work of religious philosophers who question the distinction between function and ontology. The interest in the nature of the divine, Harris insists, did not begin with Nicea or Chalcedon. It is apparent throughout the Bible.

Harris’ book has much to offer the informed reader. His detailed exegesis is unmatched in previous works on this topic as he explores matters textual, grammatical, syntactical, historical and theological. With the precision of an attorney he presents his evidence, summarizes it and argues his case. A bibliography (pp. 319–348) containing over eight hundred titles attests to his knowledge of the secondary literature. Because the evidence he cites in some cases is so massive, his presentations of data often take the form of lists and outlines. This method allows for ease of reading and facilitates analysis. Copious footnotes present related details throughout the book.

Some readers will no doubt deem Harris’ trinitarian language (e.g. p. 47 n. 112) premature and assumptive. His characterization of *Kyrios* (“Lord”) as a primarily “functional” title when applied to Christ (p. 282) is too limited, especially in regard to those Christologically interpreted OT quotations where *Kyrios* translates the divine name (e.g. Rom 10:13; 14:11; Phil 2:10–11). More significantly, Harris writes that Paul re-

formulates his monotheism to accommodate the veneration of Jesus. Apparently he assumes that pre-Christian Jewish monotheism was made in the image of rabbinic Judaism, an assumption that may not hold. Evidence suggests that Jewish monotheism became more rigid following AD 70. Thus the later belief may not reflect the earlier.

These minor criticisms aside, Harris successfully reasserts the importance of Christological titles and challenges long-held scholarly convictions. From now on, journeys into this field must deal with Harris' noteworthy contribution. Two appendices, the first on the use of the Greek definite article and the second on NT testimony to the deity of Christ, conclude the book.

David B. Capes
Houston Baptist University, Houston, TX

Jesus of Nazareth: Lord and Christ—Essays on the Historical Jesus and New Testament Christology. Edited by Joel B. Green and Max Turner. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994, 536 pp., \$37.00.

This is a collection of 30 essays written in honor of I. Howard Marshall's sixtieth birthday. The contributors are well-known scholars from Australia, Canada, England, Germany, Norway, Scotland and the United States. The essays themselves appear under three headings: (1) Jesus, the synoptic gospels, Acts; (2) Jesus, Paul, John; (3) NT Christology: wider issues. They range from broad overviews (cf. G. R. Beasley-Murray's "The Kingdom of God and Christology in the Gospels") to the interpretation of part of a verse (cf. R. J. Bauckham's "Jesus and the Wild Animals [Mark 1:13]: A Christological Image for an Ecological Age"), from less technical (cf. L. Morris, "Disciples of Jesus") to quite technical (cf. A. C. Thiselton, "Christology in Luke, Speech-Act Theory, and the Problem of Dualism in Christology after Kant"). Almost all assume a knowledge of Greek and often of Hebrew.

As in any collection of essays it is difficult to achieve consistency and unity throughout. Some fit more neatly the theme of this work than others. Some essays are more heavily footnoted than others. (One has no footnotes at all.) In this review it is impossible to comment on all of the articles in the volume. Some of the more important and interesting for me are the following.

R. J. Bauckham, "Jesus and the Wild Animals": Bauckham argues that Mark's reference to Jesus being "with the wild animals" in Mark 1:13 is an allusion to the restoration of the earth through Jesus' inauguration of the messianic age. The opposing understanding sees this passage negatively as witnessing to the fallenness of creation due to sin. According to the latter interpretation, the wild animals intensify Jesus' temptation. I frankly do not know how we can know exactly what Mark meant by this five-word comment. As for Bauckham's ecological application, this seems farfetched. Having said this, I cannot think of a better introduction to this subject.

J. B. Green, "Good News to Whom? Jesus and the 'Poor' in the Gospel of Luke": After a survey of recent discussion on this subject, which sees the "poor" as referring to the "economically destitute," Green argues that this term refers not to one's economic status but to their class status. As a result tax collectors are associated with the poor, even though their economic status might be quite different. Green argues convincingly against the "materialistic exegesis" that dominates thinking in this area. Although in reaction to such exegesis Green at times goes too far, his point is well made. This should be required reading for any interested in this subject.

Both D. L. Bock, "The Son of Man and the Debate over Jesus' 'Blasphemy,'" and E. E. Ellis, "Deity-Christology in Mark 14:58," discuss the issue of what Jesus said at his trial that was blasphemous. According to *m. Sanh.* 7:5 blasphemy is technically defined as requiring the pronouncement of the sacred name YHWH. Bock argues, however, that blasphemy could also be understood as involving the idea of sitting in God's presence. Thus Jesus' claim of sitting at the right hand of God was considered blasphemy because it assumed that he could approach God in a way no other human could. It was a claim even worse than saying he had the right to enter the Holy of Holies in the temple. Ellis argues that Jesus was accused of blasphemy primarily because he claimed to be the Son of Man (Dan 7:13–14) and combined this with the claim to be David's Lord and to sit at God's right hand (Ps 110:1). Other claims of Jesus, such as the right to forgive sins and the ability to rise from the dead, were also considered blasphemous.

R. H. Gundry, "The Essential Physicality of Jesus' Resurrection according to the New Testament": In this excellent article Gundry argues that the Biblical materials portray Jesus' resurrection as physical in nature. Gundry points out that those who see the idea of the resurrected Jesus possessing a physical body as being "crude" and "crass" reject the Biblical evidence. Even as the NT portrayal of the risen Christ swam against the strong stream of Platonic influence in its day, so Gundry argues we must as well. This is an important article.

J. W. Drane, "Patterns of Evangelization in Paul and Jesus: A Way Forward in the Jesus-Paul Debate?", and D. Wenham, "The Story of Jesus Known to Paul," deal with the issue of how much Paul knew about the historical Jesus. Drane points out that Paul's knowledge about Jesus was probably both broader and narrower than ours today. It was broader in that he knew traditions that have since been lost. It was narrower in that he probably did not know all the material found in our canonical gospels. Drane argues that Paul visited Peter in Jerusalem (Gal 1:18 ff.) with the express purpose of obtaining information about the historical Jesus. Drane's own contribution to the debate is the attempt to show Wittgensteinian "family resemblances" in the way Jesus and Paul exercised their evangelistic zeal. Up to this point it is easy to follow Drane, but when he sees these resemblances in their leaving their hearers "personal space to work out" what discipleship involved, one wonders what Jesus and Paul we are talking about. In his article Wenham reviews evidence that suggests Paul may have known more about Jesus of Nazareth than he explicitly reveals. Wenham points out that the argument from silence may be quite misleading. If it were not for a particular problem in Corinth concerning the Lord's supper, Paul would never have written his account in 1 Corinthians 11. Would it not have been false to have concluded from this silence that Paul knew nothing about this sacrament? This article is not groundbreaking. It is, however, a most useful and serviceable introduction to the subject. I recommend it to students as a good introduction to the question, which can then be followed by Wenham's *Paul: Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?*

G. D. Fee, "Christology and Pneumatology in Rom 8:9–11—and Elsewhere: Some Reflections on Paul as a Trinitarian": Fee's purpose is to refute the trend in scholarship to understand the relationship of the risen Jesus and the Spirit as one of identification or of equation based on 2 Cor 3:17. Such views of necessity involve a denial of a trinitarian understanding by the apostle. Fee points out that those who argue for a Spirit Christology do so on the basis of a small group of texts full of "notorious exegetical difficulties." On the other hand, Fee argues from a much fuller and richer corpus of references that Paul saw God, Christ and the Spirit as distinct persons best understood in a trinitarian framework.

M. Turner, "The Spirit of Christ and 'Divine' Christology": The purpose of this article is to investigate the Christological significance of the relationship of Jesus and the gift of the Spirit. Using his own words, "*there is simply NO analogy for an exalted human (or any other creature) becoming so integrated with God that such a person may be said to 'commission' God's Spirit, and through that to extend that exalted person's own 'presence' and activity to people on earth*" (italics his). This understanding, found in the earliest Christian teaching, provided a strong inclination to a divine Christology.

The above is but a superficial overview of some articles I found more interesting and valuable. With respect to the volume as a whole, I find it an appropriate tribute to Marshall. It is only fitting that such a group of outstanding scholars would contribute to this volume in his honor. Every college and seminary library should have a copy of this work, and every NT scholar should read/skim through it. Students doing research on areas touched in this volume will find it most valuable. As in the case of most essay collections I find it hard, however, to recommend the purchase of this book by pastors and students.

Robert H. Stein
Bethel Theological Seminary, St. Paul, MN

Jesus Under Fire: Modern Scholarship Reinvents the Historical Jesus. Edited by Michael J. Wilkins and J. P. Moreland. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1995, 243 pp., \$16.99.

The Jesus Seminar is the pretentious and misleading name adopted by a self-appointed group of eccentric North American academics who have taken it upon themselves to decide which of the words and events recorded in the gospels really were said or done by Jesus, and they have concluded that the answer is "very few." It is astonishing to an observer in Britain that this quixotic enterprise, aptly described by J. Neusner as "the greatest scholarly hoax since the Piltdown Man," should be thought worthy of a book-length refutation by a group of evangelical scholars. But clearly the Seminar members have been able to gain press attention in North America to a sufficient degree to make their publications a matter of pastoral concern. This is thus a book by North Americans for North Americans.

But while the immediate occasion of the book is of limited (and hopefully temporary) importance, the subject matter is in fact much wider and of more fundamental interest. For the Christian world has long been plagued by other eccentric accounts of Jesus, too varied to be categorized under a single heading but regularly characterized by a similarly cavalier approach to historical evidence, which is properly the object of ridicule on the part of many other scholars of ancient history.

So Wilkins and Moreland have asked eight evangelical specialists to write on aspects of this problem. Most of the essays at least start by considering the Jesus Seminar material but then go into wider questions of method and presupposition. The editors make it clear in their introduction that they hope to reach the interested non-Christian reader, though they recognize (and the book as a whole illustrates) the problem of trying at the same time to be "popular" and to offer a "substantive response" at an academic level, and the overtly evangelistic epilogue does not follow very comfortably from the style of much of the rest of the book. The book makes no pretense of neutrality and at times (particularly in the essay by R. D. Geivett) adopts a hectoring tone that I would expect the average uncommitted reader to find rather patronizing.

Three chapters stand out for me as of particular value. C. Blomberg first offers (pp. 19–25) a brief and trenchant critique of the idiosyncratic scholarship of the Jesus

Seminar that should make the rest of the book unnecessary. But he then goes on to provide a clear, well-documented and compelling account of the history of "historical Jesus research" and a sane account of how the gospels should be understood as historical sources. This is an admirable presentation of the conservative case in small compass, written by a man who is clearly both enviably well-read and eminently reasonable rather than merely reactive.

D. Bock discusses the question of the authenticity of Jesus' words recorded in the gospels in a lively and attractive style. He graphically warns against judging the largely oral world of the NT by the standards of our high-tech culture. His discussion of the issue of whether the gospels offer us the actual words of Jesus or rather a valid account of the content of his teaching is admirable and shows incontrovertibly how the actual data of the gospels, with their different selection, arrangement and interpretive presentation of the sayings of Jesus, rule out the ultraconservative attempt to argue at all points for the *ipsissima verba*. A welcome, wholesome chapter.

G. Habermas provides what is, to my knowledge, as good a discussion of the credibility of the gospel accounts of Jesus' miracles as can be found in a mere 20 pages. It is particularly good to see the accounts of miracles in other ancient literature, Jewish and pagan, given serious treatment in comparison with the gospels. Many Christians are unnecessarily alarmed on discovering that Jesus was not the only miracle-worker in the ancient world, and skeptics are sometimes too easily allowed to exploit that alarm. This is how historical/philosophical apologetics should be done.

In other chapters S. McKnight provides an introduction to Jesus studies that overlaps a little with Blomberg's chapter. C. Evans gives a surprisingly selective account of the debate over "What did Jesus do?" W. L. Craig compresses into a few pages his previously published lengthy accounts of reasons for believing in Jesus' resurrection but, no doubt for lack of space, neither responds directly to the old rationalistic explanations nor takes up the issue of harmonizing the gospel accounts. Geivett discusses "Jesus the Only Way?" from an angle of philosophical apologetics that sits uncomfortably alongside the more historical orientation of the rest of the book and is regrettably prone to personal rather than academic debate. E. Yamauchi provides a typically measured and well-selected account of evidence for Jesus outside the NT.

All in all, a useful if patchy book, of greater value than its limited initial target might lead one to expect. It is marred by a truly yucky cover design and by indices that incredibly seem to include only entries in the main text and ignore the footnotes.

Dick France
Wycliffe Hall, Oxford, England

Jesus: Miriam's Child, Sophia's Prophet: Critical Issues in Feminist Christology. By Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza. New York: Continuum, 1994, x + 262 pp., \$22.95.

Schüssler Fiorenza's analysis of current work in feminist Christology is an open-ended agenda for a feminist Christological discussion aimed at liberation of the oppressed. The result of such liberation would be a radical discipleship of equals where women are eligible for all ecclesiastical offices. The author argues that most contemporary, male-interpreted Christology produces an atmosphere that subjugates women and propagates an unnecessary common-sense view of gender roles. Moreover she also suggests that many feminist Christologies idealize "feminine" traits such as sacrificial love and submission while showing Jesus as the archetype of these traits. Schüssler

Fiorenza opines that these interpretations also serve to relegate women to second-class status and unwittingly promote the structure of domination from which the oppressed should find liberation. The mechanism she suggests for reaching liberation is twofold: (1) creating a Jesus and Christian movement that leads to these ends, and (2) discussing experiences of liberation inspired by divine Wisdom.

This book has many strengths. It demonstrates mastery of the field of feminist Christology by offering clear summaries of recent feminist works. Moreover the work includes an up-to-date bibliography emphasizing feminist, wisdom and liberation issues. The vast majority of these works date from 1985 to 1994. Moreover 49 pages of endnotes carefully outline recent work on the specific issues in feminist Christology. Thus the author offers the student ample entrance into recent work on this subject. Also, Schüssler Fiorenza covers a wide range of topics from the atonement and ancient Church fathers to Dan Quayle's view of the family. Thus she presents material of wide interest to a diverse audience.

Weaknesses include a plethora of neologisms (e.g. "wo/men," "s/he," "kyriarchy," "sophialogy," "malestream"). Most of these words she carefully defines, but they are burdensome for the reader and add little to her argument. The worst neologisms are "G*d" and "G*ddess," which on p. 163 she uses for a hidden agenda: In Luke 1:49 she translates *autou* as "G*d's" apparently simply to avoid using "his" for God. Another weakness is the underdeveloped idea of the oppressed gathering around Wisdom's table to forge a liberating Christianity: What makes such a discussion any more objective than any other group discussion? Moreover what is this Wisdom, and what is the guarantee of finding Wisdom's words? What makes this Christian?

To locate this work in its place in Biblical and theological studies it is necessary to say what it is not. It is not a work on the historical Jesus and only touches on the exegesis of the NT texts as they stand. The closest we find to either subject is when Schüssler Fiorenza briefly discusses layers of narrative under the text, particularly those that deal with women and the resurrection appearances. Moreover she does not interact with much evangelical scholarship on feminist issues. Thus this work is indispensable to those working with feminist issues from a nonevangelical perspective and valuable to those working with such issues from an evangelical outlook. But it is of little value to the Biblical scholar and exegete.

Overall, the work sensitizes its readers to the failure of many Christians to hold women in a position of high honor and equal significance before God. The author has given us a thought-provoking, erudite treatment of feminist issues and Christology. Though rejecting Biblical texts as normative in setting the parameters of orthodox Christianity, Schüssler Fiorenza nevertheless gives evangelicals much food for thought as we seek God's vision of unity and dignity among all believers.

Carl Judson Davis
Cornerstone Church, Conyers, GA

The Method and Message of Jesus' Teachings. By Robert H. Stein. Rev. ed. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1994, 203 pp., \$14.99 paper.

This revised edition, like the first edition, will prove to be an important textbook for introductory courses in both colleges and seminaries. Stein addresses the topics of Jesus the teacher (chap. 1), the form of Jesus' teaching (chap. 2), the parables of Jesus (chap. 3), the content of Jesus' teaching: the kingdom of God (chap. 4), the content of

Jesus' teaching: the Fatherhood of God (chap. 5), the content of Jesus' teaching: the ethics of the kingdom (chap. 6), and the content of Jesus teaching: Christology (chap. 7).

This newer edition has some comparative features worth noting. (1) The NRSV replaces the RSV used in the original. (2) The bibliography has been updated. Some of the added works are those of authors such as R. Alter, W. Watson, J. Barr, B. Witherington, C. Blomberg, A. Collins, D. Hagner and J. Piper, just to mention a few. (3) Two new sections have been introduced in this edition. One is "The Political School" of interpretation presented in chap. 4. The other is "Jesus' Authority Over the Sabbath" on p. 119. The more careful reader perhaps will feel confused at this point, because in the preface the author presents the section entitled "Jesus' Use of Amen" (pp. 121–123) as the new section instead of the latter. (4) The view presented in the first edition that Jesus' use of *abba* is a counterpart of the modern expression "daddy" is rectified (p. 85). (5) The most significant rewriting is found in the discussion of the Son of Man title. One will notice that the expression "Son of Man" is replaced by the NRSV term "one like a human being."

Apart from minor issues, such as the fact that interaction with new literary and hermeneutical methods (so crucial in gospel studies today) is almost absent, or the fact that the fourth gospel receives less attention than the synoptics, I highly recommend this book. Stein is a stellar scholar. His work constitutes a critical evaluation of the teaching of Jesus in light of what the best experts on the topic have contributed thus far.

Luis Gustavo da Silva Gonçalves
Trinity International University, Deerfield, IL

The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting. Vol. 1: *Ancient Literary Setting*. Edited by Bruce W. Winter and Andrew D. Clarke. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993, xii + 479 pp., \$37.50.

Lake and Cadbury's *The Beginnings of Christianity* remains a useful resource for the study of Acts, but it is now quite out of date in the scope of issues it addresses as well as (frequently) in the information it includes. Increasing knowledge of epigraphy and papyri has greatly expanded our horizons, current discussions of literary genre are more nuanced, our perspectives on early Judaism have been radically reconfigured, and we recognize more of the influence of Lukan literary and theological concerns on the way he reports his history. The time has long been ripe for an entirely new work.

This new series promises to take us into the world of Acts in a more complete way than any of its predecessors, including *Beginnings*. Employing the expertise of classicists rather than only NT scholars, these works will contribute substantially to relevant discussion in our field. The writers of this first volume are conversant in scholarship in their respective areas of research. NT scholars, unlikely to be able to keep up with all the secondary literature in classics, will find this book essential for research on Acts. This work does, however, presuppose a knowledge of—or at least significant interest in—Greco-Roman antiquity. The editors have thus wisely seen to it that each chapter includes an introductory summary, making the work's conclusions more accessible to those more inclined to sample than study in detail the contents of each essay.

Volume 1 addresses especially the historical context of the genre of Acts and its constituent elements. It advances us considerably beyond earlier discussions not only in its opportunity to draw on the insights of earlier research but by providing a variety of perspectives from specialists. The breadth of perspectives may be illustrated, for example, by the inclusion of the work both of L. Alexander and of D. Palmer, who critiques her.

Placing Palmer's essay on genre first was a prudent editorial decision. Palmer carries forward the arguments of Aune and others for ancient history as the genre of Acts, setting it more precisely in the context of an historical monograph. He refutes Pervo's view of Acts as a romance (a genre into which the *Acts of Paul and Thecla* fit much better) as well as the view that it is merely a technical treatise. Other genres that subsequent essayists mention (such as biography and Biblical history) advance further elements of Acts that augment this basic genre. In a more detailed response to Pervo later in the book, R. Bauckham contends that, rather than the later *Acts of Paul* defining the canonical Acts' genre as novelistic biography, *Acts of Paul* is modeled on Acts and other earlier sources, which it develops in novelistic fashion.

Once we have asked the question of Acts and history we must ask how Acts relates to our other historical source for Paul's life—namely, his letters. Demonstrating an excellent firsthand knowledge of the sources, Hillard, Nodd and Winter (chap. 8) advance our understanding on this question. They find that biographers and letter writers generally had distinctive purposes and that biographers varied in reliability. Their data suggest that Luke is a reliable biographer if he actually traveled with Paul. D. Wenham examines the parallels between Paul's writings and Acts. Although I doubt his identification of Gal 2:1–10 with the visit of Acts 11:30, Wenham carefully surveys evidence for all the positions, both on this issue and others, and remains thorough and fair in his judgments.

The work also investigates the literary genres and forms contained in Acts. C. Gempf shows that the historians Thucydides and Polybius (in contrast to writers like Isocrates and Josephus) sought to report faithfully the substance of speeches. He concludes that the variety of accuracy in ancient authors shows that an ancient "standard" cannot predict Luke's accuracy or inaccuracy in the speeches (*pace* Dibelius *et al.*) The chapter is so well done that one wishes that Gempf would publish his dissertation, which he cites in a later footnote. Also extremely helpful is Winter's comparison of reports in Acts 24–26 with official legal proceedings, incorporating most of the primary evidence available (legal papyri). These papyri were summaries, as in Acts, but were regarded as accurate transcriptions of the speeches given. The structure of forensic speeches in general sheds considerable light on those in Acts.

Other parts of the book provide many helpful insights, even where some points may be questionable (e.g. Alexander's brief appeal to technical treatises or overemphasis on Socrates; her work on Diogenes Laertius is, however, quite good) or may be more familiar to NT scholars (e.g. Marshall's excellent defense of the literary unity of Luke-Acts; B. Rosner's insightful treatment of OT literary techniques, models and motifs in Acts; D. Peterson's treatment of how Acts' fulfillment motif would have been heard in both Jewish and broader Greco-Roman contexts; P. Head's reaffirmation of the secondary character of the Western text). In line with the book's title, F. S. Spencer helpfully presents modern literary criticism in a clear way and traces major applications of these approaches in Luke-Acts.

This volume will surely become an indispensable resource in the study of Acts and its world.

Craig S. Keener
Eastern Baptist Seminary, Philadelphia, PA

The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting. Vol. 2: Graeco-Roman Setting. Edited by David W. J. Gill and Conrad Gempf. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994, xiii + 627 pp., \$37.50.

Because the narratives of Acts belong to the cosmopolitan world of the first-century eastern Roman empire, historians of that empire find them useful. Because other data from the empire enable us to grasp the cultural presuppositions with which Luke and his audience both approached his work, a volume like this one (building on dialogue between ancient historians and NT scholars) is essential. Although many of the essays build on the contributions of earlier scholarship they usually provide significant advances as well.

One weakness of the volume is inevitable: No matter how large the work, one cannot limit the scope of issues relevant to Acts to a single volume within some measure of arbitrariness. Thus, for example, B. Winter's well-documented chapter on Claudian grain shortages helpfully illumines one feature of Acts 11, but the book lacks a chapter on Greco-Roman prophetism that might illumine how Greek readers may have understood another feature of that chapter. Given the high quality of the essays, however, we may suspect that one principle of selection for topics was the availability of a scholar with substantial expertise on that topic, and this principle has led to a work of relatively consistent excellence.

Although NT scholars have long depended on Ramsay's 1904 essay on Roman roads and travel (and to a lesser extent Charlesworth's and Casson's contributions), this volume includes two chapters that advance that discussion substantially. B. Rapske suggests that ancients traveled off-season more often than we have supposed. Depending on milestones and other evidence, D. French suggests that for safety's sake Paul avoided Roman roads on his second journey. Rapske reaffirms a Malta shipwreck and believes that the author probably participated in the events.

At some points the volume's research reaffirms views many NT scholars hold but supplies fresh evidence in their favor. For instance, G. W. Hansen supports the South Galatian theory, and Gill emphasizes the preeminence of the urban elite in the churches and their impact on the spread of early Christianity. Yet the volume also includes some surprises, at least for some of us. On the basis of first-century epigraphic evidence R. A. Kearsley challenges the view traditionally accepted by most NT scholars (including myself) that had associated Asiarchs with the imperial cult. Winter makes a very good case that conflict with the imperial cult probably characterized Christianity much earlier in its history than NT scholarship supposes, perhaps as early as Acts 18. In more than one hundred pages B. Blue provides an excellent survey of data on early Christian house churches and demonstrates an outstanding command of secondary literature on the Greco-Roman social environment rarely available to NT scholars.

Treatments of specialized geographical regions in the empire are generally outstanding, though some (e.g. R. Tracey's essay on Syria) are so commendably thorough they will profit particularly specialists. Students of Acts should read the discussions concerning external evidence for Sergius Paulus (A. Nobbs' essay on Cyprus) and G. H. R. Horsley's helpful analysis of inscriptions regarding the politarchs. Gill's work on Macedonia, but especially his work on Achaia, provide even more useful information, as does A. Clarke's chapter on Italy and Rome. But P. Trebilco's chapter on Asia will prove one of the most useful chapters to the NT scholar, especially providing data for Acts 19. J. Scott provides the best treatment of "ends of the earth" (Acts 1:8) available, and scholars should seriously consider his insights into the structure of Acts. Many of the treatments (including Gill on Achaia, Clarke on Italy, Scott on "ends of the earth") reflect an impressive array of primary data and/or secondary sources in classical litera-

ture with which NT scholars rarely work, as well as remaining directly relevant to the study of Acts.

Perhaps the greatest disappointment of the book (for evangelicals) comes in some of S. Porter's conclusions in his excursus on the "we" passages. Porter does skillfully and thoroughly critique the view that Acts is a novel and the idea that "we" represents a fictitious literary device. When he turns to the narrative in Acts, however, he concludes that the abrupt appearance and disappearance of "we" at points in the narrative points away from parallels to "we" in historical narrative and points rather to use of a source. The source may be accurate, but Porter thinks it is probably not Luke's own. But given Luke's literary skill, would he have left a "we" source unidentified if it did not include him? Although Porter discerns stylistic differences in the "we" narratives, the *hapax legomena* there could depend on Luke's use of his own earlier work on the differing content (including sea-travel narratives). Nevertheless the volume as a whole (including some of Porter's work) is a masterpiece and is mandatory reading for all students of Acts.

Craig S. Keener
Eastern Baptist Seminary, Philadelphia, PA